

This case is being handled by solicitor A.G.W. van Kessel of the law firm Van Kessel Advocatuur, with offices at Orionweg 47E, Leeuwarden (8938 AG), and by solicitor P.W.H. Stassen, of the law firm Stassen & Kemps Advocaten, situated at 6 Nachtegaallaan, Eindhoven (5611 CV);

Today, the fourteenth of July two thousand and twenty-three, at the request of:

1. Mr _____ residing in Sneek, in the municipality of Sudwest-Fryslân,
2. Mrs _____ residing in Sneek, in the municipality of Sudwest-Fryslân,
3. Mr _____ residing in Sneek, in the municipality of Sudwest-Fryslân,
4. Ms _____ residing in Doetinchem,
5. Mr _____ residing in Doetinchem,
6. Ms _____ residing in Zaandam, municipality of Zaanstad,
7. Mr _____ residing in Leeuwarden;

all of whom have elected domicile for the purposes of these proceedings at the office address of the solicitor, Mr
P.W.J. Stassen, of the law firm Stassen & Kemps, with offices at Nachtegaallaan
6, (5611 CV) Eindhoven, who has been appointed as counsel in these
proceedings and will act in that capacity;

and all of them also electing domicile at the office address of the lawyer, Mr A.G.W. van Kessel, of the law firm Van Kessel Advocatuur, with offices at Orionweg 47E, Leeuwarden (8938 AG), who has been appointed as counsel in these proceedings and will act in that capacity;

I, Andries Letse Haan, bailiff with a place of business in The Hague, with offices there at Regulustweg 11;

HEREBY SUMMON:

TO PROCEED, WITHIN FOURTEEN DAYS OF THE SERVICE OF THIS WRIT, TO A WRITTEN AND IRREVOCABLE ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THE ADMISSIBILITY OF THE PRIMARY CLAIM FOR A DECLARATION OF RIGHTS, BY SUBMITTING A WRITTEN OSIGNED STATEMENT TO THE PLAINTIFFS' SOLICITORS BY SENDING IT TO PO BOX 7004 5605 JA EINDHOVEN, THE NETHERLANDS.

THIS IS TO BE DONE WITH THE EXPRESS NOTICE THAT, IF THIS DEMAND IS NOT COMPLIED WITH, THIS WRIT WILL BE FILED WITH THE COURT AS A WRIT OF SUMMONS, AND THE AFOREMENTIONED DEBTOR, IF **HE** FAILS TO COMPLY WITH THE ABOVE DEMAND OR FAILS TO DO SO IN A TIMELY MANNER,

AND SUMMONED

(public officials)

1. Mr Everhardus Ite HOFSTRA, residing at _____ ,

who is summoned by a separate writ;

2. Mr Tamino VAN DISSEL, residing in _____ ,

who is summoned by a separate writ;

3. _____ Ms Petronella Gerarda KOOPMANS _____ residing in _____

who is summoned by a separate writ;

4. Mr Ark R TTE residing at an address which the defendant has requested be kept confidential,

having served my writ at that address and left a copy thereof and of the exhibits referred to herein at:

the aforementioned address in a sealed envelope bearing the details required by law, as I found no one there to whom a valid copy could be left;

5. Mrs Si id A nes Maria AG residing at [REDACTED], who is summoned by a separate writ;

6. Mr MH o atthDeE wONGsE, residing at , who is summoned by a separate writ;

7. Mr E t oha K IPERS, residing at , who is summoned by a separate writ;

8. Mr Diederik An onius Maria Paulus ohan es GOMMERS, residing who is to be summoned by a separate writ;

9. Mr Wo ke Bastiaan HOEKSTRA, residing in who is summoned by a separate writ;

10. Mrs Cornelia VAN NIEUWENHUIZEN, residing [REDACTED] ,

who is summoned by a separate writ;

(pharmaceutical industry)

11. Mr Albert BOURLA, residing at an address in New York, United States of America, known to the claimant,

who is to be summoned by a separate writ;

(mass media)

12. Ms iGceiselle a [REDACTED] eli and Ma Therese AN CANN, residing at

who is summoned by a separate writ;

13. Mr iaan [REDACTED] Ed [REDACTED] ANSEN, residing at [REDACTED] ,

who is summoned by a separate writ;

(non-governmental organisation (NGO, WEF))

14. Mr Eike SI BESMA, residing in [REDACTED] ,

who is summoned by a separate writ;

15. Mr William Henry B 11 GATES III, residing at an address in Medina, Washington, United States of America, known to the claimant, who is summoned by a separate writ;

16. Ms Catharina VAN DER VOORT KANT, residing at who is summoned by a separate writ;

The public-law legal entity STATE OF THE NETHERLANDS, having its registered office in The Hague (“the State”), which is summoned by a separate writ;

TO:

to appear on Wednesday 22 November 2023 at 10.00 am, not in person but represented by a solicitor, at the hearing of the District Court of the Northern Netherlands, Leeuwarden site, which hearing will be held at the courthouse at Zaailand 102, (8911 BN) Leeuwarden;

NOTING THAT:

- a. if a defendant fails to appoint a solicitor or fails to pay the court fees specified below in good time, and provided that the prescribed time limits and formalities have been observed, the judge will grant a default judgement against that defendant and will uphold the claim described below, unless it appears to him to be unlawful or unfounded;
- b. if at least one of the defendants appears in court and has paid the court fees in good time, a single judgment shall be delivered between all parties, which shall be regarded as a judgment following an adversarial hearing;

- c. if any of the defendants appear in the proceedings, a court fee will be levied, payable within four weeks from the date of appearance;
- d. the amount of the court fees is set out in the most recent annex to the Civil Proceedings (Court Fees) Act, which can be found, amongst other places, on the website: www.kbvg.nl/griffierechtentabel
- e. in the case of a person who is indigent, a court fee for indigent persons, as laid down by or pursuant to the Act, shall be levied, provided that, at the time the court fee is levied, the person has submitted:
 - (a) a copy of the decision to grant legal aid, as referred to in Article 29 of the Legal Aid Act, or, if this is not possible due to circumstances for which they cannot reasonably be held responsible, a copy of the application referred to in Article 24(2) of the Legal Aid Act; or
 - 2. a statement from the board of the Legal Aid Board, as referred to in Article 7(3)(e) of the Legal Aid Act, showing that his income does not exceed the limits specified in the Order in Council pursuant to Article 35(2) of that Act;
- f. in the case of defendants who are represented by the same solicitor and who submit identical submissions or put forward identical defences, a single joint court fee shall be levied in accordance with Article 15 of the Civil Proceedings Court Fees Act;

WHEREAS:

On the grounds set out below, and on behalf of the claimants, hereinafter referred to as **the group** collectively, we submit the following claim and conclude as follows:

Contents

Definitions and reading guide.....	2
Definitions	2
Reading guide	2
Products / USB stick.....	3
Introduction.....	3
The crux of this case	3
Significance and purpose of this case.	4
Claims	5
Defendants.	6
Public officials	6
Hofstra.....	6
Van Dissel.....	8
Rutte.....	10
Kaag.....	13
De Jonge.....	15
Kuiper s	20
Gommers.....	22
Hoekstra.....	24
Van Nieuwvihuizen.....	28
Pharmaceutical industry	29
Bourla.....	29
Mass media.....	33
Van Cann.....	33
Jansen	37
Non-governmental organisation (NGO, WEF).....	39
Sijbesma.....	39
Bates.....	43
Semi-public sector	48
Kdiit.....	48
Lareb does not provide data based on batch numbers.....	49
Kant is carrying out a data analysis for the COVID-19 project.	50
Kant's cover-up.....	50
Government.....	53
Examples of excesses	54
WET partner Grimes invests in the Dutch WEF partner Heineken.....	54
The State and its civil servants are violating a fundamental principle of the rule of law.	55
provision of Article 162 of the Civil Code of the Kingdom of the Netherlands.....	55
The State is threatening unvaccinated citizens of the Netherlands via national television with.....	56
death.....	56
Claimants, damages.....	56
Unlawful acts by the defendants	57
Infringement of a right	58
Conduct contrary to a statutory provision	58
Conduct contrary to what is required by unwritten law in social dealings	60
is deemed appropriate.....	60
Establishment of liability: a conditio sine qua non.....	61
Groeysaansyrakeli jkheid.....	62
Offer of evidence.....	62
Jurisdiction of the District Court of the Northern Netherlands, Leeuwarden division	62
Form of order sought.....	63

Definitions and reading guide

Definitions

1. A number of terms are defined in the text of this summons. To avoid confusion, a number of key terms are set out and explained here.
2. Covid-19: Wherever Covid-19 is referred to in this writ, it always refers to the life-threatening lung disease purportedly caused by the alleged SARS-CoV-2 virus, as claimed by the WHO. The use of the term Covid-19 in this summons in no way implies that the claimants acknowledge the existence of a life-threatening lung disease caused by a dangerous pathogen. Nor does the use of the term 'Covid-19' imply that the claimants acknowledge the existence of the SARS-CoV-2 virus. On the contrary, the claimants are of the opinion that Covid-19 is a project initiated by NGOs and funded by the World Bank, which is being carried out by, amongst others, the defendants.
3. Pandemic: Wherever the term 'pandemic' is used in this summons, it always refers to the so-called Covid-19 pandemic as claimed by the WHO. The use of the term 'pandemic' in this writ therefore in no way implies that the claimants acknowledge that there was a health risk caused by a dangerous pathogen. On the contrary, the claimants are of the opinion that there is no evidence whatsoever to support this.
4. Covid-19 vaccine / Covid-19 injection: Where this writ refers to a Covid-19 vaccine or a Covid-19 injection, this always refers to the injectable solution which the defendants claim is a medicinal product that is safe and effective in the context of protection against the alleged Covid-19 disease. The use of the terms 'Covid-19 vaccine' or 'Covid-19 injection' in this summons in no way implies that the claimants acknowledge that it constitutes a medicinal product. On the contrary, the claimants are of the opinion that there is no evidence of the medicinal efficacy of the Covid-19 vaccine, and therefore it does not constitute a medicinal product.

Guide

- S. With regard to the facts presented in this writ against the defendants, the following applies: we allege [REDACTED] offer, if necessary, further evidence to prove that all defendants, at the time of committing their unlawful acts, were aware of all the facts and circumstances set out in this summons. [REDACTED]
6. In order to avoid repetition, with regard to the individual defendants, particular emphasis will be placed on setting out separately those facts and circumstances that specifically concern them. The order in which the defendants' unlawful conduct is described in this writ has been deliberately chosen with the aim of preventing an overwhelming amount of information. For these reasons, the claimants urge that this writ be read in the order presented and in its entirety, so as to gain a complete picture of the arguments on which the claimants

unlawful conduct in relation to each of the defendants.

Exhibits / USB stick

7. With regard to the exhibits submitted, a number of them consist of video material. In this connection, this writ of summons is accompanied by a USB stick containing the full text of the writ, including all exhibits and the video material arranged by exhibit number.
8. If, when submitting the paper exhibits, only a few pages of a document are provided, whilst the full document is provided on the USB stick, then the complete document stored on the USB stick is hereby submitted to your court as an exhibit and evidence.
9. A version of all videos suitable for Windows Media Player has been placed on the USB stick. The labelling of these files always refers to the corresponding exhibit number. With regard to the submission of video material, it is expressly noted that [REDACTED] the complete video material stored on the USB stick is hereby submitted to your court as an exhibit and as evidence.

Introduction

The crux of this case

10. The official narrative regarding Covid-19 used worldwide states that there is a Covid-19 pandemic caused by a new coronavirus called SARS-CoV-2. On 28 February 2020, this official global narrative was introduced in the Netherlands by the OMT, as part of the RIVM. Following the introduction of this narrative, the RIVM reported the following, amongst other things, in its letter to the Ministry of Health, Welfare and Sport dated 28 February 2020:
'... The virus has now been given the name SARS-CoV-2; the disease is called Covid-19. ...'
11. The letter from the RIVM to the Ministry of Health, Welfare and Sport dated 28 February 2020 is submitted as EXHIBIT 1. In an open letter on the WHO's website dated 12 March 2020, the WHO informs the world that there is a so-called Covid-19 pandemic and that it is collaborating with the World Economic Forum (WEF) to enable the private sector to play a role in this. As EXHIBIT 2, a copy of the open letter on the WHO's website dated 12 March 2020 is submitted as EXHIBIT 2. According to the official narrative, this pandemic could only be combated if everyone were to be vaccinated against it with Covid-19 injections. If not everyone were vaccinated, this would 'put the most vulnerable at particular risk'. Vaccination was said to be the only way out of the pandemic, and those who got vaccinated were therefore doing so not only for themselves, but above all for others. The message has always been that the Covid-19 injections were extensively tested, safe and effective.

12. According to the defendants, this narrative forms the basis of their actions. The Covid-19 policy based on this narrative was unquestioningly accepted, embraced and implemented by the defendants. All this took place without any thorough social, scientific, economic or ethical debate on the matter. The defendants maintain that their actions, based on this narrative, are in the interests of humanity and, in particular, public health.
13. They have had Covid-19 injections because the defendants gave them every reason to do so. They placed their trust in the defendants because of their social standing, reputation and responsibilities. In the absence of a comprehensive public debate on the accuracy of the narrative, there was [REDACTED] no reason to doubt that the Covid-19 injections had been thoroughly tested, were safe and effective, and that having them administered would be beneficial to themselves and their fellow human beings.
14. The Covid-19 injections have, **for example**, led to serious physical harm.
15. It was only after they and many others in their circle had suffered health problems that they began to question the narrative surrounding the Covid-19 injections. This prompted their quest to uncover the true state of affairs surrounding the alleged pandemic.
16. Over time, an overwhelming amount of information has become available which makes it plausible that the narrative used by the defendants cannot possibly be true. From that information, the defendants must have known that this narrative was not true. [REDACTED] this has led them to view the defendants' conduct in a completely different light and to conclude that the defendants acted unlawfully towards them. [REDACTED] will substantiate their arguments in this regard with evidence in these proceedings.
17. They request that your court examine the admissibility of their claims and rule on them on the basis of the grounds on which they have based their claims in these proceedings.

Significance and purpose of this case

18. [REDACTED] are bringing these proceedings on the basis of their legal interest in obtaining the damages they are claiming and the declaration of law to be formulated below.
19. The motivation for [REDACTED] for bringing these proceedings is partly motivated by the public interest in the process of establishing the truth, which is necessary in order to [REDACTED] in court. In view of this public interest, [REDACTED] not only to serve their own interests, but also, and not least, the interests of their fellow human beings.
20. The public interest referred to above cannot be overestimated. The arguments


put forward by
stand

and the defendants are irreconcilable and

directly opposed to one another. A similar divide is emerging within society and is the cause of significant social tensions.

21. We wish to bring the truth about Covid-19 to light through the intervention of the judiciary.

22. In the context of establishing the truth, we draw attention to two important facts which the judiciary must not overlook. First and foremost is the fact that all the defendants form part of a larger entity that is primarily controlled and directed by NGOs. These private entities are numerous and share the common characteristic of presenting themselves as benefactors. The actions of this wider network are largely directed by defendant 15, hereinafter referred to as 'Bill Gates'. To this end, a partnership was established in the year 2000 under the name Gavi, The Vaccine Alliance (hereinafter referred to as 'GAVI'). On the ^{GAVI} website, its influence and connection to all aspects of vaccination are aptly illustrated by the following image.



23. A second key fact for the process of establishing the truth is that the parties shown in the above image have the power, by virtue of their global influence, to determine the narrative surrounding Covid-19 and the Covid-19 injections, and have indeed done so.

24. Only the truth can resolve the contradictions identified above and alleviate social tensions.

Claims

25. seek a declaration that the defendants are jointly and severally liable for all damage resulting from unlawful acts committed by the defendants as a group and individually, as described in this summons.

26. claim compensation from the defendants for the personal injury and financial loss suffered as a result of the Covid-19 injections, to be quantified at a later stage and settled in accordance with the law.

Defendants: *Government
officials at Hofstra*

27. Defendant 1, hereinafter referred to as ‘Hofstra’, is affiliated in a personal capacity as an expert with the Outbreak Management Team (hereinafter referred to as ‘OMT’) of the National Institute for Safety and the Environment (hereinafter referred to as ‘RIVM’) and, in that capacity, is also professionally affiliated as a doctor with the ^{Fryslân} Municipal Health ^{Service}³ (hereinafter referred to as ‘GGD’). In the fight against infectious diseases in the Netherlands, the RIVM’s Centre for Infectious Disease Control (hereinafter referred to as ‘CIB’) plays an advisory and coordinating role. Hofstra is also chair of the Dutch Association for Infectious Disease Control (NVIB) and acts as an adviser to the network centre, where his duties consist of drafting scenarios for exercises relating to infectious diseases, as well as supervising those exercises from a so-called response cell. As EXHIBIT 3, we submit the declaration of interests that Hofstra submitted to the OMT, which sets out the aforementioned positions.
28. Through his membership of the OMT, Hofstra had access to all the information regarding Covid-19 and the SARS-CoV-2 virus that the OMT required to arrive at the best possible advice on combating the ^{pandemic}⁴. This advice was consistently followed and resulted in the narrative that vaccination was the only way out of the pandemic being accepted as undisputed and true.
29. Hofstra’s advice was consistently in line with the OMT’s final advice. The OMT did not have access to data from which, upon careful examination, the scientific conclusion could be drawn that there was a threat to public health requiring government intervention, let alone the mass administration of Covid-19 injections. At the time these recommendations were made, there was no excess mortality. As EXHIBIT 4, the claimants hereby submit a data set from Statistics Netherlands (CBS) which shows no evidence of excess mortality.
30. Hofstra was aware that healthcare capacity was not under strain. Insofar as that capacity appeared to be limited, this was a consequence of government policy regarding healthcare, including the use of an unsuitable PCR test and the scaling back of healthcare capacity over many years. EXHIBIT 5 contains information regarding the government-led dismantling of Dutch healthcare capacity, which began in 1972. It should be noted that the government no longer makes data available regarding the extent of healthcare capacity for the period after 2018. Defendant No. 8, in his capacity as chairman of the Intensive Care Association, stated in an interview in 2021 that the number of ICU

beds had been reduced to a total of 950 beds. As EXHIBIT 6, the claimants hereby submit an article from *De Telegraaf* dated 21 October 2021, which confirms this statement by Gommers. When Defendant No. 6 took office in 2017, the Netherlands still had 2,056 ICU beds.

31. Hofstra is a key participant in the Covid-19 project to be described below 19 project, which will be described below. Hofstra has placed his positions within the OMT, the NVIB and the Network Centre at the service of the implementation of this Covid-19 project. This included, amongst other things, drafting scenarios for pandemic exercises held in connection with the Covid-19 project and, as chair of the NVIB, leading a misleading pro-Covid-19 vaccination campaign in collaboration with the GGDs for the benefit of the Covid-19 project. All this whilst Hofstra, as a member of the OMT, knew that the Covid-19 injections were not intended to serve the health of the Dutch population, including but to facilitate the implementation of the Covid-19 project. These allegations will be substantiated in detail later in this summons.

32. Hofstra did everything in his power to ensure the success of the mass Covid-19 vaccination campaign for the benefit of the Covid-19 project. In an open letter on the NVIB website dated 17 April 2021, Hofstra writes the following on this matter:

'...Since the start of the pandemic, the Municipal Health Services (GGDs) have been continuously carrying out and coordinating source and contact tracing, testing, vaccinating and advising local authorities, organisations and all residents of the Netherlands. The GGDs have recruited and trained thousands of people in a very short space of time to carry out all these tasks as effectively as possible. And each one has a remarkable ability to inform people that they have tested positive and to carry out source and contact tracing, or to explain to disappointed callers that, unfortunately, it is not yet their turn for a vaccination. These are not always easy situations...'

As PRODUCTION 7, please a copy of Hofstra's open letter dated 17 April 2021.

33. Further on in this summons, it will become apparent that, with this open letter, Hofstra [redacted] deliberately misled the Dutch public. In April 2021, Hofstra knew that the Covid-19 injections, or at least certain batches of them, were life-threatening. Hofstra also knew at that time that the Covid-19 injections offered no protection whatsoever against the alleged virus.
34. Hofstra should have spoken out against the advice of the OMT and, as a doctor, should also have opposed the actions of the GGD, whereby citizens, including young people aged 12 and over, were encouraged at schools, using a so-called 'vaccination bus', to receive a Covid-19 injection without parental consent. Because Hofstra endorsed all of this – or at least did not speak out against it – they have continued to follow the narrative [redacted] have allowed the Covid-19 injections to be administered.

35. Hofstra can be held accountable for failing, as a doctor, a member of the OMT,

chair of the NVIB and adviser to the Network Centre, to fulfil his responsibilities and, as a result, for acting with negligence towards , resulting in resulting in the damage suffered.

They would not have (been able to) have the Covid-19 injections administered had Hofstra fulfilled his duties with the requisite social diligence. The OMT's advice would then have been different; or at the very least, Hofstra would have publicly opposed this advice, as a result of which they would have been adequately warned and would not have had the Covid-19 injections administered.

Ann Dissel

36. Defendant 2, hereinafter referred to as 'Van Dissel', has been director of the CIB since 15 August 2013. As indicated above, the CIB is part of the RIVM. In that capacity, Van Dissel is chair of the OMT. According to the CIB's website, the CIB is the point of contact for the World Health Organisation (hereinafter referred to as 'WHO') and the Centres for Disease Control of the United States of America (hereinafter referred to as 'CDC'). The CDC is the US equivalent of the Dutch RIVM. In this sense, Van Dissel, like the other defendants, is connected to the wider context as described in this summons. Van Dissel has consistently and knowingly, and therefore deliberately, publicly defended the manifestly unlawful advice of the OMT, in the knowledge that this advice was incorrect and harmful and would be followed by the vast majority of the Dutch population.
37. Given Van Dissel's expertise and the position he holds, he instilled great confidence in the naïve [REDACTED] that vaccination was the only way out of the pandemic and that Covid-19 vaccines would be safe and effective.
38. On the eve of the vaccination phase, it was Van Dissel who, as director of the RIVM, championed the large-scale roll-out of vaccinations. In this context, Van Dissel deliberately contributed to the deception of the Dutch population by propagating the falsehood that vaccinations would lead to herd immunity⁵. Van Dissel also facilitated the RIVM's role as manager of the large-scale vaccination programme. In doing so, Van Dissel expressed the wish that all vulnerable people would be vaccinated as soon as possible. An online article from RTL Nieuws dated 9 December 2020, which demonstrates this, is submitted as EXHIBIT 8.
39. Van Dissel can be held accountable for failing to fulfil his responsibilities as chair of the OMT and, as a result, for acting with gross negligence towards [REDACTED] resulting in [REDACTED] resulting in the damages suffered by [REDACTED]. They would not have (been able to) have the Covid-19 injections administered had Van Dissel fulfilled his duties with the requisite social diligence. The OMT's advice would then have been different; or at the very least, Van Dissel would have publicly opposed this advice, as a result of which they would have been adequately warned and would not have had the Covid-19 injections administered.

Koopmans

40. Defendant 3, hereinafter referred to as 'Koopmans', is, by profession, a professor of virology at Erasmus MC in Rotterdam. In addition, Koopmans is bfJ the

Since 2006, Koopmans has been head of the so-called viroscience department (department of virology) at Erasmus MC. Koopmans is a regular expert advisor to the OMT. Koopmans has been a member of the WHO since 2014. Koopmans has consistently publicly supported the OMT's recommendations. During the period in which Koopmans supported the aforementioned advice, zfJ had been appointed by the WHO as a researcher and tasked with the research taking place in Wuhan, which focused on the origin of the SARS-CoV-2 virus. The WHO terminated this appointment after journalists from the United States discovered that Koopmans had served on the CDC in Guangdong, China, and in that capacity had advised on the development of laboratory capacity for the detection of emerging infectious diseases and had maintained various collaborative research projects in China concerning the emergence of viruses. Koopmans had publicly concealed all of this. As Exhibit 9, the claimants submit a journalistic article written by Luis Miguel and published on the website of *The New American* on 12 December 2021.

41. Koopmans closely followed the trials conducted by Moderna and Pfizer for their Covid-19 vaccines. In this regard, the claimants refer to the interview Koopmans gave on 10 April 2020 to Mr Bohlmeijer, correspondent for Goede Gesprekken⁶. As a prominent member of the WHO and the OMT, Koopmans had access to all first-hand information regarding the aforementioned trials. Consequently, Koopmans knew that Moderna had already commenced its Covid-19 vaccine trials in 2017 and that Pfizer had commenced its Covid-19 trials just four days after the Chinese government had released the genetic code of the alleged SARS-CoV-2 virus to the world on 8 January 2020. The plaintiffs will elaborate further on the evidence supporting this assertion in this writ of summons. Koopmans therefore knew that Covid-19 was a project and not a disease. Nevertheless, in carrying out this Covid-19 project, Koopmans followed the official narrative of her key client, the WHO.
42. With regard to Koopmans' access to information, it is particularly significant that Koopmans had access to the Pfizer safety reports, which were still being kept secret at the time, including the Pfizer report FDA-CBER-2021-5683-0000054. Among other things, the latter report shows that, even before 28 February 2021, over 42,000 cases had been reported to Pfizer, including 1,223 deaths and 11,361 cases of serious and permanent injury. Koopmans withheld this extremely alarming information from the public. This report will be discussed later in this summons and will be submitted as Exhibit 40.
43. Misinforming the public by withholding key information and disseminating incorrect information is a manipulation technique that has been frequently used by the defendants. It is reprehensible and bizarre that it was precisely the defendants, including Koopmans in particular from the Dutch branch of Gavi – namely the Vaccination Alliance – who, in the final quarter of 2019, established a 'Disinformation Think Tank'. The participants in this 'Disinformation Think Tank' consist exclusively of individuals who are strong advocates of mass vaccination. In her role as a participant in the 'Disinformation Think Tank', Koopmans developed and applied a 'framework' designed to steer the public debate. The direction in which the debate was steered was exclusively in favour of mass vaccination. The framework

used the social polarisation surrounding whether or not to take Covid-19 injections to shape that steering. Following a third meeting of the Vaccination Alliance and the Disinformation Think Tank, a report was drawn up. This report includes, amongst other things, the following quotes:

‘...The think tank must adopt multiple approaches, partly due to the diverse profiles of its members. In order to engage in dialogue with the target group, the right tone must be struck. This is not just about facts, but also about the (emotional) dynamics of the group. By breaking the committee down into smaller groups, through which you can build trust, you give this group the feeling of being heard and understood. . .’

‘. 4. It is a good idea to engage a variety of people who demonstrate authority and leadership; these could be experts from their professional backgrounds, or you could use a well-known figure (e.g. a famous footballer) to deliver a one-off message such as ‘I’m having the vaccine...’

44. As for PRODUCTION 10, the report from the third meeting of the Vaccination Alliance and the Disinformation Think Tank.
45. Koopmans concealed her role in the Disinformation Think Tank and concealed the fact that she and the influencers recruited by the Disinformation Think Tank were steering the public debate on mass vaccination. It is also worth noting that, in her capacity as a member of the OMT, Koopmans had access to the aforementioned Pfizer report FDA-CBER-2021-5683-0000054 and deliberately withheld from the public the information available therein and the conclusions to be drawn from it. Consequently, in our view, it is established that Koopmans spread disinformation and that the ‘Denktarik Disinformation’ campaign was, in reality, specifically designed to ensure that the public was misinformed through the use of influencers recruited for this purpose. All this was done to facilitate mass vaccination with Covid-19 injections – which Koopmans knew to be harmful – in order to ensure the success of the Covid-19 project.
46. Koopmans can be held accountable for failing to fulfil her social responsibility as a scientist and as a member of the OMT and the WHO, and for thereby acting with social negligence *laatscnapp*, resulting in *[REDACTED]* resulting in the damage suffered by *[REDACTED]*. The public would not have (been able to) receive the Covid-19 injections had Koopmans fulfilled her duty with the requisite social diligence. The OMT’s advice would then have been different; or at the very least, Koopmans would have publicly opposed this advice, as a result of which they would have been adequately warned and would not have had the Covid-19 injections administered.

Rutte

47. Defendant 4, hereinafter referred to as ‘Rutte’, is the Prime Minister of the Netherlands and a prominent member of the World Economic Forum (hereinafter referred to as ‘WEF’). As EXHIBIT 11, the claimants hereby submit details of Rutte and his former employer, Unilever, as published on the

website of the

WEF, and a number of photographs depicting the relationship between Rutte and the President of the WEF, Mr Klaus Schwab.

48. Schwab is Rutte's superior. This is evident, amongst other things, from various letters from Schwab to Rutte. As an important example of such a letter, the claimants submit

Exhibit 12 is a letter from Schwab to Rutte dated 21 October 2020. This letter reveals that the WEF is formulating ideas and plans to reshape the so-called post-Covid-19 world. In this letter, Schwab instructs Rutte to ensure that the Netherlands takes the lead on these reforms in Europe. These reforms have already been referred to as the Covid-19 project. The Covid-19 injections are crucial to this. Rutte has accepted this mandate and is carrying it out on behalf of the WEF, which explains why Rutte is advising the Dutch population, including [REDACTED] Covid-19 injections.

49. Rutte has systematically, in collaboration with the defendants – in particular defendant 6 – promoted this narrative in numerous public speeches, thereby abusing his office as Prime Minister. Rutte was guilty of the 'you're doing it for others' doctrine, whereby people who made the entirely normal choice to carry on with their lives in a manner customary for a flu season were dismissed as irresponsible and harmful to society. The Covid-19 measures implemented under Rutte's leadership had nothing to do with public health, but with the implementation of the Covid-19 project. Rutte's portrayal of the Netherlands as a 'sick patient' and the Covid-19 measures — with the Covid-19 vaccination as their central theme — as a 'medicine', were elements that Rutte exploited to mislead the Dutch population, including [REDACTED] — into accepting the Covid-19 measures. [REDACTED] zo te : We cite the following examples here. [REDACTED] pteren. [REDACTED]

50. During the press conference on 23 February 2021, Rutte stated, amongst other things, the following.
'... *What we are doing today remains incredibly exciting, even though these may seem like small steps. We must realise this very clearly. That is precisely why those basic rules are so important. And that is precisely why it is so important that we continue full steam ahead on the path that Hugo de Jonge will now update you on. The path of increased testing and vaccination will hopefully lead to a summer with far fewer restrictions. ...*

51. Following on from this, De Jonge highlighted the following regarding the path that, according to Rutte, we should be hoping for:

With the start of the vaccination programme, the end of the crisis has begun, but the end itself will take a while yet. The path out of the crisis follows three tracks. Until enough people have been vaccinated, restrictions and intensive testing will remain necessary. The fact that the figures are slowly improving, making things more feasible again, is – as I've already said – incredibly exciting...

Vaccination is picking up speed. The first two million doses have been administered. We expect to reach two million by mid-March and, by the end of March or early April, we'll be at three million — provided the supplies go to plan, of course. The speed at which the vaccines arrive determines the speed at which we can vaccinate.

We're also seeing the first clear signs of how effective the vaccines are against infection with the virus.

52. As stated in PRODUCTION 13, the plaintiffs are providing information regarding the press conference given by Rutte and De Jonge on 23 February 2021.
53. During the press conference held by Rutte and De Jonge on 11 May 2021, they explained what 'stage 2 of the plan to reopen society' would look like. Rutte stated, amongst other things, the following on this matter.

'We hope to see you all heading towards what we hope will be a lovely summer, thanks to the vaccinations. Hugo de Jonge will say more about this shortly, as well as about our plans for the summer holidays and the associated travel arrangements...'

54. Following on from this, De Jonge made the following points regarding expectations for the summer holidays.

We could well be in for a lovely summer. The vaccination campaign is well under way. This week, the seven millionth dose will be administered, and by the second half of May 2021, everyone aged sixty or over, as well as everyone at high risk — such as people with leukaemia or those with Down's syndrome — will have received at least their first dose. This is an important milestone we have been working towards...

In addition, we have succeeded in offering a first dose of the vaccine to everyone working in the healthcare sector who is not in a vulnerable group...

As PRODUCTION 14, we provide information regarding the press conference given by Rutte and De Jonge on 11 May 2021, as well as, by way of example, a similar press conference held in the United Kingdom.

55. Rutte knew that the narrative surrounding the so-called Covid-19 pandemic was untrue and that the Covid-19 injections — in particular certain batches — cause serious physical harm. The hope held out by Rutte was, in reality, nothing more than a means of deceiving the Dutch people in order to ensure the success of the Covid-19 project. Rutte's deception was unprecedentedly malicious, all the more so given that, at the time of his aforementioned statements, he was already aware that in the Pfizer trial cited by Koopmans (Pfizer report FDA-CBER-2021-5683-0000054), more than 1,200 deaths had already been reported and, according to reports, more than 11,000 people had suffered serious, permanent physical injury after receiving the Covid-19 injections.
56. On 10 October 2022, a hearing took place in the European Parliament at which Ms Janine Small, a director at Pfizer, formally admitted before the hearing committee that Pfizer had never tested the Covid-19 vaccine for its ability to prevent transmission. Rutte is aware of this. As a result, Rutte also knew that the 'you're doing it for others' doctrine he promoted is a lie and is intended solely to persuade people, through psychological deception, to have Covid-19 injections. As EXHIBIT 15, the claimants hereby submit part of the Pfizer hearing and the short interview by Ongehoord Nederland dated 12 October

2022

in which Rutte is confronted with Ms Small's statement, dismisses it as nonsense, and indicates that he still supports the Covid-19 vaccinations and advises everyone to 'simply' get vaccinated.

57. Rutte can be held to account for failing to fulfil his political and social responsibilities as Prime Minister of the Netherlands and, as a result, for acting with ~~social negligence~~ ~~negligence~~, resulting in ~~the~~ resulting in damage.
58. Rutte committed these unlawful acts with the intention of supporting the interests of Schwab and the WEF in the Covid-19 project. Article 97a of the Criminal Code provides as follows:

'Anyone who enters into a relationship with a person or body established abroad with the intention of inducing such a person or body to provide, promote or bring about support for the cause of sedition, to strengthen such a person or body in their intention to that end, or to promise or grant assistance to such a person or body in that regard, or to prepare, promote or bring about insurrection, shall be punished by life imprisonment or a term of imprisonment of up to thirty years, or a fine of the fifth category.'

59. As indicated in the indictment, all the alleged acts are attributed to all the defendants. Thus, the remarks made above regarding Article 97a of the Criminal Code apply equally to Hofstra, Van Dissel and Koopmans.
60. They would not have (been able to) have the Covid-19 injections if Rutte had fulfilled his duties with the requisite social diligence. The Dutch government's policy would then have been different; at the very least, Rutte would have publicly challenged the narrative, as a result of which they would have been adequately warned and would not have received the Covid-19 injections.

Kaag

61. Defendant No. 5, hereinafter referred to as 'Kaag', holds the office of Minister of Finance and is a prominent member of the WEF. Prior to taking up this post, Kaag worked primarily for the United Nations (hereinafter referred to as 'UN'), which, through its affiliated organisation the WHO, plays a significant role in the broader context referred to above. During her time as Minister, Kaag began working for the WEF and is part of a so-called think tank there. In this think tank, plans are devised for implementing a total reorganisation of, amongst other things, Dutch society. This reorganisation is referred to by the WEF as 'Covid-19: The Great Reset'. In order to implement the Great Reset, it is of the utmost importance that the 'Sustainable Development Goals' (hereinafter referred to as: SDGs) set out by the UN in Agenda 21 (1992) and Agenda 2030 (2015) become the guiding principles for the reorganisation of societies in all UN member states. Kaag's participation, as a Dutch Minister, in a think tank run by an

NGO – more specifically, the WEF – is contrary to Kaag’s constitutional position, as the Great Reset is not in the interests of the Dutch population and therefore not in . Furthermore, the plans and the impact of the Great Reset on the entire Dutch population have never been submitted to the Dutch Parliament. The conception and implementation of the Covid-19 project and the Great Reset constitute an unlawful act by Kaag against

62. Kaag presents herself as the Minister responsible for coordinating the SDGs at national level within the framework of the Great Reset and, in that capacity, is a member of a group of thinkers at the WEF. As EXHIBIT 16, the claimants submit a recording of an interview with Kaag in which she presents herself as such. This recording also illustrates what the Great Reset will entail.
63. The Great Reset is based on the premise that nothing is right anymore and that everything must be done anew — without the consent or consultation of the population — differently and, according to the WEF, better. This same body of thought is being imposed on the world by the UN through its Agenda 21 and Agenda 2030. The UN uses the slogan ‘Build Back Better’ in this context. Worldwide, many politicians in positions similar to that of Kaag have promoted this ideology and adopted the slogan ‘Build Back Better’. As Minister for Foreign Affairs, Kaag is committing herself to this ‘Build Back Better’ mandate from the WEF and the UN. As proof of this, as EXHIBIT 17, a letter from Kaag dated 27 May 2021 to the WHO (as part of the UN and affiliated with the WEF), in which she expresses her broad support for the ‘Build Back Better’ mandate.
64. The philosophy of Kaag and her think tank, and the many topics and systems that, according to Kaag’s philosophy, must be implemented in today’s society, have been visualised by the WEF in an illustration. The WEF disseminates these ideas via its website and the free-to-download book *Covid-19: The Great Reset* by Klaus Schwab, published on 13 July 2020. Schwab promoted the Great Reset in early June 2020 via a video message from the WEF. The aforementioned image depicting the ideas that Kaag stands for, an image and download link for Klaus Schwab’s book *Covid-19: The Great Reset*, as well as the aforementioned video message, are submitted by the claimants as EXHIBIT 18.
65. A key condition set out in the plans for the implementation of the Great Reset concerns the administration of Covid-19 vaccinations to the entire population, in order to counter what is portrayed in the official narrative of the WHO and the WEF as an ‘existential future health crisis’. In the plans of the WEF and the WHO, the population – particularly the Millennial generation and future generations – is urged to call upon the international community without delay to ensure vaccination for all. The message is that no one will be safe until everyone has been vaccinated. As EXHIBIT 19, the claimants submit two video messages from Klaus Schwab dated 26 January 2021 and July 2022 respectively, in which Schwab promotes the ideas – for which Kaag

champions – and states that no one will be safe until everyone has been vaccinated.

66. As a Minister and member of the WEF, Kaag is a strong advocate of these plans and, by extension, of Covid-19 injections. All this whilst Kaag is aware that, during the Pfizer trials referred to repeatedly in this summons, many people died and thousands suffered severe, permanent physical injury.
67. The Covid-19 project is crucial to realising the Great Reset advocated by Kaag and the other defendants. In order to ensure that the WEF can direct and monitor the Dutch government in the context of the Covid-19 project, Kaag's Ministry, amongst other bodies, has ensured – via the Permanent Representation (PV) – that information is exchanged directly between the WEF and her Ministry. All of this has taken place without the Dutch Parliament being informed. It is therefore abundantly clear that Kaag, like the other defendants, does not serve the interests of the Dutch people and therefore nor those of Wh at has been stated regarding Rutte in relation to Article 97a of the Criminal Code also applies to Kaag.
68. As EXHIBIT 20, the claimants submit information concerning the Representation of the Netherlands in Geneva and Kaag's response to parliamentary questions in which she acknowledges her dual role.
69. Given her background, roles and connections, Kaag, just like all the other defendants, knows that this is a false narrative. In particular, Kaag has abused her office as Minister by actively participating, without parliamentary consent or oversight, in the implementation of the Great Reset and the Covid-19 project through, amongst other things, the private NGO, the WEF.
70. Kaag must be held to account for failing to fulfil her political and social responsibilities as a politician and Minister and for thereby acting with social negligence, resulting in [REDACTED] resulting in the damage suffered by the Dutch Government's policy would not have come about without Kaag's unlawful conduct. Kaag should not have cooperated with the plans of the WEF and the WHO and, as a Dutch Minister, should have publicly opposed the narrative, which she failed to do.
71. [REDACTED] had not (been able to) have the Covid-19 injections administered, in which case Kaag would have fulfilled her duty with the requisite social diligence.

De Jonge

72. Defendant No. 6, hereinafter referred to as 'De Jonge', held the office of Minister of Health, Welfare and Sport from March 2020 to December 2021 and is a prominent member of the WEF. As EXHIBIT 21, the claimants submit a printout of a page from the WEF's website showing De Jonge's membership of the WEF.

73. As Minister of Health, Welfare and Sport, De Jonge was responsible for the running of the RIVM. Under De Jonge's leadership, the RIVM implemented and executed the WHO's Covid-19 strategy. This strategy is based on military psychological behaviour-manipulation tactics. These tactics are primarily based on instilling widespread fear, in this case of a purportedly deadly virus. The aim was to mislead the population. In the Covid-19 project, this deception served to encourage as many people as possible to receive Covid-19 injections. In doing so, De Jonge fulfilled the task apparently assigned to him by the WHO and the WEF to mislead as many people as possible into receiving the Covid-19 injections. As EXHIBIT 22, the claimants submit information taken from the central government's website, which shows how, in implementation of the Covid-19 strategy, the aforementioned military psychological influence tactics were turned into government policy by De Jonge.
74. On 11 March 2020, the WHO declared the Covid-19 pandemic. Immediately after the pandemic was declared, De Jonge set about carrying out the task entrusted to him by NGOs to deploy the aforementioned behavioural influence techniques against the Dutch population, including [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. In response, De Jonge was criticised by many concerned Dutch citizens for the way in which he encouraged people to have Covid-19 injections. As an example of the latter, reference is made to an impassioned plea by Mr Frank Ruesink on 16 April 2020, of which a video recording was made and which is submitted by the claimants as EXHIBIT 23. In this video, Mr Ruesink can be seen pointing out to De Jonge that Covid-19 injections are merely one of many options for combating the alleged pandemic, whilst pleading with De Jonge to also consider those alternatives. In response, De Jonge pulls a sceptical face and states that he regards the WHO's instructions as authoritative. This reaction from De Jonge can only be explained by the malicious intent with which De Jonge and the other defendants are carrying out the Covid-19 project. As evidence of this malicious intent, the claimants refer to two email messages, dated 15 May 2020 and 25 May 2020 respectively, which came to light following Freedom of Information Act (Wob) requests. The claimants submit these messages as EXHIBIT 24. In the email of 15 May 2020, De Jonge's Ministry states:

*Regarding public support: when it comes to behavioural change, there is often a considerable gap between the (intentional) willingness to change and actual behaviour. Cf. also indications regarding AYP use in other countries. Perhaps that gap is less significant here than is fiercely claimed, given that there will be fewer restrictions on zullen zijn?'
freedom in the future*

75. In the email dated 25 May 2020, the Ministry of De Jonge states:

'...The first draft of the bill also explains why this law is being included in the Wpg, but the first three organisational points for drafting the law come from the 1 May letter (the only points on which we agree). The fourth is a kind of logical

- deontological legitimization;
- restriction of fundamental rights;
- rules for the longer-term than emergency measures, but on a temporary basis.
- Flexible, so everything is subject to ministerial regulation

iPnc iS D e a ee fl i o o e and e oo e o e e
the OC isc ei i a i tss ee a ee s s oo d
ko d e eireae e . With that h/deLi/JrJieid and that flexibility, the
emergency regulations are in good shape...'

76. This email continues:

'...We do say that the bill strikes an optimal balance for the dilemma that extending it would inevitably undermine the objectives of the measure!' (That sentence was my own, and I'm still proud of it) because anything you like can follow on from that. We'll come up with a few sentences tomorrow. Good night'

77. During his time as the aforementioned Minister, he, together with Rutte, caused, during numerous public appearances, enormous fear of Covid-19 amongst the [REDACTED] on, including [REDACTED]. These public statements consisted largely of televised press conferences held in response to periodic OMT recommendations. During those press conferences, Covid-19 measures restricting freedom were announced on the basis of the Covid-19 narrative. The message conveyed was that the measures could only be lifted if the vast majority of the Dutch population were to receive Covid-19 injections. In the scenario proposed by De Jonge, he appealed to people's sense of humanity on countless occasions. He did this by repeatedly telling the public that anyone who had a Covid-19 jab was doing a good deed because they were doing it for others. Because of this massive lie and deception, many people, including [REDACTED] felt compelled to receive Covid-19 injections.

78. The claimants reiterate, for the sake of completeness, that the arguments they put forward against each of the defendants apply to all defendants with regard to their knowledge of what actually took place and the role they played in it. Against this background, it is almost inconceivable that De Jonge, who, for example, was also aware of the Pfizer trials, [REDACTED] deliberately misled so many people and [REDACTED] endangered their lives and health.

79. An illustration of the widespread deception of Dutch citizens, including by De Jonge, is the interview with 'Dit is Robbert' on the YouTube channel 'Open kaart' from December 2020. In this interview, the following statements by De Jonge – shown in italics – are highlighted, amongst others. Reference is made throughout to the timestamps in the video. The interviewer's questions and answers are placed in brackets. A screenshot of this video is submitted as EXHIBIT 25.

{3:36) If you'd known, of course, what you were getting yourself into, then we would naturally have prepared ourselves very differently for that pandemic.

80. In this part of the interview, De Jonge reveals that he is involved in the implementation of the Covid-19 project, for which there is a schedule of which he is aware.

{32.53) Well, actually, a vaccine is a year ahead. A vaccine is only
W1117' EÓÓ!S.

81. As will be explained in detail in this summons, this concerns a Covid-19 injection that carries significant health risks, making this statement a blatant lie.

(33.03) The existence of vaccines is a blessing for humanity, a triumph for science. A triumph for science is that this vaccine has been developed in such a short time.

82. As will be explained in detail in this summons, the so-called vaccines had already been developed for the Covid-19 project prior to the WHO's declaration of the alleged pandemic.

{33.59) What we've actually done is make a commitment in advance, including a pledge of diligence: we're going to invest a great deal of money. Would it then be possible to start production at the same time as the development and clinical trials of the vaccine? And that's actually how Jtef came about – things are now moving much faster; we're making use of technologies that have already been thoroughly tested, so that's why it can now proceed much more quickly, but we haven't cut any corners in any way. All safety requirements are being met as usual. And that's important because trust in a vaccine like this is crucial. So if the EMA – the European Medicines Agency – gives the green light, that effectively serves as a stamp of approval: it's sufficiently safe and sufficiently effective, so you can simply start using it.

83. De Jonge makes a statement about investing money. In doing so, he demonstrates that he is not working for the Dutch government, but for another party which he refers to as 'we'. After all, the Dutch government has not invested in the development and research of Covid-19 vaccines. The EMA has not declared that the Covid-19 vaccine is safe and that you can simply use it. It was an experiment which, by its very nature, is not safe.

(35.28) You know. A vaccine is just that. You don't get a vaccine for yourself – you do it to protect yourself, but you actually do it for the people around you, the people who we love to keep safe. I think we need to say that to one another as well. I sometimes hear people say: 'Well, we'll have to see if I actually want to and so on.' Then I think, 'Come on, lads, hello, that's not the point.' We're in the very worst crisis since the Second World War. We need to turn the page on this as quickly as possible. Er, we're buckling under the weight of all the measures we have to take, and that's taking its toll on us. On the front line of healthcare, at the GGDs, they've been operating in crisis mode for ten months now. They're working flat out and you can see the strain mounting. They're really keeping it up. All they have to do is pop out to get a copy of the register. And then sit there looking a bit smug, saying, 'Oh well, I'll just have to...'

Let's see if I actually want it. Well, of course I can't. I hear people making excuses: 'Yes, I don't know exactly what's in it.' 'I don't know exactly what's in it.' So I think, 'Oh, you've been eating it your whole life and you don't know exactly what's in it.' Well, this has actually been thoroughly tested to see if it's any good, if it's rubbish, and if it's safe; the side effects have been identified. You know, this is, by far, the very best thing that could happen to us in this crisis. And we must thank our dear Lord on our bare knees that this vaccine exists and, of course, just go ahead and use it.

84. Here, De Jonge is applying military psychological behaviour-manipulation tactics. Furthermore, he is deliberately providing false information regarding the testing and safety of the Covid-19 vaccines. The comparison with frikandellen is unworthy of a Minister and in flagrant breach of the constitutional provision set out in Article 7 of the ICCPR.

(38.44) So the UK started vaccinating people even though the EMU had said it was safe. And that was actually when there were still inconclusive research results from that third phase – the third phase of research. So there were various research findings. The third clinical phase involves administering the vaccine to a large group of people to identify any side effects, any contraindications, and the results of that third clinical phase must be submitted to the EMA, which then decides whether it is acceptable or not. So they give the green light. And the British have already started, even before the EMA has made that decision. They've done so under an emergency procedure. I haven't done that because I think you're then cutting things a bit too short. And then you end up with people saying, 'Well, actually, the Joel vaccine is fine,' because not even all the research results have been finalised before you start rolling it out. I don't think that's responsible. So I didn't do that.

85. Here, De Jonge demonstrates that he was aware of the previously mentioned Pfizer trials and the Pfizer safety reports, which were still being kept secret from the public at the time, including the Pfizer report FDA-CBER-2021-5683-0000054. De Jonge knew that the Pfizer trial had entered its third clinical phase on 1 December 2020 and that there had already been numerous reports of deaths and serious, permanent physical injury among the participants in this third clinical trial. De Jonge withheld this crucial information. This trial, with all its deaths and injuries, was not a reason for De Jonge to call a halt to the Covid-19 vaccination campaign. In this respect too, De Jonge is acting as the implementer of the Covid-19 project and is harming the interests of Dutch citizens, including

(A large proportion of the Dutch population who are currently still hesitant would be convinced if they saw that you were actually doing this)

t39.38) I wouldn't have the slightest problem doing it in public. Or something like that. If Miss /telpf trusted me, she wouldn't have any problem with it. My only hesitation about being the first to do so is that I would then be taking the place of someone who needs it far more than I do. So I don't want to do that; I wouldn't think it was right, because then I'd actually be taking the jab that was meant for someone else's parents.

86. Here, too, we are dealing with a manner of influencing behaviour that is utterly unacceptable for a Minister. What is particularly sad about this is that De Jonge is specifically targeting young people.

{40.30)that he's trying to explain to your followers why it's so incredibly important to get vaccinated. That you're not doing it for yourself but to protect the people around you, and that it's perfectly safe. And if you do get vaccinated, then that's fine.

87. As set out in this summons, no tests were ever carried out prior to the Covid-19 injections being brought to market to demonstrate their effectiveness in preventing transmission, which makes the mantra 'you're doing it for others' false and misleading. By claiming it is 'perfectly safe', De Jonge is misleading the public, including Incidentally, the agreement between De Jonge and the interviewer, as purported in the interview – that they would get 'vaccinated' at the same time and that an explanation would be provided to viewers in that context – was not honoured.
88. Towards the end of his tenure as Minister, De Jonge stated the following during an interview for VARA OP1 on 7 January 2022:
'In the Netherlands, we have a small, exaggerated minority that refuses to be set free. I certainly don't think you should say, under the guise of freedom: "Those who refuse are violating freedom." Yes, it is precisely that virus that is preventing us from regaining our freedom from the virus. It is not the government that is restricting your freedom; it is the virus that is limiting your freedom...'
89. This quote demonstrates how De Jonge is focused on falsely inducing behavioural change within the framework of the Covid-19 project he is implementing. As EXHIBIT 26, the claimants submit a video of De Jonge's interview on VARA OP1 on 7 January 2022.
90. De Jonge can be held accountable for failing to fulfil his political and social responsibilities as a Minister of the Netherlands and for consequently acting with gross negligence, resulting in resulting in the damage suffered. The Dutch government's policy would not have come about without De Jonge's unlawful conduct. De Jonge should not have cooperated with the plans of the WEF and the WHO and, as a Dutch Minister, should have publicly opposed the narrative, which he failed to do. What has been stated regarding Rutte in relation to Article 97a of the Criminal Code also applies to De Jonge.
91. Had the Covid-19 injections not been administered, De Jonge would have fulfilled his duties with the requisite social diligence.

Kuipers

92. Defendant No. 7, hereinafter referred to as 'Kuipers', succeeded De Jonge as Minister of Health, Welfare and Sport in January 2022. As far as is known, Kuipers had no political career known to the public prior to this ministerial post. Prior to his ministerial appointment, Kuipers was chairman of the board of Erasmus MC from March 2013 to January 2022 and, in effect, the boss of Koopmans, who had been head of the Department of Medical Sciences there since 2006. During this period, Kuipers was also a paid speaker and adviser for the vaccine manufacturer AstraZeneca.

In April 2021, before taking office as Minister, Kuipers was a fierce opponent of halting AstraZeneca's Covid-19 vaccinations for people under the age of sixty. This was despite the fact that Kuipers' colleagues at AstraZeneca had stated that they regarded the Covid-19 vaccinations as a threat to public health.

93. During the period in which he was promoting the Covid-19 injections, Kuipers appeared regularly on television in his capacity as chair of the National Network for Acute Care (LNAZ), a network uniting hospitals in the Netherlands that have an intensive care unit. In that capacity, Kuipers 'reported' on an allegedly major threat of a shortage of ICU beds.
94. In doing so, Kuipers gave the impression that a potential shortage might arise as a result of an expected influx of Covid-19 patients. Painting this scenario contributed significantly to the fear of Covid-19 that had already taken hold in society due to statements made by the other defendants. There was never any shortage of ICU beds, despite the fact that, in the years leading up to the alleged Covid-19 pandemic, ICU capacity had already been significantly reduced worldwide, including in the Netherlands, as a result of government policy.
95. In line with the narrative, Kuipers emphasised in a television broadcast on Thursday 30 December 2020, even before the first round of vaccinations, that it would be crucial for staff to remain available to provide care. In this regard, Kuipers was referring in particular to GPs, ambulance staff, and hospital staff in A&E, intensive care and Covid-19 wards. Kuipers believed that, for this reason, vaccination of these groups should begin immediately. As EXHIBIT 27, the claimants submit a screenshot of the interview on 'Nieuwsuur' dated 31 December 2020.
96. On 30 December 2020, Pfizer's third clinical trial – which had been mentioned on several occasions – was roughly halfway through. Kuipers' predecessor, De Jonge, referred to this trial in an interview with 'Dit is Robbert' on the YouTube channel 'Open kaart' in December 2020. In this interview, De Jonge described the Covid-19 vaccines as 'completely safe'. Pfizer was the first supplier of Covid-19 vaccines for the Covid-19 vaccination campaign that began on 8 January 2021. At that time, the Pfizer Covid-19 vaccine had not yet been authorised, and, moreover, there had already been many deaths and injuries to report in that trial.
97. Kuipers' push to start administering unauthorised Covid-19 injections on Monday 4 January 2021, or on the planned date of 8 January 2021, was blatantly unlawful. This was all the more so because these Covid-19 injections were part of a trial which Kuipers knew had already resulted in many deaths and injuries. In view of to these facts and circumstances, Kuipers' push to administer Covid-19 injections to all essential healthcare staff as early as 4 January 2021 is evidence of malicious intent. We are of the opinion that the potential doomsday scenarios of shortages outlined by Kuipers were intended solely to serve the Covid-19 project.

98. Through his television appearances and public statements prior to his appointment as Minister, Kuipers contributed significantly to the deception that [REDACTED] led to [REDACTED] had every reason to have get the Covid-19 injections.
99. During his time as Minister, on 15 February 2022, at a press conference on the coronavirus, Kuipers was able to convey a seemingly sympathetic message by announcing, in his capacity as Minister, that the Covid-19 measures were largely being lifted and that the Netherlands was reopening. Despite this announcement, Kuipers continued thereafter – knowing that the narrative was fraudulent – to insist on the ‘necessity’ of administering Covid-19 injections to the general public on a large scale. Kuipers is implementing a policy geared towards this end. It should be borne in mind that Kuipers was aware of the Pfizer report concerning the third clinical phase as early as 30 April 2021. As indicated above, in this report Pfizer documented 1,223 deaths and 11,361 people with permanent severe physical injuries. Under Kuipers’s responsibility, these injections are still being administered to largely defenceless people to this day without any form of informed consent, and Kuipers is concealing the harmful effects of the Covid-19 injections. What has been stated to Prime Minister Rutte regarding Article 97a of the Criminal Code also applies to Kuipers.
100. Kuipers can be held accountable for failing to fulfil his political and social responsibility as a Minister of the Netherlands and for thereby acting with social negligence, resulting in [REDACTED] resulting in the damage suffered [REDACTED] which government’s policy would not have come about without Kuipers’ unlawful conduct. As a Dutch Minister, Kuipers should have publicly challenged the narrative, which he failed to do. [REDACTED] would not have (been able to) have the Covid-19 injections administered. [REDACTED] Kuipers fulfilled his duty with the requisite social diligence.

GO!TIIR0YS

101. Defendant No. 8, hereinafter referred to as ‘Gommers’, has been affiliated with Erasmus MC since 2014 as a specialist in the field of intensive care medicine³.
102. From February 2016 to February 2022, Gommers was the chair of the Dutch Society for Intensive Care (hereinafter referred to as ‘NIVC’) and, according to the RIVM website, a permanent invited member of the OMT.
103. In 2009, the pharmaceutical manufacturer Pfizer and the NIVC entered into a cooperation agreement that entailed more than merely providing financial support. This collaboration was carried out under Gommers’ leadership. In view of this, there are close ties between Pfizer, the NIVC and Gommers. As EXHIBIT 28 [REDACTED] an article from the *Netherlands Journal of Critical Care* dated 2 April 2009, which demonstrates this.





104. Kuipers' statements in the television broadcast on 31 December 2020, as described above in relation to Kuipers (Exhibit 27), were confirmed by Gommers, and he reinforced this by calling for the administration of Covid-19 injections to all healthcare workers to begin on Monday 4 January 2021 as a matter of priority. When asked during this programme, Gommers stated that he had taken the day off so that he could personally collect the boxes of Covid-19 injections from the central warehouse in Oss.
105. On 6 January 2021, Gommers reportedly received a Covid-19 vaccination and, in front of the media, sang the praises of the scientific community and the pharmaceutical industry, which had worked together 'really brilliantly' to produce the Covid-19 vaccine as quickly as possible. Gommers said: *'We must work together as quickly as possible over the coming weeks to ensure that everyone is vaccinated. Then we can get back to our normal lives.'* It should be borne in mind that, at the time of all this, the much-discussed Pfizer trial was roughly halfway through the third clinical phase, so there was no factually sound reason to sing its praises. In reality, this was pure deception designed to facilitate the implementation of the Covid-19 project. The behavioural manipulation tactics that Gommers was employing at the time were characterised by a combination of presenting himself as a knowledgeable and trustworthy doctor and displaying euphoria about a new Covid-19 injection. This combination served to induce, amongst the Dutch people, including to induce a psychological state in which they, too, would become euphoric about the Covid-19 injection just like Gommers⁴, have them administered so that normal life could resume. As EXHIBIT 29, we submit an article from NOS News dated 6 January 2021 about Gommers' Covid-19 injection.
106. In order to persuade even those who had not had the Covid-19 injections and the subsequent 'boosters', Gommers began to adjust his tactics for influencing behaviour. Gommers did this by giving the impression of being 'critical' of Covid-19 policy. It was precisely by adopting an attitude that appeared critical at first glance that Gommers gained the trust of healthcare workers in particular who were unsure whether they should have a Covid-19 booster jab. In doing so, Gommers created the false impression that it would be possible to make an informed decision about having a Covid-19 booster jab. However, an informed decision can only be made when sufficient (public) information is available about the contents of the Covid-19 jabs and their short- and long-term effects. That information did exist, but was kept secret from the Dutch people, including kept secret.
107. Furthermore, a key argument put forward by Gommers prior to administering the Covid-19 booster jab was that he was doing so for the benefit of the patients in his hospital. In this way, Gommers, too, invoked the mantra 'you do it for others'. That argument by Gommers was also false because there were no research findings on preventing transmission through vaccination. On the contrary, Gommers knew – just like Pfizer and all the other defendants – that transmission had never been tested because this was apparently not relevant to the Covid-19 project.

108. Given Gommers' knowledge and expertise – including the report on the Pfizer trials, which has been mentioned on several occasions, and the close ties between Gommers and Pfizer – Gommers knew better than anyone that this ~~argument~~ was false and that his actions would cause enormous harm to the ~~population~~ and would therefore also . It should be borne in mind that Gommers was already aware of the Pfizer report concerning the third clinical phase as early as 30 April 2021. As indicated above, in this report Pfizer recorded 1,223 deaths and 11,361 people with permanent severe physical injuries. Under Gommers' responsibility, these injections are being administered to Dutch healthcare staff. To this very day, this is being done to healthcare workers without genuine informed consent. Gommers is falsely convincing healthcare workers that by receiving Covid-19 injections, they are protecting patients. As EXHIBIT 30, we submit an article on the news website NU.nl dated 29 December 2021, which concerns the Covid-19 booster injection allegedly received by Gommers.
109. Gommers committed his unlawful acts intentionally and apparently did so with the aim of persuading healthcare workers to receive a Covid-19 injection, with the foreseeable consequence that these people would suffer harm and healthcare capacity would consequently be reduced. It stands to reason that the defendants will then attribute this decline to (the purported illness) Covid-19, thereby once again falsely legitimising Covid-19 measures. This is a crucial part of the unlawful act jointly committed by the defendants, which amounts to the implementation of the Covid-19: The Great Reset Project. Worldwide, this approach has been the same among officials in the same position as Gommers. What has been stated regarding Article 97a of the Criminal Code in relation to Rutte also applies to Gommers.
110. Gommers can be held accountable for failing to fulfil his social responsibility as an authoritative member of the OMT and chairman of the NVIC and that, as a result, he has acted ~~socially~~ socially negligent towards ~~mainly~~ , resulting in ~~resulting in~~ resulting in the damage suffered. The Covid-19 policy would not have come about without Gommers' unlawful conduct. Gommers ~~should~~ should have misled the public and, given his scientific and social standing, should have publicly challenged the Covid-19 narrative, which he failed to do.
111. ~~should~~ would not have (been able to) have the Covid-19 injections administered had Gommers fulfilled his duties with the requisite social diligence.

HoeJrsfro

112. Defendant No. 9, hereinafter referred to as 'Hoekstra', took office in 2017 as Minister of Finance, a post which Hoekstra held until 10 January 2022. On 10 January 2022, Hoekstra became Minister for Foreign Affairs. Hoekstra is a prominent member of the WEF and is therefore familiar with the plan, already cited by the WEF upon Kaag's appointment, for the complete

reorganisation of society (Covid-19: The Great Reset). As PRODUCTION 31, we are  a screenshot from the WEF's website showing Hoekstra as a member of the WEF.

113. Hoekstra is a champion of the 'Covid-19: The Great Reset' project and regards Schwab as a dignitary. For this reason, Hoekstra addresses Mr Schwab as 'Your Excellency'. Schwab has appointed Hoekstra in the Netherlands as one of the key implementers of the Covid-19 project. The nature of the relationship between Schwab and Hoekstra is illustrated by the fact that Schwab, in turn, addresses Hoekstra via his secretary as 'Dear Minister'. It should be borne in mind here that, given his appointment as Minister, Hoekstra should, according to Dutch etiquette, be addressed as 'Your Excellency' – not Schwab. As EXHIBIT 32,  herewith a copy of a letter from Hoekstra addressed to whom he refers as 'Your Excellency'.
114. In the introduction to this summons, it was argued that Covid-19 is a project initiated by NGOs and funded by the World Bank. Having reached this point in the summons, we shall  further explain their perspective on the relationship between the defendants and the WEF, and in particular between Hoekstra and the WEF. The WEF is a foundation under Swiss law. This legal form is comparable to what is known as a 'stichting' in the Netherlands. It is therefore a private organisation which, at the time of its establishment, held no formal position vis-à-vis any national government. As EXHIBIT JJ,  we herewith a copy of an extract from the Swiss commercial register relating to the WEF's registration there. The WEF's articles of association are also submitted herewith.
115. On 3 June 2020, Schwab and the then-future King of England announced the launch of the 'Covid-19: The Great Reset' project via an online meeting. Subsequently, the WEF sent out written invitations for the major gathering in Davos, Switzerland, in January 2021, entitled 'The Great Reset'. Hoekstra was also invited to this event. On 10 July 2020, Hoekstra received the invitation. As EXHIBIT 34, we submit  the information regarding the 'The Great Reset' gathering, as well as Hoekstra's correspondence with the WEF in response to this.
116.  wish to explain in further detail to your court what it means, from their perspective, that the defendants have become involved with the WEF and advocate the ideas behind 'Covid-19: The Great Reset'. In this regard, we refer  first and foremost to Schwab's book entitled 'Covid-19: The Great Reset', which the WEF has made accessible to everyone via its website (see note 9 to this summons). This book was published online by the WEF in July 2020. On the basis of the information contained in this book and the events described therein, we conclude that this book was written in 2019 and finalised in the course of 2020 for publication in July 2020.
117. The defendants share the ideas that Schwab has set out in 'Covid-19: The Great Reset'. In his book, Schwab describes how the Covid-19 pandemic crisis has heralded the decisive moment, at which point many

aspects of the world will have to change forever. [REDACTED] refer in this context to a number of quotations:

'This is our defining moment — we will be dealing with its fallout for years to come and many things will change forever.'

118. According to this line of thinking, all the 'flaws' in the world will be laid bare by the Covid-19 pandemic crisis. The following quote is illustrative in this regard.

'Most notably, social divides, a lack of fairness, a lack of cooperation, a lack of global governance and leadership — these are now laid bare as never before, and we feel that the time for reinvention has come.'

119. According to this school of thought, nothing will ever return to the 'old' normal. The following quote is illustrative in this regard.

'Nothing will ever return to the "broken" sense of normality that preceded the crisis, because the coronavirus pandemic marks a fundamental inflection point in our global trajectory'

120. According to this line of thinking, the old world as [REDACTED] we knew it will disappear completely. In this context, the following quote is illustrative.

'The world as we knew it in the early months of 2020 is no more, dissolved in the context of the pandemic.'

121. According to this line of thinking, radical and enormous changes will soon be upon us, which will have major consequences for everyone's lives, including [REDACTED]. In this context, the following quote is illustrative.

'Radical changes of such consequence are coming that some pundits have referred to a "before coronacrisis (BC)" and "after coronacrisis (AC)" era. We will continue to be surprised by the rapid and unexpected nature of these changes — as they conflict with one another, they will also have second-, third-, fourth- and higher-order consequences, cascading effects and unforeseen outcomes.'

122. According to this line of thinking, a radically new 'new normal' will be created. The following quote is illustrative in this context.

'In so doing, they will usher in a "new normal" radically different from the one we are essentially leaving behind.'

123. In view of the philosophy of the defendants described above, including Hoekstra, we conclude [REDACTED] that the defendants, through their 'Covid-19: The Great Reset' project, are in the process of implementing an unprecedented and radical change amongst the Dutch population. The Covid-

19 injections

apparently form part of this project. This is evident because the Covid-19 injections were explicitly mentioned by Schwab in the words: '*Nobody will be safe, if not vaccinated to enter unless they are vaccinated*'. As proof of this statement, we refer to their Exhibit 19.

124. We hereby refer once again to their document 32, which includes a letter from Hoekstra to Schwab dated 14 February 2019. In that letter, Hoekstra, in his capacity as Minister, wrote to Schwab stating that he would like to collaborate with him on bringing about technical and political developments leading to further (financial) globalisation. Hoekstra conducted this correspondence in secret and without a mandate from the Dutch parliament, and therefore also without authorisation. Given the philosophy of the WEF, the content of this letter can only be interpreted as an unconditional commitment by Hoekstra to provide full cooperation, in his capacity as Minister of Finance, to the Covid-19 project: The Great Reset. Hoekstra did indeed provide this cooperation, for which he abused his office as Minister of Finance.
125. As indicated above, part of the Covid-19 project involves conveying the message to the public that no one will be safe until everyone has been vaccinated with Covid-19 injections. For the Great Reset to succeed, it is crucial that the crisis is portrayed as one of unprecedented scale, necessitating unprecedented measures. Through an unprecedented financial 'support package', Hoekstra ensured that the perception was created that there was indeed a crisis of unprecedented proportions caused by a new coronavirus. Without Hoekstra's cooperation, the implementation of the Covid-19 project in the Netherlands would not have been possible due to a lack of access to the Dutch Exchequer. What has been stated regarding Prime Minister Rutte in relation to Article 97a of the Criminal Code also applies to Hoekstra.
126. As a Minister and member of the WEF, Hoekstra is a strong advocate of the Covid-19 project and, by extension, of Covid-19 injections. All this whilst Hoekstra is aware that, as evidenced by the reports from the Pfizer trials referred to repeatedly in this summons, the Covid-19 injections have cost many people their lives and caused severe, permanent physical injury to thousands of people.
127. As a result of the fear fuelled by Hoekstra and the other defendants fomented fear of the alleged new coronavirus, its unprecedented consequences and the view propagated as a solution that unprecedentedly drastic measures were necessary, their decision to have the Covid-19 injections administered was taken in a state of great fear.
128. Hoekstra can be held accountable for failing to fulfil his political and social responsibilities as a Minister of the Netherlands and for thereby acting with social negligence towards resulting in the damage resulting in the damage suffered by the Dutch government's policy would not have come about without Hoekstra's unlawful conduct, nor could it have been implemented. Hoekstra should not have cooperated with the plans of the

134. Worldwide, individuals in a position similar to that of Van Nieuwenhuizen have acted in the same way, resulting in the aforementioned lack of information occurring on a global scale. The fact that all the defendants have cooperated in this regard speaks volumes regarding the assertion that the defendants are acting unlawfully as a group.
135. At the time of Van Nieuwenhuizen's unlawful conduct on 28 March 2020, the third clinical phase of the Pfizer trial – referred to repeatedly above – had not even commenced. This constituted a blind deviation from a treaty which is specifically intended to provide protection in a situation such as the one at hand. This demonstrates malicious intent on the part of all the defendants and, in particular, Van Nieuwenhuizen. What has been stated to Prime Minister Rutte regarding Article 97a of the Criminal Code also applies to Van Nieuwenhuizen.
136. Van Nieuwenhuizen must be held accountable for failing to fulfil her political and social responsibilities as a Minister of the Netherlands and for thereby acting with social negligence towards and resulting in [REDACTED] resulting in the damage suffered. The Dutch Government's policy would not have come about without Van Nieuwenhuizen's unlawful conduct. Van Nieuwenhuizen should not have deliberately breached the Aarhus Convention and, as a Dutch Minister, should have publicly challenged the narrative, which she failed to do.
137. [REDACTED] would not have been able to receive the Covid-19 injections had Van Nieuwenhuizen fulfilled her duty with the requisite social diligence.

pharmaceutical industry

BOIIY ĨG

138. Defendant No. 11, hereinafter referred to as 'Bourla', trained as a veterinary surgeon and has been a senior executive at the US-based pharmaceutical manufacturer Pfizer since 1993. During Bourla's long career at Pfizer, he became familiar with the operational aspects of all of Pfizer's divisions. In 2018, Bourla became the second-in-command at Pfizer. With effect from 1 January 2019, Bourla was promoted to Chief Executive Officer (CEO) at Pfizer and, from that date, took all key decisions at Pfizer.
139. Bourla is a 'contributor' to the WEF and Pfizer is a 'member' of the WEF. Bourla is a champion of the WEF's ideology and 'Covid-19: The Great Reset'. As PRODUCTIE 37 sets out [REDACTED] information from the WEF's website which demonstrates the links between Bourla and Pfizer and the WEF.
140. In public statements, Bourla has declared that in 2020 he urged Pfizer's employees to rapidly develop a Covid-19 vaccine. Furthermore, Bourla claims to have emphasised that the vaccine to be developed must be safe and effective. The production of

the Covid-19 ‘vaccines’ reportedly began on Bourla’s instructions prior to approval by the US Food and Drug Administration (hereinafter referred to as the ‘FDA’). According to Bourla, this was part of Pfizer’s strategy to ensure the ‘vaccines’ would be ready immediately following approval by the regulatory authorities. As PRODUCTION 38 provides a

screenshot of a video message dated 14 December 2020, which confirms the above.

We note here a striking similarity between the wording used by Bourla and De Jonge, where Bourla stated that the Covid-19 injections had been developed ‘vii/ioflt coating *conners*’, whilst De Jonge, on 26 December 2020, spoke in the same context of ‘not *cutting the hoc/ii/es* in any way’.

141. In an open letter from Bourla published on Pfizer’s website on 15 October 2020, Bourla makes several promises and commitments to the world’s population. In this letter, Bourla emphasises the importance of transparency regarding the development of the ‘vaccine’. Bourla assures the public that authorisation for ‘public use’ can only be granted by the medicines regulatory authorities if Pfizer has successfully demonstrated that three conditions have been met. Only once it has been demonstrated that the ‘vaccine’ currently under development is effective, safe and can be produced to a consistently high standard can approval for ‘public use’ be considered, according to Bourla. As PRODUCTION 39, we are providing [REDACTED] a copy of Bourla’s letter dated 15 October 2020.
142. For Europe, conditional authorisation was granted at the end of 2020 in accordance with Article 14(7) of EC Regulation 726/2004, whereby Pfizer was obliged to collect and submit to the EMA, in accordance with a set timetable, all manner of information relating to the administration of the Covid-19 injections. It is therefore established that the Covid-19 injections that were administered as part of a clinical trial. The EMA has stipulated that this trial will continue until at least August 2024.
143. According to its frequently cited safety report ⁹, Pfizer conducted an extensive clinical trial from November 2020 to February 2021, during which participants were injected with Pfizer’s Covid-19 ‘vaccine’, known under the brand name Comirnaty / BNT162b2. A total of 29,914 women, 9,182 men and 2,990 children took part in this trial. Within one month of the start date of this clinical trial, 1,223 participants died and 11,361 participants suffered serious, permanent physical injury. Pfizer reports in its aforementioned safety report that it does not have data for 9,400 trial participants. For this reason, it is not known whether these individuals died or sustained injuries as a result of the clinical trial. As shown in EXHIBIT 40, [REDACTED] the safety report dated 30 April 2021.
144. The aforementioned safety report [REDACTED] was withheld by Bourla, but was released to the public in October 2021 following intervention by the judiciary in the United States of America. The data from this report demonstrate that the Pfizer Covid-19 ‘vaccine’ is life-threatening. This safety report revealed that the three

conditions that Bourla had set out in his earlier open letter of 15 October 2020 for the be request for permission from the medicines regulatory authorities. If Bourla had done what he had assured the world's population in his open letter of 15 October 2020, no authorisation had ever been sought from the medicines regulatory authorities and Pfizer's Covid-19 injection had not been administered. Through his open letter and by concealing the safety report from the public, Bourla has deliberately misled the public.

145. Bourla's deception goes much further. 'Safe' and 'effective' were the key phrases used worldwide to persuade the majority of the world's population to have Covid-19 injections. Bourla, as well as all the other defendants, repeated these words ad nauseam. In addition, a key slogan was 'you're doing it for ^{others}'. The defendants, particularly Bourla, thereby implied that the Covid-19 injections would prevent transmission of the alleged virus. Based on this implicit message, the public worldwide came to believe – and also to assume – that as more people received a Covid-19 injection, the risk of infection with this virus would decrease, and that this was the only way the pandemic could be brought to an end.
146. Bourla knew, however, that Pfizer and other Covid-19 vaccine manufacturers had paid no attention whatsoever to preventing the transmission of the supposed new coronavirus when developing the 'vaccines'. Bourla knew that amongst the global public, and therefore also on this point – a misunderstanding partly created by him – the importance of which cannot be overstated. The entire Covid-19 policy worldwide was based on the notion that vaccination could prevent the transmission of the alleged virus, thereby making 'vaccination' an effective means of combating the purported pandemic. All of this is a huge lie that was perpetuated by Bourla and the other defendants. Had Bourla practised the transparency he had promised, never have resorted to having Covid-19 injections administered.
147. The lie regarding the prevention of transmission of the alleged virus through Covid-19 vaccinations was exposed in the European Parliament on 10 October 2022. Bourla, amongst others, was summoned for questioning by several MEPs. Bourla refused to appear before the European Parliament's hearing committee. He sent his colleague, Ms Janine Small, in his place. Ms Small formally admitted to the hearing committee that Pfizer had never tested the Covid-19 vaccine for its ability to prevent transmission. As EXHIBIT 41, on a screenshot of the European Parliament hearing on 10 October 2022, [REDACTED],
148. Ms Small, delegated for this purpose by Bourla, attempted to obscure the true nature of this sensational admission by stating that it was due to 'the speed of science' that no research into transmission had been carried out. As will be explained below, the reference to the 'speed of science' made on numerous occasions by Bourla and the other defendants is false and a gross lie. This

reference made no sense whatsoever, as in reality the Covid-19 injections had already been developed prior to the alleged pandemic.
We shall substantiate this claim in greater detail later in this summons.

149. On 19 January 2023, prior to the WEF meeting in Davos, Bourla was confronted by journalists from the Canadian TV channel 'Rebel News' regarding the statement made by his colleague Small on 10 October 2022. Despite these journalists' repeated questions seeking his response to Ms Small's statement, Bourla once again refused to make a statement. Bourla felt it sufficient to remark, 'Have a nice day'. The transparency promised by Bourla in his open letter thus proves all the more to be a huge lie. In doing so, Bourla demonstrates his contempt for everyone who has placed their trust in him and Pfizer, including As EXHIBIT 42, we submit a screenshot of the Rebel News interview with Bourla dated 19 January 2023.
150. Bourla's extremely underhand modus operandi of concealing crucial information about the contents and mechanism of action of Comirnaty / BNT162b2 (mRNA injections) also applies to the presence of graphene oxide in every mRNA injection, regardless of whether it is from Pfizer or Moderna²². In its Covid-19 injection leaflet, Pfizer describes 'tozinameran' as the active ingredient, along with other substances bearing complex chemical names, which are designated by codes, specifically the codes 'ALC-0315' and 'ALC-0159'.
151. The aforementioned codes can be explained by reference to the patent granted in Shanghai, China, on 27 September 2020, bearing the number CN 112220919A. It is abundantly clear from this patent that – particularly in the case of mRNA vaccines against the 2019-nCoV coronavirus – graphene oxide serves as a 'carrier' for lipid nanoparticles (LNPs). The Chinese patent No. CN 112220919A²³, granted on 27 September 2020, together with a translation thereof, is submitted as EXHIBIT 43. The English-language abstract of this patent states the following.
- 'The invention relates to the field of biomedicine, and specifically to a vaccine, in particular to the development of a 2019-nCoV coronavirus nuclear recombinant nano-vaccine. The invention also comprises a method for preparing the vaccine and the application of the vaccine in animal experiments. The new coronavirus vaccine comprises graphene oxide, carnosine, CpG and the novel coronavirus CBD; carnosine, CpG and the novel coronavirus RBD are bound to the backbone of graphene oxide; the CyG coding sequence is shown as SEQ ID NO 1; the novel coronavirus RBD refers to a novel coronavirus receptor-binding domain which can generate a broad-spectrum antibody targeting the RBD in a mouse's body, and serves as a strong support for the prevention and treatment of the novel coronavirus.*
152. In response to widespread public concern, so-called 'fact-checkers' in the media have investigated the claim that graphene oxide is present in the Covid-19 injections. These concerns arose because, amongst other things, graphene oxide causes people's blood to clot. The outcome of these checks was consistently and falsely that it was not present, and Bourla, too, deliberately allowed this misrepresentation to persist.

153. Videos and scientific reports by highly reputable individuals have emerged which, using evidence, explain with great precision that graphene oxide is present as a main component in all mRNA injections and primarily serves a purpose other than affecting health *in prima*. In this context, we refer to a video in which a self-proclaimed former [REDACTED] employee, Karen Kingston, provides a detailed explanation of this. This explanation reinforced the conviction that Bourla is a key player in the ‘Covid-19: The Great Reset’ project and that the Covid-19 injections forced upon people were never intended to protect them against an alleged virus. As PRODUCTION 44, we are sharing a screenshot relating to a video by Karen Kingston.
154. In light of the above, graphene oxide can be classified as the main component of the Pfizer Covid-19 ‘vaccine’. It goes without saying that the dreaded and highly toxic graphene oxide should not have been part of the vaccine, and no one who had known about this – and certainly not, [REDACTED] would have been prepared to have this poison injected into their bodies.
155. Bourla must be held accountable for having grossly breached his scientific and social responsibilities as CEO of the leading manufacturer of Covid-19 injections, and for having thereby acted with social negligence [REDACTED], resulting in the damage [REDACTED]. What was stated regarding Rutte in [REDACTED] Article 97a of the Criminal Code also applies to Bourla.

MssssnieJia

Van Cann

156. Defendant No. 12, hereinafter referred to as ‘Van Cam’, was deputy editor-in-chief of NOS News from 2011 and became the new editor-in-chief of NOS News (hereinafter referred to as ‘NOS’) on 1 September 2022.
157. On its website, the NOS sets out its mission statement based on the Media Act. It reads as follows.

‘The NOS, as an integral part of public service broadcasting, aims to be the primary source of information in the fields of news, sport and events, so that the Dutch public is better able to assess developments in the world, thereby enabling them to make more informed decisions about their behaviour. To this end, the NOS adheres to the highest journalistic standards of diligence, fairness, impartiality, accuracy and objectivity. The NOS strives to make this information accessible via all relevant media and to all sections of society.’
158. As (deputy) editor-in-chief, Van Cam is responsible for the direction of the Covid-19 section. It was part of Van Cam’s remit to ensure that the editorial team adhered to the standards applicable to journalism. With regard to the internationally recognised ethical standards for journalists, we refer to the standards as adopted by the International Federation of Journalists. The most recent

edition of the standards adopted by this federation is attached as PRODUCTION 45.

159. The manner in which the NOS reported on the alleged Covid-19 crisis was determined by Van Cam.
160. From the outset of the alleged Covid-19 crisis, namely from January 2020, Van Cam chose to use the headlines, photographs and suggestions in the NOS's editorial work to instil maximum panic and fear amongst the population. The NOS's reporting made people extremely fearful of the idea that a deadly virus ^{was} on its way from Wuhan.²⁶ Van Cam capitalised precisely on this without allowing for proper journalistic investigation. Van Cam slavishly followed the official narrative as imposed globally by the WHO and unquestioningly adopted by all the defendants.
161. We shall now examine a limited number of examples which, in view of the standards applicable to Van Cann, are, to put it mildly, unacceptable in terms of her conduct.
162. Firstly, we wish to point out the fact that the NOS portrayed the first person infected with coronavirus as someone who, due to the Covid-19 virus, instantly transformed from a healthy person into someone who was (as good as) dead. Dead or sick people on the streets, people in hospitals and people on ventilators in the ICU – that is how the NOS portrayed an infection. Yet even in the early stages, a simple journalistic investigation should have immediately raised serious doubts about the authenticity of the reporting, which the NOS had uncritically taken from international news agencies and other sources. On 29 January 2020, the NOS reported in its article 'How honest is China about the coronavirus outbreak?', stating, amongst other things: *'On 9 February 2020, nCoV2019 was identified as the cause of pneumonia in patients in Wuhan. Shortly afterwards, the Chinese authorities released the genetic code of the virus.'*
A copy of this NOS article dated 29 January 2020 is submitted as EXHIBIT 46.
163. Official documents from the EMA have revealed that it was reported to the EMA that Moderna as early as 2017 and Pfizer as early as 14 January 2020 already had a Covid-19 vaccine at their disposal and were in the process of testing these Covid-19 injections. It should be borne in mind that, as far as Pfizer is concerned, this would mean that Pfizer had its Covid-19 injection already ready for testing within four days, whilst for Moderna it would mean that it had had a vaccine against a future virus at its disposal for two and a half years. In this context, information is submitted as EXHIBIT 47, which came to the attention of MEP Cristian Terheş and from which this follows. This information demonstrates that the Covid-19 injections already were in development well before the outbreak of the alleged Covid-19 pandemic. As proof of this, to call MEP Cristian Terheş to give evidence under oath. The NOS and other media outlets should have investigated this newly revealed information thoroughly and informed the public about it in detail. In reality, the media,

including Van Cam and the NOS, practised outright censorship instead of informing the public.

164. The fact that there was no report on the European Parliament hearing of 10 October 2022 (Exhibit 41) clearly demonstrates that censorship took place. It is conclusive that Van Cam, as editor-in-chief, collaborated in a cover-up designed to perpetuate the lie that the Covid-19 injections would prevent transmission. The statement on this matter by a Pfizer director, Ms Janine Small, before a European Parliament inquiry committee should have been global news and gone ‘viral’.
165. The existence of censorship is also evident from the fact that no report was made of MEP Cristian Terhes’s speech on the findings of special hearings in the European Parliament at which executives from, amongst others, Moderna and Pfizer were questioned. As already indicated above in relation to Bourla, important information regarding the safety and efficacy of the Covid-19 injections came to light during these hearings. In two speeches delivered by MEP Cristian Terhes on 11 October 2022, Mr Terhes highlighted the fact that the European Parliament is being withheld information about the contracts with Pfizer by the European Commission. Mr Cristian Terhes also reported on the reason given to him by Pfizer for withholding this information. According to Pfizer, this is due to ‘commercial secrets’. Mr Cristian Terhes also draws attention to the fact that the Covid-19 vaccines offer no protection against transmission of the virus. Furthermore, Mr Cristian Terhes points to the sharp rise in excess mortality since the roll-out of the Covid-19 vaccination campaign. Mr Terhes also raised the issue on 11 October 2022 that Pfizer had reported data to the EMA regarding the start of trials of the Pfizer Covid-19 injections on 14 January 2020, whilst the genetic code of the alleged Covid-19 virus had only become known three days earlier. At Moderna, the trials even date back to 2017. All of this should have been presented to the Dutch public as breaking news by Van Cann, and Van Cann was responsible for ensuring that thorough journalistic investigation was carried out into everything that Mr Terhes brought to light in [REDACTED] of 11 October 2022. In this context, as EXHIBIT 48, we submit screenshots of the two speeches given by MEP Cristian Terhes on 11 October 2022.
166. The fact that Van Cann is responsible and liable for Covid-19 censorship is further evidenced by the fact that it withheld all information from the public regarding the special committees of inquiry set up by MEPs in October 2022. These committees investigated the safety and effectiveness of the Covid-19 injections and the manner in which the purchase agreements between Pfizer and the European Commission were concluded secretly and fraudulently as early as January 2020. Ursula van der Leijen, on behalf of the European Commission and on behalf of the Netherlands, placed orders with Pfizer totalling over EUR 71,000,000,000.00 (71 billion euros). The Netherlands, and consequently the Dutch population, are jointly and severally liable for the payment of this

remains unpaid to date. It should be borne in mind that this purchase agreement for this amount was concluded whilst Pfizer's Covid-19 injections were still in the

were in the clinical trial phase (production 38). As editor-in-chief, Van Cam swept all of this under the carpet on a global scale and withheld from the public, including the realisation of the unimaginably far-reaching (potential) consequences of these shocking shocking facts. This is incompatible with the very essence of the profession of journalism and the NOS's mission statement.

167. On 26 October 2022, in the German Parliament, the parliamentary group leader of the major political party AFD (Alternative für Deutschland), Dr Alice Weidel, drew attention in no uncertain terms to the (censorship) scandals relating to (1) the interview with Janine Small and her statement about not preventing transmission, (2) the European Commission's confirmation that the Covid-19 injections do not protect against infection, and (3) Ursula van der Leijen's secret agreements with the pharmaceutical industry regarding the aforementioned billion-euro procurement. This MP also identifies the extent of the damage caused by the Covid-19 injections as a subject that is being censored. This Member of Parliament leaves no room for misunderstanding regarding the personal liability of journalists such as Van Cann. As PRODUCTIE 49, we are providing  a screenshot of the speech by Dr Alice Weidel dated 26 October 2022.
168. As evidence of the scandals rightly highlighted by Dr Alice Weidel and censored by Van Cann, we submit  as EXHIBIT 50 a screenshot from a video dated 13 October 2022 in which European Commissioner Wolfgang Philipp confirms in the European Parliament that the Covid-19 injections offer no protection whatsoever against transmission.
169. Under Van Cann's leadership, the NOS has cooperated fully in the forceful and fear-mongering dissemination of the Covid-19 narrative, which is clearly aimed at persuading people to take Covid-19 injections through social pressure and a misrepresentation of the facts. This is despite the fact that the NOS should have pointed out that this involved participation in a large-scale, global experiment based on gene therapy for which there was, in fact, no justification.
170. The very first thing Van Cam and her NOS journalists should have done was to report on what is written in the package leaflets for the Covid-19 vaccines. The package leaflets for all Covid-19 mRNA 'vaccines' stated in no uncertain terms that this is a conditionally authorised 'medicine' which may only be administered on a doctor's prescription and must subsequently be monitored periodically as part of a medical trial until at least 1 August 2024. Van Cann was aware that this information was being withheld from the public because package leaflets for Covid-19 injections were not being provided.
171. As evidence that the Covid-19 injections are a product that has been conditionally authorised in Europe, the claimants submit, as EXHIBIT 51, a package leaflet from Pfizer. Reference is made to pages 66 and 67, which set out the conditions of the marketing authorisation for the period up to and including July 2024. It is noteworthy that in the latest version

of the Pfizer package leaflet, these conditions are no longer explicitly described.

172. Van Cam ensured that not a single scientist was able to express their opinion via the NOS, as a public and independent broadcaster, in order to communicate these important facts to the public. This is nothing short of censorship. Consequently, through his censorship, Van Cam perpetuated the false narrative.
173. The aforementioned unlawful act by Van Cam against [redacted] and the Dutch citizens is conclusive because it also means that the slogan propagated by the NOS under Van Cam's leadership – 'You *do it for everyone*' and 'Everyone *does it for one* another' – is based on a huge lie. This lie was evidently put out into the world by Van Cam with no other intention than to exert pressure on people, through the improper use of state media, to have an experimental Covid-19 injection administered that has nothing to do with health, but solely with the implementation of the Covid-19 project. What has been stated regarding Rutte in relation to Article 97a of the Criminal Code also applies to Van Cam.
174. It should also be noted that, under Van Cam's leadership, the NOS censored countless reports on health damage caused by Covid-19 injections by failing to include them or by dismissing them as disinformation.
175. Finally, we point [redacted] that, under Van Cam's leadership, the NOS censored the countless scientists and concerned citizens in the Netherlands who, using the power of facts and arguments, questioned the legitimacy of the Covid-19 measures, by failing to include them or dismissing them as disinformation.
176. As editor-in-chief, Van Cam is aware of the aforementioned standards of journalism, which stem, amongst other things, from the Bordeaux Convention and the 2008 Code of Ethics for Journalism applicable in the Netherlands. The Bordeaux Code sets out as the first and most fundamental duty the principle that journalists must have respect for the truth and for the public's right to the truth. Van Cam has grossly violated that duty, with the result that [redacted] as giving impression of the facts. Had they learnt the truth via the NOS – which [redacted] they followed daily – they would not have had the Covid-19 injections.
177. In summary, it can be stated that Van Cam has failed in her journalistic duty as editor-in-chief of the NOS. She is personally liable for the censorship she caused by, on the one hand, collaborating in a cover-up and, on the other, uncritically adopting the official and agenda-driven Covid-19 narrative, whilst even minimal journalistic investigation should have made it clear that this narrative was false. The NOS mission statement cited above apparently applies neither to the NOS nor to Van Cam.

Jansen

178. Defendant No. 13, hereinafter referred to as 'Jansen', was editor-in-chief of the daily newspaper De Telegraaf from 1 September 2015 to 1 June 2023.

In that capacity, Jansen led the editorial team with the same editorial responsibilities and duties as those set out above in relation to Van Cann. The same allegations apply to him as to Van Cann.

179. From the outset of the alleged Covid-19 pandemic, *De Telegraaf*, through its newspaper and websites under Jansen's editorial supervision, did everything in its power to instil great fear and panic amongst its readers and viewing public. In doing so, under Jansen's leadership, the guidance issued by the communications departments of all government ministries – particularly regarding the Covid-19 narrative – was accepted uncritically. Given the nature and content of *De Telegraaf*'s reporting on the alleged Covid-19 pandemic, there is no doubt whatsoever that, under Jansen's leadership, *De Telegraaf* allowed itself to be used as a weapon of fear against the Dutch population. Its reporting consistently suggested that there were countless infections with the alleged Covid-19 virus, leading, for many, to serious illness, hospitalisation and death at an unprecedented rate. The imagery featured in De Telegraaf's reporting – selected under Jansen's leadership at the start of the alleged Covid-19 pandemic – was characterised by the portrayal of the alleged Covid-19 pandemic as consisting of virtually nothing but death and destruction. The numbers of the sick and the dead were bandied about without providing any journalistically substantiated context to accompany those figures.
180. As EXHIBIT 52, the claimants submit a number of reports published by *De Telegraaf* under Jansen's responsibility, from which the foregoing is evident. The terminology used in these reports is reminiscent of war rhetoric; references to war terms contributed to the fear and panic. The battle against a virus was portrayed as if a war were underway, resulting in a huge number of deaths and injuries. Another highly reprehensible element is that the reporting maliciously played on the idea that things could still get much worse. With a well-functioning and competent editorial team acting in accordance with journalistic responsibility, this would not have been possible. What has been stated above regarding Van Cam in relation to the Bordeaux Code and the 2008 Code of Journalism applies equally to Jansen.
181. Insofar as Jansen might wish to defend himself by claiming that he has recruited 'critical journalistic staff' in the persons of Ronald Plasterk or Mariarine Zwagerman, we note [REDACTED] the following. Both Plasterk and Zwagerman have voiced a pseudo-critical stance on the handling of the alleged Covid-19 pandemic, but have not challenged any substantive aspect of the narrative. Jansen has used Plasterk and Zwagerman to provide a platform for a sham opposition. This was done to maintain his readership's confidence in the journalistic integrity of his editorial team, whilst in reality the public was being deliberately and grossly misled. [REDACTED] They have thus been misled by Jansen. [REDACTED]
182. The same applies to Jansen: the journalistic investigative questions regarding the Covid-19 narrative, which were also raised in Van Cam's case, should have been examined.

183. As editor-in-chief, Jansen is familiar with the aforementioned standards of journalism, which stem, amongst other things, from the Bordeaux Convention and the 2008 Code of Ethics for Journalism applicable in the Netherlands. The Bordeaux Code sets out as the first and most fundamental duty the standard that journalists must have respect for the truth and for the public's right to the truth. Jansen, just like Van Cam, has grossly
by ~~ass gevolg~~ that false representation of the facts
had. Had ~~██████████~~ they had learnt that truth from De Telegraaf – which they also followed daily – they would not have had the Covid-19 injections. What has been stated regarding Rutte in relation to Article 97a of the Criminal Code also applies to Jansen.
184. In summary, it can be stated that Jansen failed in his journalistic duty as editor-in-chief of *De Telegraaf*. Jansen is personally liable for the censorship he caused by, on the one hand, collaborating in a cover-up and, on the other hand, uncritically adopting the official narrative, whilst even minimal journalistic investigation should have made it clear that this narrative was false.

Non-governmental organisation (INGO), IVE

Sijbesma

185. Defendant No. 14, hereinafter referred to as 'Sijbesma', has held senior executive positions at various globally operating companies, including DSM. These companies are members of the WEF. Sijbesma currently holds, amongst other positions, the roles of non-executive director at Unilever N.V., chair of the Supervisory Board of Philips N.V., member of the WEF's Supervisory Board, climate lead for the World Bank's CO₂ pricing project, member of the International Monetary Fund's External Advisory Board, co-chair of the UN's Global Centre for Climate Adaptation ('GCA') and ambassador for the UN World Food Programme. As PRODUCTIE 53 has information from the WEF website regarding Sijbesma's CV.
186. Sijbesma is an outspoken advocate of the WEF's ideology, in particular the ideas described by Klaus Schwab in his book *Covid-19: The Great Reset*
total reorganisation (page 18). In order to enable his personal contribution to this total reorganisation, he is a
Sijbesma statutory member of the WEF. As evidence of this, we refer ~~██████████~~ to page 2 of the extract relating to the WEF, submitted as Exhibit 33. In this reorganisation, all factors determining human life are made subject to forced change by the WEF and the UN. A characteristic feature of this political ideology is that this forced and planned change is presented as justified by pretending that the world is beset by major crises that can only be resolved through tough, centralised global intervention. Owing to the purported severity of these crises and the claim that science holds the solution to them, the defendants, including Sijbesma, are implementing a global plan. This plan forms part of Agenda 21 (14 July 1992) and Agenda 2030 (27 September 2015) and is known as 'The Great Reset'. As set out in EXHIBIT 54 pages 1 to 3 of

187. At the start of the alleged Covid-19 pandemic, Sijbesma states that on 26 March 2020 he was asked by the government to scale up the GGD's testing capacity for Covid-19. He was also asked to help determine the vaccination strategy. In this context, the government awarded Sijbesma the title of 'special coronavirus envoy'. Sijbesma presented himself in this regard as a well-meaning volunteer. As EXHIBIT 56, information on this subject comes from i ksoverl e € on Sijbesma's role as special envoy for the coronavirus crisis. His links with the WEF were deliberately disregarded by Sijbesma and the defendants.
188. In her capacity as coronavirus envoy, Sijbesma staged a charade that was widely publicised through the media and also misled the public. Sijbesma contributed to the false narrative that Covid-19 tests were a scarce commodity. In the interview on 'Buitenhof' on 12 April 2020, Sijbesma spoke of major problems with the procurement of Covid-19 tests. He claimed that, compared to other countries, the Netherlands would find it difficult to purchase these Covid-19 tests from international manufacturers in any significant quantity because the Netherlands was applying a restrictive testing policy. As PRODUCTIE 57, we are providing a screenshot of the relevant interview on Buitenhof dated 12 April 2020.
189. One of Sijbesma's additional roles is that of climate leader at the World Bank Group. The World Bank has an analysis and visualisation tool accessible to everyone via the internet, called 'DataBarik'. DataBarik utilises the so-called World Integrated Trade Solution ('WITS'). WITS is software developed by the World Bank in collaboration with various UN agencies³¹. This software enables users to view and retrieve information on global trade and tariffs. As PRODUCTION 58, we provide information regarding WITS as published on the WITS website.
190. In 2017, WITS was used to record cross-border import and export data for Covid-19 test kits and Covid-19 diagnostic Test instruments and apparatus. The 'World Customs Organisation', as part of the World Bank, has provided Covid-19 test kits in 2017 the unique classification number HS-2017 with production number 3002.15 was assigned. In 2017, the Covid-19 Diagnostic Test Instruments and Apparatus were assigned the unique classification number HS-production 2017 with p number 9027.80. As PRODUCTION 59, the information relating to global trade in 'Covid-19 test kits' and 'Covid-19 diagnostic test instruments and apparatus' in 2017, as it was available via WITS up to 7 September 2020.
191. In 2018, WITS also recorded the import and export between countries of many millions of Covid-19 test kits and diagnostic test instruments and apparatus. Many millions of Covid-19 test kits were purchased by, amongst others, the European Union and Germany. As PRODUCTION 60, we present the information relating to global trade in

‘Covid-19 test kits’ and ‘Covid-19 diagnostic test instruments and apparatus’ in 2018, as available via WITS until 7 September 2020.

192. On 7 September 2020, the data previously submitted as Exhibits 59 and 60 was amended in WITS such that the description in the lists no longer read ‘Covid-19 test kits’ and ‘Covid-19 diagnostic test instruments and apparatus’, but was changed to ‘Medical test kits’ and ‘Medical diagnostic test instruments and apparatus’. This change did not go unnoticed. As EXHIBIT 61, we submit a printout of the aforementioned data in WITS, as retrieved and printed via WITS on 7 September 2020. As Exhibit 59 demonstrates, whilst the description in the lists was amended, this was not the case in the text below the lists, where the word ‘Covid-19’ was still being used.

193. The situation in WITS described above, as at 7 September 2020, did not last long. On the very same day, WITS was amended once again, and in the process the word ‘Covid-19’ was also removed from the t [REDACTED] the lists.

They expressly offer to prove the accuracy of their assertions regarding WITS by means of witnesses and expert witnesses.

194. The account of events given by Sijbesma, Mr Buitenhof, is demonstrably false in light of what has been stated above regarding WITS. In reality, this concerns a Covid-19 project funded globally by the World Bank. This project is known within the World Bank as the ‘Covid-19 Strategic Preparedness and Response Programme (SPRP)’. According to the World Bank’s website, the SPRP is expected to run until 1 April 2025.

195. We cannot help but get the impression that the WITS system actually serves as a monitoring system for the solvency of members affiliated with the UN and the World Bank. From their research into the patent registers, we believe [REDACTED] further conclude that the financial interests of the Rothschild banking family in the Covid-19 project were enshrined in, amongst other things, patent number US 2020/0279585 A1. This patent is described as a ‘system and method for testing for Covid-19’ and was filed on 17 May 2020 by Richard A. Rothschild and published on 3 September 2020. The basis of the patented invention is set out in the provisional application numbered 62/240,783 dated 13 October 2015. This application related to an invention described as ‘system and method for using, biometric, and displaying biometric data’ and had previously led to a granted patent under number US 2017/0229149 A1. These patents confer on the inventor exclusive legal and economic rights in respect of the invention, which involves the centralised monitoring of people’s biometric data in combination with video footage of their surroundings. Where this occurs, the Rothschild family has extensive rights under [REDACTED] patents. Submitted as EXHIBIT 62 [REDACTED] the patent numbered US 2020/0279585 A1³².

196. et al. suspect that this technology, patented by global banker Richard A. Rothschild, is being utilised by the defendants as part of the

Covid-19: The Great Reset project. The patent will then form the legal

basis for this global banking family's financial claim in connection with the use of the patented invention by virtually the entire global population involved in the Great Reset. It is telling that the WEF refers to its projects 'The Internet of Things' and 'The Internet of Bodies'. The patented invention is crucial to these projects, in which everything – and in particular human bodies – are interconnected via 5G and 6G internet technology. There is

there is no doubt whatsoever that, given the position he has held as mentioned above, Sijbesma is involved in this. As PRO [REDACTED] 63 sets out information from the WEF website regarding the linking of people's biometric data to the Internet of Things, along with an explanation thereof.

197. If [REDACTED] we had known what Sijbesma actually stands for and what he is involved in, we would not have wanted anything to do with the Covid-19 injections and would not have allowed ourselves to be vaccinated under any circumstances.
198. It follows from the facts set out above that the defendants, including Sijbesma, are aware that Covid-19 is a project rather than a disease, which was already being implemented, at least as early as 2017, under the project name 'Covid-19 Strategic Preparedness and Response Programme ("SPRP")'. All this explains why the chairman of the WEF — Klaus Schwab — was able to publish his book 'Covid-19: The Great Reset' as early as June 2020, having prior knowledge of the matter.
199. As an insider at the World Bank, the UN and the WEF, Sijbesma is fully familiar with and involved in the Covid-19 project intended to lead to the Great Reset. This involvement is the real reason why the government, including the defendants De Jonge, Rutte, Kaag, Hoekstra and Van Nieuwerihuizen, appointed him as the Dutch coronavirus envoy.
200. During the interview on the 'Buitenhof' programme on 12 April 2020, Sijbesma was aware of the official narrative that (1) on 11 January 2020, the Chinese authorities had disclosed the genetic code of the alleged virus to the world and that (2) on 14 January 2020 — three days later — already had a Covid-19 vaccine which they were due to start testing from that very same date. It is evident that, as special coronavirus envoy, Sijbesma [REDACTED]. The entire thrust of his argument was directed at nothing other than the Great Reset.
201. Sijbesma can be held accountable for acting on behalf of the WEF as an implementer of the Great Reset and [REDACTED] in that context, deliberately misled the public regarding the usefulness and necessity of the Covid-19 injections. If Sijbesma had indeed been a special coronavirus envoy acting in the interests of the Dutch population's health, he would have provided honest and complete information, and [REDACTED] the Covid-19 injections would not have been (or could not have been) administered. What has been stated regarding Rutte in relation to Article 97a of the Criminal Code also applies to Sijbesma.

202. Defendant No. 15, hereinafter referred to as ‘Gates’, is one of the richest people in the world. A large part of his wealth stems from his interests in Microsoft. He has placed the bulk of his wealth in a foundation governed by US law, the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, which is based in Seattle, United States of America. According to its website, this foundation aims to combat poverty, disease and inequality worldwide.
203. Gates is also the founder of and is associated with ‘Gavi, the Vaccine Alliance’ (hereinafter referred to as ‘GAVI’). Upon the establishment of GAVI in 1999, the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation made no less than \$750,000,000.00 available to vaccinate children in poor countries. Through GAVI, amongst other channels, Gates has access to every organisation in the world and exerts influence over, for example, governments, the WHO, UNICEF, the World Bank, the vaccine industry, research and technical agencies, civil society organisations and other private philanthropists. In this context, Gates regularly visits Rutte in his office in the ‘Toren’ of the Binnenhof. As PRODUCTIE 64 reports information from RTL Nieuws and Twitter regarding a number of these visits by Gates to Rutte.
204. The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation and Gavi are, together, by far the largest donors to the WHO and play a decisive role in shaping WHO policy.
205. The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation and Microsoft are key strategic partners of the WEF and, through their input, make a significant contribution to the development of the WEF’s strategy and its Great Reset. In PRODUCTION 65, we present information from the WEF’s website regarding the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation and Microsoft.
206. Gates wants the world to believe that, as well as being a philanthropist, he is also a prophet of the future. As early as 2015, Gates predicted that it would no longer be wars that would threaten the future of humanity, but viruses. As shown in PRODUCTION 66 a screenshot of a TED Talk dated 3 April 2015 in which Gates demonstrates his alleged gift for prediction. As EXHIBIT 67, we submit a screenshot of a video dated 27 May 2015 from YouTube entitled ‘What Bill Gates is afraid of’.
207. In the aforementioned videos, Gates uses unproven claims about the Spanish flu and the Ebola virus to instil fear of the arrival of a deadly variant of a new coronavirus. In doing so, Gates presents himself as the world’s protector by, amongst other things, investing in ‘computer modelling’ of viruses and promoting new global projects aimed at detecting viral outbreaks, creating enormous testing capacity and the rapid development of methods to vaccinate everyone in the world on a frequent basis.

208. On 15 May 2018, the WEF, in collaboration with the Johns Hopkins Centre for Health Security in Washington DC, organised a training exercise based on a simulation of a global pandemic under the code name ‘Clade X: A Pandemic Exercise’³. The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation is one of the major ‘Philanthropy Partners’ of the Johns Hopkins Centre⁵. PRODUCTIE 68 provides a brief explanation of the pandemic role-play, the trailer and the full recording of the ‘Clade X’ role-play. Participants were not permitted to criticise the pandemic scenario outlined therein. Clade X was a role-play designed to prepare for the implementation of the Covid-19 project. Consequently In this summons, the defendants are categorised according to their role in the Covid-19: The Great Reset project. In Clade X, precisely those roles were rehearsed in advance, and the defendants essentially played their roles exactly as they had been rehearsed in Clade X. In effect, the alleged Covid-19 pandemic was thus rehearsed before the eyes of the world.
209. Clade X was followed up on 18 July 2018 at a special WEF meeting in Davos. An impending pandemic was simulated there under the theme: ‘How 6 *Wals countries can prepare for the next infectious disease pandemic*’. The Netherlands was also well represented at this WEF meeting. As EXHIBIT 69, we hereby submit and others hereby provide information from the WEF website regarding this WEF pandemic simulation dated 18 July 2018. The apparent purpose of this meeting was to reach agreements on what the future should look like following a major pandemic outbreak, as simulated specifically with Clade X. In this context, the information set out in Exhibit 69 states:
- ‘...At the end of the exercise, six long-term policy goals were proposed, which, if enacted, could prevent, or at least mitigate, the outcome of a pandemic similar in scale to Clade X:*
- 1. Develop the capability to produce new vaccines, drugs and rapid diagnostics for novel pathogens within months, not years°!.*
210. On 18 January 2019, the WEF and the Harvard Global Health Institute published a ‘White Paper’. It warns of an imminent outbreak of a global infectious disease. Through the White Paper, entitled ‘Outbreak Readiness and Business Impact: Protecting Lives and Livelihoods across the Global Economy’, the WEF and the WHO are preparing member countries (Agenda 2030 signatories) for the outbreak of a severe pandemic. ^{minor As a} ~~As a~~ ^{PRODUCTION} ~~As a~~ ^{PRODUCTION} 70, we present the first three pages of the WEF White Paper ‘Outbreak Readiness and Business Impact: Protecting Lives and Livelihoods across the Global Economy’, as well as related information from the WEF website.
211. On 18 October 2019, the WEF, together with the Johns Hopkins Centre for Health Security and the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, organised an extensive exercise in New York simulating a high-level pandemic caused by an nCoV virus, under the project name ‘Event 201’. The narrative used by participants during this meeting to simulate the response to a pandemic through role-playing essentially corresponds to the narrative of the hypothetical Covid-19 pandemic from early 2020 until – in the Netherlands – 10

March 2023. In addition to the similarity in the narrative of a contagious virus resulting in many deaths, there is – even more so than with Clade X during Event 201 – a striking similarity in the way in which the media, the government and NGOs presented themselves to the public, including . At the conclusion of this Event 201, a number of very specific ‘suggestions’ are given to the participants regarding what needs to be done in the event of ~~participate~~ future major pandemic. As PRODUCTION 71, we are providing ~~information~~ information about Event 201 from the Johns Hopkins website, as well as a full video recording of Event 201.

212. Throughout all the simulations mentioned above, the narrative was that a vaccine was needed to save humanity.
213. According to the official narrative presented to the world two months after Event 201 as part of the implementation of the Covid-19 project (the alleged Covid-19 pandemic), a new beta coronavirus was discovered in Wuhan, China, at the end of 2019, which quickly spread across the globe, infecting and killing many people.
214. The similarities between the scenario in Clade X, Event 201 and the official narrative regarding the alleged Covid-19 crisis constitute compelling evidence that all these events took place as part of the Covid-19 project. As previously stated in this summons, these preparations for the Covid-19 project also involved preparing for the production of ‘vaccines’ and applying for patents on those ‘vaccines’.
215. In particular, on behalf of the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, the pharmaceutical companies Moderna and Pfizer have been developing beta coronavirus mRNA vaccines since mid-2011. The first patent in this context was published on 28 February 2020 under number US-10702600-B1 and is based on provisional applications dating back to 22 October 2015 and belonging to BioNTech GmbH and Moderna TX Inc. As EXHIBIT 72, we submit et al. reproduce the first page of the patent numbered US-10702600-B1.
216. They conclude from this patent (Exhibit 72) and its history that the invention on which, according to the official narrative, the Covid-19 injections are based already existed in 2015 and that, therefore, the lightning-fast development that is claimed to have taken place at ‘Warp speed’ and ‘The speed of science’ cannot in reality have occurred. The statements made by Moderna’s CEO to MEP Mr Cristian Terhes (Exhibit 41) that Moderna’s clinical trials had already begun in 2017 are, given the implications of this patent, more than plausible. In short, it is a gross falsehood to claim that a ‘vaccine’ was developed within a few months of the outbreak of the alleged Covid-19 pandemic.
217. The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation has spent no less than \$100,000,000.00 (one hundred million US dollars) in the development of beta coronavirus mRNA vaccines. According to the official narrative

, the new coronavirus, known as SARS-CoV-2, belongs to the beta coronavirus group. As PRODUCTION 73 indicates information taken from the Moderna website and a Google search result showing the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation's investment in beta coronavirus mRNA vaccines.

218. On 12 December 2019, Moderna and the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases⁸ (hereinafter referred to as 'NIAID') entered into an agreement with the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, United States of America. This agreement is entitled '*Material Transfer Agreement*'. This agreement shows that Moderna and the NIAID each own half of the beta coronavirus mRNA vaccines. Under this agreement, the university is commissioned to carry out 'non-human challenge studies' on various 'coronavirus vaccine candidates'. These are tests in which laboratory animals – divided into groups that have or have not received the coronavirus vaccine under test – are deliberately infected with a coronavirus, after which the efficacy of the mRNA beta coronavirus vaccine is assessed. It should be noted here that, as part of the same collaboration between the aforementioned parties, mRNA vaccines have been tested for HIV, amongst other things, since at least 2016. This agreement demonstrates that the narrative claiming that mRNA-based coronavirus vaccines were developed only after a new coronavirus had emerged in Wuhan is based on a massive lie. As PRODUCTION 74, we present the Material Transfer Agreement dated 12 December 2019.
219. In the context of the alleged Covid-19 pandemic, the WHO, through its Director-General Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus, declared to the world on 11 March 2020 that a Covid-19 pandemic was underway. Gates subsequently reinforced the official Covid-19 narrative in his frequent media appearances by, from the very start of the alleged pandemic, painting a picture that the world could only be saved by a medicine that would need to be at least 95 per cent effective. Conventional medicines would not be able to achieve this level of effectiveness; only a coronavirus vaccine yet to be developed might be capable of doing so in the future. According to Gates, that vaccine would then need to be administered to seven billion people. Gates outlined in the early stages of the so-called pandemic, an urgent situation in which scientists were hard at work developing several new vaccines. The hope, according to Gates, was that one of these vaccines would prove successful within 18 months. This account of events was false. As evidence of this, we present, as EXHIBIT 75, a screenshot of a video message posted by Gates on 30 April 2020 on YouTube, entitled 'The race for a Covid-19 vaccine'.
220. As demonstrated above, the reality was that, with funding from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, work had already been underway for years prior to the alleged coronavirus pandemic on the development of a vaccine based on mRNA technology against a disease caused by a beta coronavirus. All the patents for the so-called Covid-19 vaccine had been applied for years before the outbreak of the pandemic, and the animal

trials had already been carried out. Contrary to what Gates has

, there was nothing of the nature of an unprecedented achievement in ultimately bringing a Covid-19 ‘vaccine’ to market within one year rather than 18 months.

221. The reality is that the preparations for the so-called Covid-19 pandemic were carried out under Gates’s leadership in every respect. On the one hand, the Covid-19 vaccine was already fully prepared; on the other hand, Gates, the WHO and the WEF had already conducted global drills with the parties required to impose the measures relating to the so-called Covid-19 pandemic on the population, including .
222. A particularly reprehensible aspect of Gates’ media appearances is that he stated that as soon as the Covid-19 ‘vaccine’ was on the market, he would use it immediately, regardless of which manufacturer produced it. He claimed they would all be safe and effective ‘vaccines’. have placed great trust in this statement by Gates. At the time this statement was made by Gates, namely 3 December 2020, test subjects had already died during Pfizer’s clinical trials of its Covid-19 ‘vaccine’. We refer here to Bourla’s comments in this regard concerning the Pfizer safety report of 30 April 2021 (Exhibit 38). As evidence of Gates’s statements of 3 December 2020, we submit as EXHIBIT 76 a screenshot of an interview with Gates on the ‘Today Exclusive’ show, as posted on YouTube under the title ‘It Looks Like Almost All The Vaccines Are Going To Succeed’.
223. Gates prides himself on his knowledge of mRNA technology and, as the largest financier of its development, knows better than anyone how far that technology has progressed and what it actually entails. Gates is the person par excellence who has made all aspects of the development of the Covid-19 mRNA ‘vaccines’ possible. Gates has closely monitored this development and protected his own financial interests involved in it through patents, shareholdings and agreements.
224. It is inconceivable that Gates, who had every interest and every resource at his disposal, would not have known that, as early as November/December 2020, participants had died and others had suffered irreversible physical injury during Pfizer’s clinical trials. Furthermore, in our view, it is established that Gates knew that a key element in the development of the Covid-19 mRNA vaccines lay in the use of the highly dangerous graphene oxide, as described by Bourla. There is no doubt that Gates intentionally harmed people’s health.
225. Gates’ influence on the Covid-19 deception, deliberately orchestrated together with the other defendants, cannot be overestimated. Gates is the principal private driving force behind WHO policy. This is because Gates, together with GAVI, accounts for a significant portion of the WHO’s budget – as much as 15 per cent of it. The signatories to Agenda 21 and Agenda 2030, including the State of the Netherlands, comply with WHO directives. Gates also sponsors various Dutch institutions through the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, including

universities, in order to ensure that the ideology required for the Great Reset is instilled in the minds of as many people as possible. The latter is crucial to the success of the Covid-19: The Great Reset project. Information from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation's website reveals that, over recent years, these institutions have received nearly half a billion euros from Gates in exchange for their cooperation in rolling out the 2030 Agenda and the Great Reset. As rnoziuCTIE 77, we are providing an Excel spreadsheet containing information obtained via the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, which shows the amounts and recipients recorded in this context.

226. Gates is to be held accountable for having, for years, prepared and now implementing the alleged Covid-19 pandemic – the consequences of which he knew would be disastrous worldwide – for the benefit of the 2030 Agenda and the Great Reset. In this way, Gates, in collaboration with the defendants, has enabled people were misled and consequently received the Covid-19 injections. Without Gates' unlawful conduct, they would not have been able to receive the Covid-19 injections. What has been stated regarding Rutte in relation to Article 97a of the Criminal Code also applies to Gates.

s⟨⟩ni

government

Kant

227. Defendant No. 16, hereinafter referred to as 'Kant', was appointed on 13 March 2013 to the Lareb Adverse Reactions Centre (hereinafter referred to as 'Lareb') as director with full powers. As of 28 December 2021, Kant combined this formal position at Lareb with the role of Chair of the Lareb Board of Directors. In that capacity too, Kant has sole and independent authority. Kant has therefore been the de facto policy-maker at Lareb since 13 March 2013. As EXHIBIT 78, we submit information from the Commercial Register relating to Lareb.
228. Lareb is an organisation with the legal form of a foundation. Lareb is funded by the Medicines Evaluation Board (CBG) and the Ministry of Health, Welfare and Sport (VWS).
229. Lareb works in collaboration with the CBG and supports it in its statutory duty of pharmacovigilance. Lareb informs the CBG via reports. Where vaccines are concerned, Lareb also informs the National Institute for Public Health and the Environment (RIVM). The RIVM can then take measures. For example, it may amend the package leaflet, tighten the criteria for who may use the medicinal product or receive the vaccine, or withdraw a product from the market. Lareb thus acts as a crucial intermediary in identifying adverse reactions to the Covid-19 vaccines and issuing warnings in this context.
230. On 8 September 2020, the RIVM commissioned Lareb to develop a 'Covid Information and Monitoring System' (CIMS). A crucial aspect of this was that, within the RIVM's system, the side effects of the various batches of the

different Covid-19 vaccines are

based on the relevant batch number and — where consent had not been explicitly withheld — based on the personal identification number (BSN) of the person in question.

231. A data processing agreement was concluded between the RIVM and Lareb in accordance with privacy regulations. The purpose of this data processing agreement was to enable Lareb to retrieve the vaccine product and batch number from the RIVM's CIMS system using the patient's BSN number. In this way, Lareb enters data on the side effects of the Covid-19 injections into the RIVM's CIMS system.
232. An agreement was concluded between De Jonge and Lareb, under which Lareb was commissioned to record the side effects of the Covid-19 vaccines using the BSN number and batch number.
233. The importance of maintaining a register in which distinct batch numbers are linked to the reported side effects is evident. After all, a batch number is a number assigned to a production run of medicines. If something goes wrong in the production process, it stands to reason that the entire production run (batch) is affected by the same defect.
234. Batch numbers are the ideal means of verifying whether the quality of medicines is consistent and whether they are safe and effective. Without a register based on batch numbers, there can be no effective identification of defects in quality, safety and efficacy.
235. In view of the above, there is no doubt that the RIVM and Lareb are capable of providing an overview, by batch number, of the recorded adverse reactions to the Covid-19 injections.

Lareb does not currently provide data based on batch numbers

236. A Freedom of Information request dated 4 August 2022 was submitted to Kuipers' Ministry, asking it to publish summary lists of all batch numbers for the Pfizer, Moderna, AstraZeneca, Janssen and Novavax vaccines. This Freedom of Information request also asked for the publication of a summary register detailing the number of adverse reactions and deaths linked to the batch numbers of the aforementioned vaccines. In a decision dated 29 March 2023, Kuipers stated that the Ministry of Health, Welfare and Sport (VWS) had issued a search request to the RIVM, Lareb and the CBG-MEB. Kuipers stated that the requested documents were not found at these bodies. The search request therefore did not yield any documents. For this reason, the Woo request was not granted. Submit as EXHIBIT 79 Kuipers' Woo decision dated 29 March 2023.
237. As indicated above, Lareb plays a crucial role in pharmacovigilance. According to Lareb's ^{website}, it carries out regular research as

independent organisation. According to Lareb, the aim of these studies is to gain a better understanding of known side effects of vaccines and medicines and to identify new side effects at an earlier stage. According to its website, Lareb also collects information on the course, risk factors, treatment and burden of side effects. All of this is done with the aim of enhancing the safety of medicines and vaccines. This role in pharmacovigilance is incompatible with Lareb's assertion that it is unable to provide data on adverse reactions based on batch numbers.

Kant is engaging in a smokescreen to serve the Covid-19 project

238. The remarkable assertion by Lareb – and therefore Kant – noted above, that no data based on batch numbers can be provided, has only one explanation: Kant is lying. This lie by Kant serves an interest other than that of public health. Kant's lie is of great importance to the success of the Covid-19 project. Worldwide, individuals in the same position as Kant are perpetuating this lie with the aim of ensuring the success of the Covid-19 project.
239. Kant's lie conceals the enormous differences in harmful short-term side effects between the various Covid-19 vaccine batches. Kant knows this better than anyone because she is familiar with all the capabilities of the CIMS system and, as an independent authorised director on behalf of Lareb, has accepted the Ministry of Kuipers' mandate to record the side effects per batch.
240. Kant will be unable to refute the claimants' allegations that she consciously and deliberately caused Lareb to neglect its duties in the field of pharmacovigilance. The evidence supporting this assertion by the claimants is clear and will be presented and explained below.

UDTI'S COO OF

241. Lareb, under Kant's leadership, maintained a register of the adverse reactions to the Covid-19 injections for the purposes of the Covid-19 project, consistently recording the relevant batch number.
242. Until 19 November 2022, Lareb recorded the side effects and deaths reported to it not only for the RIVM, but also for the international data system known as 'VAERS'. Part of Kant's cover-up involved deliberately withholding information from the Dutch public regarding side effects and deaths resulting from Covid-19 injections, as identified by batch numbers. As already indicated, Kant has categorically denied that this data was available.
243. However, this data was indeed entered by Kant into the international VAERS registration system using batch numbers. Within VAERS, this data was only retrievable at the Dutch level with knowledge of the VAERS system and the search variables and codes to be used therein. However, all Dutch data was removed from VAERS on 18 November 2022.

244. The data, as it was available in Vaers up to 19 November 2022, can be obtained via a historical online ^{database}.⁴⁰ As a result, the claimants have access to the Covid-19 batch data recorded in Vaers prior to 19 November 2022.
245. A key example of the very significant differences between batches of Covid-19 vaccines concerns the Covid-19 Pfizer batch EM0477. This batch is of great significance because it was administered to the Dutch population as early as January 2021 – at the start of the vaccination campaign – and immediately led to numerous and serious reports of adverse reactions and deaths. This batch is notable in that, shortly after administration, more than thirty deaths were reported as early as February and March 2021. More specifically, batch EM0477 led to 71 reports of adverse reactions, 34 of which were reports of deaths. It should be noted here that, on reading the reports drawn up in connection with these reports, the ‘Regulatory authority number’ linked to the relevant Lareb official appears in each case. The first letters of this reference are always ‘NL-LRB’. What is alarming in this regard is that the adverse reactions and deaths described in these reports almost all occurred within a few days, and the harmful nature of this batch cannot have escaped the attention of Lareb – and therefore Kant as well. Whilst this batch had already led to more than thirty reports of deaths to Lareb by March 2021, there was no indication from Kant that the safety of the ‘Covid-19 vaccine’ could no longer be guaranteed. As shown in EXHIBIT 80 – information from the VAERS system regarding the reports of the 34 deaths from batch EM0477 reported to Lareb.
246. It is easy to establish that the Pfizer batch EM0477, cited as an example, was particularly lethal compared to other batches administered in the Netherlands during the same period, namely by comparing it with other Pfizer Covid-19 batches administered to the Dutch population during the same period, such as batches numbered EJ7133, EJ6975 and CE6792. Each of these other batches has only one report of a non-fatal side effect. As PRODUCTION 81, we are providing [REDACTED] a comparative overview including the aforementioned batches administered in the Netherlands.
247. A comparison of international data on the Pfizer Covid-19 batch EM0477 with international data from other Covid-19 batches also reveals enormous differences — more than a factor of 100 — in terms of the number of reported deaths and injuries per batch. As EXHIBIT 82, we submit three pages [REDACTED]; a 908-page ‘international comparison’ between the batches.
248. Research conducted in Denmark under the leadership of Professor Peter Rits Hansen has demonstrated that there are very significant differences in mortality and side effects between batches of the Pfizer Covid-19 vaccine. Professor Hansen is affiliated with the Department of Cardiology at the University of Copenhagen and serves as an expert for the European Medicines Agency (EMA). His research shows that approximately 4 % of all batches are responsible for over 70 per cent of all reported side effects, 27 per cent of

all serious adverse reactions and 47 per cent of all reported deaths following vaccination. Following this research, questions were raised in the European Parliament on 10 May 2023. We submit as EXHIBIT [REDACTED] Professor Hansen's study, as well as information regarding his appointment at the EMA and the questions raised in the European Parliament concerning his research.

249. Despite all the facts and evidence, Kant persists in her lies. Kant's lies serve the Covid-19 project and constitute a deliberate and direct attack on the health of the Dutch people, including Kant's literal statement: 'We can say that fear of the vaccine was unfounded'. This is a lie and deception of unproportioned proportions, and it goes without saying that Kant is thereby acting un[REDACTED] towards [REDACTED] the entire Dutch population. As EXHIBIT 84, we are submitting [REDACTED] a screenshot of an article in the AD dated 20 November 2021, which contains the statement quoted above.
250. Kant's role in the Covid-19 deception deliberately orchestrated together with the other defendants cannot be overstated. As indicated above, Lareb – and therefore Kant as well – is funded by the Medicines Evaluation Board (CBG) and the Ministry of Health, Welfare and Sport (VWS). Kant allowed himself to be paid by the pharmaceutical industry and Kuipers' Ministry and, over a period of ten years, corrupted Lareb so that the Covid-19 project and the Great Reset could be implemented through the Covid-19 vaccination campaign. It is with this aim in mind that Kant leads Lareb.
251. As regards the almost unimaginable gravity of Kant's behaviour, I wish to point out that Kant is a key participant in the 'Desinformation Think Tank'. We have previously argued in Koopmans that it is precisely the 'Desinformation Think Tank' which, through influencers recruited for this purpose, promotes the dissemination of disinformation for the benefit of the Covid-19 project. This makes it all the more reprehensible that Kant is personally involved in delivering Covid-19 courses for GPs, whilst leaving these GPs unaware of what Lareb actually recorded for the various batches and failing to inform the GPs of her position within the Disinformation Think Tank. As EXHIBIT 85, we submit by de de information regarding the aforementioned Covid-19 c[REDACTED] GPs delivered by Kant.
252. Through her foundation Lareb, Kant has been an important source of information for the claimants regarding the safety and effectiveness of the Covid-19 injections. It was Kant who deliberately and falsely reassured the claimants by covering up the very important warning that some Covid-19 batches are far more lethal and/or far more harmful than others. Had Kant shared this information about the significant differences in adverse event reports between the various batches with the Dutch public – which was her duty – then the claimants would not have (been able to) receive a Covid-19 injection and would not have suffered any harm. What has been stated regarding Rutte in relation to Article 97a of the Criminal Code also applies to Kant.

253. Defendant No. 17, hereinafter referred to as ‘The State’, has as its primary duty the protection of its citizens. The State is not permitted to delegate this duty, for which it bears exclusive responsibility and liability, to a foreign power. This applies regardless of whether that foreign power is a foreign legal entity under public law or an organisation under private law. In carrying out its primary duty, the State must respect the fundamental rights and international human rights of its citizens and actively protect them to this end. This is to ensure that its citizens are fully entitled to these rights at all times. A significant part of these rights, relevant to this case, is set out in the ethical principles developed by the judiciary in the context of the Nuremberg trials. These principles are set out in the 1947 Nuremberg Code. The core of the 1947 Nuremberg Code forms the basis of Article 7 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (hereinafter referred to as the ‘ICCPR’), concluded in New York in 1966. This article reads as follows:

'No one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment. In particular, no one shall be subjected without his free consent to medical or scientific experimentation.'

254. The State is to be held accountable for having carried out, without the freely given consent of its citizens to participate in the Covid-19 experiment (Covid-19 project), a medical and scientific (behavioural) experiment on all its citizens, including [REDACTED] under [REDACTED] was carried out, resulting in serious harm to, amongst other [REDACTED] is on [REDACTED]
255. Insofar as the State might argue that, because not every citizen has received a Covid-19 injection, this does not constitute a medical and scientific experiment on all its citizens, this view is based on a misinterpretation of Article 7 of the ICCPR. After all, the data of citizens who have not received a Covid-19 injection are also recorded by the RIVM, and one of the aims of the experiment was to influence citizens' behaviour through torture and cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment and punishment. The Covid-19 measures imposed by the State on its citizens, under the influence of the defendants in the context of the Great Reset, involved torture, including, amongst other things, the obligation to wear sickening face masks and to maintain a distance of at least one and a half metres from one another. The Covid-19 measures were unlawful given their malicious nature, as explained in detail in this summons. For all citizens, these measures were undesirable and humiliating, even if not everyone was aware of this due to fear and deception. Furthermore, the State has punished citizens who resisted the unlawful Covid-19 measures.
256. The fact that the State unlawfully failed to protect its citizens, including [REDACTED], is evident from [REDACTED] that the State colluded with the other defendants and allowed them to corrupt the very institutions that were supposed to

, were corrupted. It was evident to the State that the other defendants had been working together for years to undermine the State's authority in order to render the Dutch population, including

vulnerable to the Covid-19: The Great Reset project. It is established that all the defendants are affiliated with the private foundation, the WEF, and that their actions are aimed at implementing the Covid-19: The Great Reset project, given the State's access to information. After all, this access to information is partly determined by defendants acting as its civil servants and subordinates. Furthermore, the WEF, in the person of Schwab, openly declared as early as 2017 that it would penetrate all governments worldwide through its members. As EXHIBIT 86, we submit

a video relating to Schwab's statement from 2017. The fact that the State has for so long allowed the WEF, and in particular the defendants, to play their harmful role within the Dutch context means that, to quote Schwab, 'we have to prepare for a more angry world' and therefore 'necessary action' must be taken. The bleak future that this effectively portends for the Dutch population, including , was articulated by Schwab in a speech on 14 July 2020. As EXHIBIT 87, we are submitting a screenshot from Schwab's video dated 14 July 2020.

257. The State's utterly reprehensible and harmful acts and omissions are manifestly unlawful and are leading to ever-increasing excesses under which the Dutch people, including , are suffering. The defendants are all fully responsible and liable for these excesses because, at their core, they can always be traced back to the manifestly unlawful 'Covid-19: The Great Reset' project, to which the defendants lend their full cooperation and in which the defendants do not hesitate to abuse the institutions of for that purpose. We cite a number of examples of this.

For footage of ' ' excesses

WGA porter Grimes invests in the Dutch WEL yai tner Herrie/ren

258. A prime example of such excess is that the State allowed WEF partner Gates to make an investment of EUR 880,000,000.00 here in the Netherlands in the Heineken brewery group. Heineken is a WEF partner which, during the so-called coronavirus crisis in July 2021, used malicious and manipulative television adverts in the Netherlands to encourage people, particularly the elderly, to get vaccinated with Covid-19 injections. This manipulation utilised the false pretence that freedom would be granted exclusively to those who had been vaccinated with Covid-19 injections. This was reflected in the WEF/Heineken credo 'The night belongs to the vaccinated'. In this way, Heineken, with the State's approval, implemented the Covid-19: The Great Reset project. The State did all this to protect its citizens, including should have prevented all this. It must be borne in mind that it was precisely amongst the elderly – who were targeted and misled by the aforementioned credo – that many deaths and injuries resulting from the Covid-19 injections were reported. As PRODUCTIE 88, we submit a

screenshot of Heineken's video, as well as information from the WEF website regarding Heineken and information regarding Gates' investment in Heineken.

The State and its officials are in breach of a legal provision as set out in Article 162 of the State Penal Code

259. A second transgression that attention is drawn to is the fact that the State and its officials have failed to apply Article 162 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. This article reads as follows:

- 1. Public authorities and civil servants who, in the course of their duties, become aware of an offence the investigation of which they are not responsible, are obliged to report this immediately, by submitting the relevant documents to the public prosecutor or to one of his deputies, and,*
- o. if the offence is a breach of official duty as referred to in Title XXVIII of Book Two of the Code of Criminal Law, or*
- b. if the offence was committed by a public official who, in doing so, breached a specific official duty or made improper use of the power, opportunity or means conferred upon him by his office, or*
- c. if, through the offence, unlawful or improper use is made of a regulation the implementation or enforcement of which has been entrusted to them.*
- 2. They shall, upon request, provide the public prosecutor or the person designated by him with all information concerning criminal offences with the investigation of which they are not charged and which have come to their knowledge in the course of their duties.*
- 3. The provisions of the first and second paragraphs shall not apply to a witness who, by refusing to provide information, would, in the course of the proceedings, endanger himself or another person, or who, in the event of such proceedings, would be unable to give evidence.*
- 4. No such obligations shall apply to legal persons or to members of legal persons whose functions and powers are defined by or pursuant to the law, in so far as general administrative regulations have been issued for that purpose.*
- Regulations may be laid down by or pursuant to general administrative regulations in the interests of the proper implementation of this Article.*
- 6. The obligation to report offences referred to in paragraph 1(c) may, in consultation with the public prosecutor and with due regard to the provisions referred to in the preceding paragraph, be further restricted.*
- 7. A proposal for a general administrative measure as referred to in the fourth or fifth paragraph shall not be made until the text has been published in the Dutch Government Gazette and two months have elapsed since the date of publication.*

260. It is held that honest and upright civil servants of the State who are aware of the offences in public office set out in this summons are obliged to report them without delay, together with the documents relevant to the case, to the public prosecutor or to one of his assistant prosecutors. The fact that no report has been made to date pursuant to Article 162 of the Code of Criminal Procedure may, in the opinion of an excess.

261. [REDACTED] It must be noted that many well-meaning and well-informed Dutch citizens have made their serious objections and concerns known to Dutch civil servants, but that no action was subsequently taken in response. A striking example of this is that on 4 January 2023, in the municipality of Haaksbergen, Mr Ton Koenderik, exercising his right to speak, fully informed the municipal council about the frequently cited Pfizer safety report of 30 April 2021 (Exhibit 40) and its implications. It is particularly reprehensible that, as this video shows, the State is silencing its own citizens. A screenshot of Mr Ton Koenderik's extremely important and striking address dated 4 January 2023 is submitted as EXHIBIT 89.

The State is threatening unvaccinated citizens outside the Netherlands with death via national television.

262. A third and final particularly reprehensible excess attributable to the State, which [REDACTED] attention must be drawn to, concerns the following. During the so-called Covid-19 crisis, the State openly threatened people who did not wish to receive Covid-19 injections with death on national television. To this end, the State, through its public broadcasters NOS, NTR and VPRO, had two gruesome video messages produced and broadcast them via the Rijksoverheid Postbus 51 television information channel. These videos convey the clear message that people without a Covid-19 injection must be ruthlessly murdered. As evidence of this, we submit [REDACTED] two screenshots from videos dated October 2021 as EXHIBIT 90. The message from the State contained therein is abject and infamous. We were mentally abused upon viewing these video messages from the State.

263. Had the State fulfilled its duty to protect its citizens, [REDACTED] not (been able to) have the Covid-19 injections administered.

The claimants,

264. The claimants are all Dutch citizens residing in the Netherlands who placed their trust in what the defendants had put forward and, as a result, were misled and consequently received multiple Covid-19 injections. All claimants have suffered damage as a result of this misrepresentation and as a result of the Covid-19 injections administered to them as a consequence of this misrepresentation. The claimants' damage is both pecuniary and non-pecuniary within the meaning of Article 6:106 of the Dutch Civil Code.
265. The claimants' material damage consists of financial loss, in particular personal injury. As a result of the Covid-19 injections, all claimants were injected, without their freely given consent, with (among other things) the toxic graphene oxide. It is plausible that the Covid-19 injections, and in particular this toxin which forms part of those injections, cause lasting adverse health consequences in people. For this reason alone, it is plausible that all claimants are suffering personal injury. In the case of claimants 4, 6 and 7, the personal injury has manifested itself in the form of serious physical injury. In the case of the other claimants, there are currently no *external signs of*

serious physical injury, albeit with less severe symptoms. This does not alter the fact that it is plausible that the Covid-19 injections also caused physical injury to them. In this regard, it should be noted that it is plausible that the claimants' health will also suffer in the long term as a result of these Covid-19 injections. With regard to their personal injury and the plausibility thereof, the claimants refer to the diagnoses made by medical specialists. These diagnoses are submitted as EXHIBIT 91.

266. In addition to material damage, all claimants have suffered non-material damage within the meaning of Article 6:106 of the Dutch Civil Code. This damage consists of the mental distress experienced by the claimants (feelings of pain, suffering, shame, powerlessness and uncertainty about their health) as a result of the deception to which they were subjected. The Covid-19 injections themselves, and more specifically the fact that the claimants know they have been injected with them whilst being unable to know exactly what the consequences will be, also give rise to non-pecuniary damage within the meaning of Article 6:106 of the Dutch Civil Code.
267. In the context of non-pecuniary damage, it is further noted that the claimants have argued, with reasons, that the defendants acted with the intention of causing them harm. It is also noted, in connection with the provisions of Article 6:106(1)(c) of the Dutch Civil Code, that claimants 2 and 3, as well as claimants 4 and 5, are married to one another.
268. It is settled case-law that, for a case to be referred to proceedings for the assessment of damages, it is both necessary and sufficient that the existence or possibility of damage resulting from an attributable breach or tort is plausible. The claimants are of the opinion that, with the present writ of summons, they have amply satisfied this standard for referral to proceedings for the assessment of damages.

Unlawful conduct by the defendants

269. Article 6:162 of the Dutch Civil Code provides that a person who commits a tort against another, which may be attributed to them, is obliged to compensate the other party for the damage suffered as a result.
270. A tort is defined as an infringement of a right and an act or omission contrary to a statutory duty or to what is deemed proper in society under unwritten law, subject to the existence of a ground for justification.
271. In this writ of summons, the claimants have described in detail the manner in which the defendants have been guilty of implementing the 'Covid-19: The Great Reset' project and the widespread deception of citizens required for this purpose. As a result, the defendants have clearly acted unlawfully. Consequently, all types of unlawful conduct referred to in Article 6:162 of the Dutch Civil Code apply to the defendants. Below, the claimants will provide a non-exhaustive list of significant examples of this.

272. With regard to the infringement of the claimants' rights, the claimants draw particular attention to Article 7 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights⁴³, which provides:

No one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment. Nor shall anyone be subjected, without his free and informed consent, to medical or scientific experimentation.

273. As a result of the defendants' actions, the claimants have found themselves in a situation in which they have been subjected to an ongoing medical and scientific experiment without their freely given consent.

Acting in breach of a legal duty

274. Article 2 of the Criminal Code stipulates that Dutch criminal law applies to anyone who commits any criminal offence in the Netherlands. None of the defendants, not even those residing abroad, can evade their legal duty to comply with the Dutch Criminal Code.

275. Reference has already been made to the significance of Article 97a of the Criminal Code, which concerns an offence against the security of the State. This article reads as follows.

Any attempt made with the intention of bringing the Kingdom wholly or partly under foreign control or of seceding a part thereof shall be punishable by imprisonment for an indefinite term or a fixed term not exceeding thirty years, or by a fine of the highest category.

276. The claimants are of the opinion that the manner in which the defendants have been guilty of implementing the 'Covid-19: The Great Reset' project and the widespread deception of citizens required for this purpose must be classified as an act contrary to the legal duty to refrain from committing criminal acts within the meaning of this article.

277. It is further noted that the defendants' actions constitute assault within the meaning of Article 300 of the Criminal Code. In doing so, the defendants have deliberately harmed the plaintiffs' health. This article reads as follows.

1. *Assault is punishable by imprisonment for a term not exceeding three years or a fine of the fourth category.*
2. *If the offence results in serious bodily harm, the offender shall be punished with imprisonment for a maximum of four years or a fine of the fourth category.*
3. *If the offence results in death, the offender shall be punished with imprisonment for a term not exceeding six years or a fine of the fourth category.*

4. *Intentional harm to health shall be treated as equivalent to assault.*
 5. *Poging tot dit misdrijf is niet strafbaar.*
278. Specifically with regard to claimants under 4, 6 and 7, who have suffered serious bodily injury as a result of the defendants' actions, reference is hereby made to Article 308 of the Criminal Code. This article provides as follows.
1. *He is guilty if, through his own fault, he causes another person to suffer serious bodily injury or such bodily injury as to result in temporary illness or incapacity in the performance of his occupation or profession, he shall be punished with imprisonment for a term not exceeding one year or a fine of the fourth category.*
 2. *If the offence is committed through recklessness, the offender shall be liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding two years or a fine of the fourth category.*
279. With specific regard to the State and its officials, it should be reiterated that the claimants point to a flagrant breach of Article 162 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, which legally obliges officials — in short — to report offences committed in the course of their duties.
280. Finally, the claimants draw attention here to the defendants' obligation to comply with the statutory obligations under the International Crimes Act. Article 3 of this Act makes genocide a criminal offence. This article reads as follows.
1. *Anyone who, with intent, acts to **destroy**, in whole or in part, a national, ethnic or religious group, or a group belonging to a particular race, as such:*
 - a. members of that group;*
 - b. members of the group inflicts serious physical or mental harm;*
 - c. intentionally inflicts on the group acts aimed at its total or partial physical destruction;*
 - d. takes measures intended to prevent births within the group; or*
 - e. forcibly transfers members of the group to another group,**shall be found guilty of genocide and sentenced to life imprisonment or a fixed-term imprisonment of not more than thirty years, or a fine of the sixth category.*
 2. *The incitement and instigation to genocide which takes place publicly, orally or in writing or by means of images, shall be punished in the same way as the act itself.*
281. The claimants request that, in its search for the truth, this court also examine whether genocide has been committed against the claimants on the grounds set out in sub-paragraphs (b) and (c) of this article. The claimants consider this to be plausible, in view of the facts and circumstances set out fully and truthfully by them in this summons.

Acting in a manner contrary to what is *deemed proper* in *social intercourse* under *unwritten law*.

282. In this writ, the claimants have set out, with regard to each of the defendants, the role they fulfil in society. In doing so, the defendants have been categorised into groups according to the social position they (primarily) occupy.
283. Public officials, in particular, are held to the standard of serving the public, including with integrity, so that trust in the government is not betrayed. Defendants 1 to 10 have grossly breached this trust through the implementation of the 'Covid-19: The Great Reset' project and the widespread deception of citizens required for this purpose. Insofar as such conduct is not prohibited by law or codes of conduct, it contravenes what is deemed appropriate in society under unwritten law.
284. The pharmaceutical industry's very *raison d'être* depends on the trust that citizens can place in the safety and efficacy of medicines which they are entitled to assume have been properly tested. Given this and the fact that medicines have a significant impact on people's health, the pharmaceutical industry has a duty to act with the utmost care regarding the health interests of the public by ensuring medicines are safe, effective and properly tested. The pharmaceutical industry's actions must, first and foremost, be aimed at not betraying the public's trust. Through the pharmaceutical industry's collaboration in the implementation of the 'Covid-19: The Great Reset' project and the widespread deception of the public required for this purpose, the pharmaceutical industry has grossly breached this trust. Insofar as such conduct is not prohibited by law or codes of conduct, it contravenes what is deemed appropriate in social intercourse under unwritten law.
285. As regards the mass media, they are required to inform the public in a diligent, reliable, independent, pluralistic and objective manner. In this regard, the mass media must carefully verify the information they provide to the public. In doing so, the mass media must allow scope for differing opinions and facilitate a balanced debate. This summons sets out that the mass media are practising censorship and, in doing so, are cooperating in the implementation of the 'Covid-19: The Great Reset' project and the widespread deception required for it. Insofar as this conduct is not prohibited by law or codes of conduct, it contravenes what is deemed appropriate in social intercourse under unwritten law.
286. Non-governmental organisations (and their officials) pride themselves on the idea that, without seeking profit, they wish to support people and governments in their mission to enable humanity and its environment to flourish to the full. In doing so, they present themselves as benefactors who wish to support this mission. This manner of presenting themselves creates a justified expectation amongst the public that these organisations and their officials will not act in their own interests.

In view of this, these organisations and their officials are bound by the unwritten standard that they must not harm the interests of people and their environment. This summons describes in detail how the defendants, Sijbesma and Gates, are cooperating in the implementation of the ‘Covid-19: The Great Reset’ project and the widespread deception required for it. This project is harmful to people’s health and their environment. Insofar as such conduct is not prohibited by law, it contravenes what is deemed appropriate in social intercourse under unwritten law.

287. As regards the quasi-governmental sector, the State and the citizen must be able to rely on the fact that the governmental tasks entrusted to them at the expense of the Dutch people, including are entrusted to them, are carried out with integrity and due care. Through the implementation of the Covid-19: The Great Reset project and the widespread deception of citizens required for this purpose, Kant has grossly breached this trust. Insofar as this conduct is not prohibited by law or statutory regulations, it contravenes what is deemed appropriate in social intercourse under unwritten law.
288. As already indicated above, the State’s primary duty is to protect its citizens. It is incompatible with this duty for the State to facilitate and permit the implementation of the Covid-19: The Great Reset project and the widespread deception of citizens in the Netherlands required for this purpose. Insofar as this conduct is not prohibited by law or rules of conduct, it contravenes what is deemed appropriate in social intercourse under unwritten law.

Establishment of liability: a conditio sine qua non

289. It has been consistently set out in this writ of summons that, were it not for the unlawful acts of the defendants, committed both individually and jointly, the claimants would not have received a Covid-19 injection, and consequently their damage would not have occurred.
290. In view of the joint and several liability to be discussed below, the ‘conditio sine qua non’ link is not a prerequisite for the admissibility of the claims of
[REDACTED]

Attribution of liability to the defendants

291. The unlawful acts of which the defendants are accused may be attributed to them because they are attributable to their own fault and to causes for which they are liable under the law and in accordance with generally accepted principles. After all, the defendants have actively cooperated in the implementation of the Covid-19: The Great Reset project and the widespread deception of citizens required for this, including

Procedure, your court has jurisdiction to hear the claims against Hofstra. Since there is such a connection between the claims

against the respective defendants — who acted as a group — are so closely connected that considerations of efficiency justify their joint hearing, your court has jurisdiction, pursuant to Article 107, in respect of all defendants to hear and determine the claims brought against them by the claimants.

Prayer

IN CONCLUSION

That the court may be pleased to rule by judgment:

- (1) declare that the defendants, as a group and individually, have acted unlawfully towards the claimants by deliberately and unlawfully misleading them and thereby inducing them to receive Covid-19 injections which the defendants knew, or at least ought to have known, were not safe and effective.
- (2) to order the defendants, jointly and severally – such that payment by one shall discharge the other – to compensate the claimants for their damages, to be quantified in accordance with the law and settled in accordance with the Act.
- (3) Order the defendants to pay the costs of these proceedings pursuant to a provisional order for costs to be made by your court.

The costs of this writ are:

deed C 106.73 + information costs C 0.59 + VAT C 22.54 = total C 129.86

The costs of this writ have been increased by VAT because the applicant is unable to set this off.

I declare that the additional costs are necessary to carry out this official act properly and that the bailiff has no direct or indirect interest in the company or third party that charged these costs.

(signed) Bailiff



' <https://www.who.int/euro-pe/health-to-ruins/vaccines-and-immunizations> tab=tab 1 ' <https://www.Navi.org/our-alliance>

³ The GGD is an administrative unit of the Fryslân Safety Region.

* This advice is submitted to the Ministry of Health, Welfare and Sport (VWS) via the Administrative Coordination Meeting (BAO). The BAO assesses the substantive advice for administrative feasibility and practicability and ultimately determines the control policy.

"As will be explained in more detail below, Van Dissel was also aware that the Covid-19 vaccines have never been tested for their ability to prevent transmission of the supposed virus.

"lit tys //decorrespe>nrlent nl/11128/c4e-wereld-is-voor;ioec4-veranderr4-door-corona-denkt-viroloog-iiiarion-koo emans/e0013376-fee5-045c-3dab-ee243S7670ia

Mr Sclawab, who is one of the founders of the 'Covid-19 The Great Reset' project, will be discussed in further detail in this summons.

"The basic rules remain in force and are as follows: (1) stay at home if you have symptoms and get tested; (2) keep a distance of 1.5 metres from others; (3) wash your hands frequently and cough or sneeze into your elbow; (4) work from home as much as possible; (5) avoid crowds: leave if it gets too busy; (6) travel outside rush hour as much as possible; (7) wear a face mask in indoor public spaces.

" Addition by the litigation lawyer

" [LitL °://re parti. tree fr/scliwab2020.pdf](https://reparti.treefr/scliwab2020.pdf)

"Frank Ruesink MBA / Founder of Liefdevol Rebellenen, Freedom Speaker & System Disruptor <https://www.linker4in.ccim/in/frankruesink/?originalSubdomain=nl>

² Emphasised by the litigation lawyer

¹⁰ Gommers is also registered as the inventor of a ventilation system (ADVS), for which patent applications were filed with the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) on 30 September 2016. A patent has since been granted in this regard under number 10773045. Furthermore, a patent application for this invention is still pending under number 20180093063. The rights arising from the patent numbered 10773045 have been transferred to Kirura Holding B.V.

¹¹ _____ dispute that the defendants, including Gommers, were actually injected with a Covid-19 injection solution.

" Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-Making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters, Aarhus, 25 June 1998

¹² [https://wctten.cverlaeid.nl/BWBV00017\(00/29 March 2005](https://wctten.cverlaeid.nl/BWBV00017(00/29 March 2005)

"This can be compared to the EMA, the EU/EEA Heads of Medicines Agencies and the European Medicines Agency (EMA).

" <https://wis'iv pfizer.com/news/aiuiotirlcemen ts/open-letter-to-Pfizer-regarding-the-Aura-Cede-AIBcrt-Bourla> " This report bears the reference number 090177e 196ea and is dated 30 April 2021

¹⁰ According to Pfizer, this brand name is composed of parts of the words Covid-19, community, immunity, and mRNA.

" Variations of this slogan have been used in all languages worldwide.

¹ The name 'Moderna' is derived from a contraction of the words 'Mode' and 'RNA'.

² This patent was published on 15 January 2021, but could not be found until mid-June 2021 using standard search terms, including the patent number, via the search engine provided online by WEF partner Google, which is used by the vast majority of the world's population.

² • Displayed in bold and underlined by the litigation lawyer.

" [li https://over.nos.nl/tuganisa tie/taken-en-naissie/](https://over.nos.nl/tuganisa tie/taken-en-naissie/)

¹ • Until 1 September 2022, Van Camo worked as deputy editor-in-chief alongside Mr Gelauff, who was editor-in-chief until that date. Gelauff subsequently retired and, as far as can be ascertained, he is no longer active as a journalist.

² The various versions of the package leaflets for the Pfizer vaccine Comirnaty, drawn up at different times, state, up to and including the November 2022 version, under E: '*Specific conditions under which the conditional authorisation may not be fulfilled.*' That section mentioned the planned end date of the experiment, namely August 2024.

¹¹ The complete Agenda 21 has been placed on the USB stick.

² "The complete 2030 agenda has been saved on the USB stick.

¹⁰ <https://databank.worldbank.org/>

³ United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) and in consultation with organisations such as the International Trade Centre, the United Nations Statistics Division (UNSD) and the World Trade Organisation (WTO)

" It has been placed on the USB stick with full

copyright. ³³ [la https://www.conclusionmationore/](https://www.conclusionmationore/)

¹⁰ • Cladistics (or cladism) is a method of analysis used in biosystematics to determine the presumed evolutionary relationships between organisms. The word 'clade' is derived from this.

¹⁰ <https://centerforhealththsecurity.com/who-we-are-at-the-center-for-health-security-0> "•

The video material from this production has been placed on the USB stick.

³ In bold and underlined by the litigation lawyer

³ ^Dr Fauci was the director of this organisation from 1984 to 2002. "

<https://www.lareb.nl/>

° <https://www.medalerts.org/vaersdb/findfield.plip> In the search system of this database, data entered by Lareb staff into VAERS can be found using the so-called 'expert mode'. To do this, enter the DC Split Type: NLPFIZER, NLMODERNATX or NLJNJFOC under the 'Demographics' tab.

• 'The full overview can be downloaded via <https://knollfrank.gitlab.io/HowBadIsMvBatcla/batchCodes.html>

T.F.E. Tjong Tjin Tai, 'The Damages Proceedings', No. 401, with reference to, amongst others, Supreme Court 30 June 2006, ECLI:NL:FiR:2006:AX6246, RvdW 2006, 681, para. 3.5.2 and Supreme Court 23 September 1988, ECLI:NL:HR:1988:AD5713, NJ

1989, 743 and S.D. Lindenbergll, GS Damages, Article 6:97 of the Dutch Civil Code, note 5.6.

* New York, 16 December 1966