

Main proceedings (court documents)

EXPLANATORY NOTES ON THE MAIN PROCEEDINGS

1

Summoning issued by bailiffs on behalf of the claimants on 14 July 2023

By this summons, the seven claimants are bringing their civil claim against 17 defendants before the District Court of Leeuwarden, the Netherlands. They demand that the court declare that the defendants, as a group and individually, 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. In this writ of summons, the defendants were given a period of 14 days to admit liability. Ninety-one items of evidence were attached to the writ of summons.

2

22 November 2023

The court was informed by the plaintiffs' lawyers of the tragic death of the sixth plaintiff in these proceedings, who died at the age of 51 as a result of the Covid-19 injections, leaving behind three children. The court was requested to stay the proceedings for the time being to allow for deliberation.

3

10 January 2024 The State of the Netherlands and 11 other defendants respond with a written statement of defence to the summons

The State of the Netherlands and 11 other defendants respond to the summons with a written statement of defence. The State and the defendants adhere to the official Covid-19 narrative, according to which a contagious virus spread from Wuhan. The State argues that it was entirely reasonable for it to call on citizens to get vaccinated, not only for their own sake but also for the sake of others.

4

21 February 2024: statement of defence by the defendants Cann and Jansen

These defendants, employed by the Dutch Broadcasting Foundation (NOS) and the Dutch newspaper De Telegraaf, concur with the State's statement of defence. They argue that, during the Covid-19 pandemic, the NOS and De Telegraaf played a crucial role in informing the Dutch public about all aspects of the pandemic. In this regard, the following is stated in their statement of defence, among other things:

'8. ... The Covid-19 pandemic spanned an extremely hectic period, during which the media, amongst others, were under considerable and constant pressure to report daily on newsworthy developments surrounding the Covid-19 virus. The overwhelming volume of information arising from (the fight against) the Covid-19 pandemic necessitated editorial decisions.

9. Generally speaking, the NOS and De Telegraaf can state that they have included the most important facts relating to the Covid-19 pandemic in their reporting. Although the tone of the

Main proceedings (court documents)

EXPLANATORY NOTES ON THE MAIN PROCEEDINGS

NOS and De Telegraaf differs on certain points in terms of content, both media organisations have made every effort to report on the Covid-19 pandemic faithfully and accurately. In this context, the NOS and De Telegraaf wish to emphasise that none of their publications on Covid-19 and the coronavirus crisis have been found to be unlawful... ‘

5

21 February 2024 Statement of defence by the defendant Van der Voort - Kant (Kant)

Kant is affiliated with the Dutch adverse reaction centre Lareb. She argues that the Claimants’ allegations are (largely) incorrect, that Kant did not lie about batch-related problems in the administration of vaccines, and that there was no cover-up either.

6

BILL GATES INTERLOCUTORY PROCEEDINGS

Separate proceedings concerning Bill Gates arising within the wider case.

21 February 2024

In a so-called incidental submission, Bill Gates takes the view that the court in the Netherlands lacks jurisdiction.

7

BILL GATES INTERLOCUTORY PROCEEDINGS

On 20 March 2024, the plaintiffs’ lawyers submit a written submission in response to Gates’ arguments regarding jurisdiction. The defendants’ lawyers do the same.

8

BILL GATES INTERLOCUTORY PROCEEDINGS

1 May 2024 Judgment in the interlocutory proceedings.

18 September 2024 Oral hearing in the interlocutory proceedings. The video of this hearing had to be anonymised by order of the court.

By judgment of 1 May 2024, the court decides to hold an oral hearing on the interlocutory application raised by Gates, challenging the court’s jurisdiction.

9

BILL GATES INTERLOCUTORY PROCEEDINGS

16 October 2024

Final judgement in the interlocutory proceedings

Bill Gates’s argument that the court lacks jurisdiction is rejected. The court considers itself to have jurisdiction and the case proceeds.

Main proceedings (court documents)

EXPLANATORY NOTES ON THE MAIN PROCEEDINGS

10

21 February 2024 Bourla's statement of defence.

Bourla refers to compliance with statutory safety standards in the development of the vaccine and the health benefits in relation to the risks associated with it. According to Bourla, all the claimants' arguments are unfounded.

11

27 November 2024 Gates's statement of defence

According to Gates, the claimants do not appear to recognise that the SARS-CoV-2 virus (hereinafter: 'Coronavirus') and the respiratory disease it causes actually exist. In this regard, the following is stated in his statement of defence, among other things:

'3.2.1 First of all, plaintiffs do not appear to acknowledge that the SARS-CoV-2 virus (hereinafter: "Coronavirus") and the respiratory disease caused by it actually exists. They are under the impression that the 'narrative' based on this is

part of a malicious, premeditated plan to with a vaccine which, according to the claimants, is unsafe (or even toxic). This is incorrect. The Coronavirus exists and can cause various health problems, the severity of which must not be downplayed. There is, and the vaccines that protect against the coronavirus are safe and have been competent authorities.'

12

11 December 2024

Plaintiffs' statement of claim "Submission of vaccination certificates, amendment of claim and request for a preliminary hearing" The plaintiffs request that the court schedule a preliminary hearing, at which they may consult with the court and the solicitors for all parties regarding. At the end of this statement the plaintiffs request the court:

- '... a. The progress of the proceedings for each group of defendants;
- b. The submission of new and supplementary evidence arising from the rapidly unfolding developments regarding the factual basis of the claimants' claims; this evidence to be provided by submitting new documents and taking the evidence, under oath, of national and international expert witnesses;
- c. The manner in which the right to be heard is exercised in the interests of proper procedural order;
- d. Allowing independent media access to all public oral hearings and all examinations of national and international expert witnesses for the parties;
- e. How the remainder of the proceedings will proceed...'
-

Main proceedings (court documents)

EXPLANATORY NOTES ON THE MAIN PROCEEDINGS

13

11 December 2024 Court's procedural decision

The court rejects the pleading submitted by the claimants and wishes first to proceed to the submission of the claimants reply and the counter-reply.

14

17 December 2024

The claimants' solicitors expressly object to the refusal. Among other things, he writes to the court:

'... From the diametrically opposed arguments of the parties, including arguments in the pleading returned by your court, it is crystal clear that the claimants' claims are now partly based on the fact that what the so-called 'vaccine' produced by the defendants, but rather a biological weapon.

...

Finally, the Claimants remind this Court of its obligations under Article 162 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. For the record, it is noted that this obligation applies to all courts and public officials who, in the course of their duties, become aware of certain offences. The fulfilment of this obligation cannot therefore be left to the administration of your court...'

15

8 January 2025

Statement filed by the claimants. The claimants' solicitors comment on the adjournment in connection with the death of claimant No. 6 and request a postponement for the submission of their reply.

16

**5 February 2025
Interim judgment**

The court considers the stay of proceedings in respect of claimant 6 to be invalid, and therefore the proceedings will continue in the name of the late claimant. The claimants are granted until 11 June 2025 to submit their reply.

17

**11 June 2025
Statement of reply, also containing an amendment to the claim.**

The claimants' solicitors submit a reply and amend their claim so that the declaration sought relates to the defendants' conduct until a final judgment is delivered in these proceedings.

The claimants' solicitors also submit 54 new items of evidence (exhibits) to the court. On the basis of this evidence, the claimants take the view that the Covid-19 injections qualify as biological weapons. The aspect of a spiritual struggle underpinning the legal battle is also

Main proceedings (court documents)

EXPLANATORY NOTES ON THE MAIN PROCEEDINGS

described in detail. A central theme in this submission is ‘preferential reality’ – a false picture of reality created by and for governments and those in power through the deception of citizens, which serves their plans. The claimants are presenting a comprehensive offer of evidence to the court.

18**23 July 2025 Rejoinder on behalf of Van Cann and Jansen**

In this, they state, amongst other things:

‘ 15. The Dutch legal system is based on the assessment of specific facts and legal principles. Theories that fall outside the scope of that assessment and for which no evidence is provided cannot play no part in these proceedings. The theories put forward by the Claimants regarding “The Great Reset”, the ‘preferential reality’, that the COVID-19 vaccines are biological weapons, that genocide is taking place, and that Van Cann and Jansen are being directed by NATO, the WHO or other international organisations, are all based on speculation and are not supported by any verifiable or independent evidence. In law, therefore, they cannot be given any weight.’

...

‘ 17. Jansen and Van Cann dispute that they deliberately misled the public about the coronavirus pandemic or that the reporting by NOS and/or *De Telegraaf* encouraged people to get the COVID-19 vaccines; nor not to mention that Jansen and Van Cann knew, or ought to have known, that these vaccines would (or could) be harmful to the health, fertility and mental well-being of the claimants and/or the Dutch people.

18. The defendants have not produced any evidence to make these serious allegations even remotely plausible. The claimants’ assertions are far-fetched, irrelevant and lack any factual basis...’

19**3 September 2025
Gates’s reply**

Gates disputes all the plaintiffs’ arguments. He states, amongst other things:

‘2.2 ... In this regard, Gates wishes to emphasise that the idea of a ‘preferential reality’ is not only incorrect but also untenable. The international organisations and partnerships which, according to the claimants, are the proponents of the ‘preferential reality’, generally operate in the public eye. Policy documents, (minutes of) meetings and reports are largely accessible to the public and are constantly the subject of debate, criticism and press coverage by independent (investigative) journalists. It is therefore inconceivable that a (to be clear: fictional) global plan to withhold facts and events from the world.’

20

3 September 2025 Conclusion of Bourla's rejoinder

Bourla dismisses the plaintiffs' allegations as unfounded conspiracy theories. He states, amongst other things, that the claimants' allegations concern unfounded conspiracy theories. In this regard, the following is stated in his rejoinder:

"10. Contrary to the claimants' view, the coronavirus is real, as is the disease COVID-19 and the global pandemic that broke out in March 2020. The COVID-19 vaccines, including Comirnaty, played a major role in curbing the pandemic. Bourla refers to Chapter 1 of his Statement of Defence for a detailed explanation of the existence of COVID-19 and the COVID-19 pandemic.

11. The claimant refuses to accept these facts and dismisses all evidence-based data as 'manipulated data' that is allegedly part of a fabricated 'preferred reality' that the State 'projects' onto the population. The claimant alleges that he (and the entire world population) has been deliberately misled into getting vaccinated against COVID-19. This is said to have been part of a large-scale conspiracy - aimed at genocide amongst the population, with the COVID-19 vaccines serving as 'bioweapons', according to the claimants.

...

26. Comirnaty also has few side effects, and those that do occur are generally mild and short-lived. The claims made by the plaintiffs regarding the alleged side effects of Comirnaty don't hold water:

- There is no evidence that Comirnaty causes diabetes (and as for that latter claim, the plaintiffs have not provided any substantiation whatsoever).
- Insofar as the plaintiffs use the term 'cardiovascular diseases' to refer to myocarditis (inflammation of the heart muscle) and pericarditis (inflammation of the pericardium), it is true that these are side effects of Comirnaty. However, these side effects are extremely rare. They usually go away on their own or can be effectively treated with medication.
- Comirnaty does not (and has not) led to a massive increase in deaths. As is well known, the potential side effects of Comirnaty are closely monitored. In this context, there is also ongoing monitoring to determine whether reported deaths following vaccination might be a result of the vaccination. Between January 2021 and December 2023, approximately 12,000 reports were made of deaths following vaccination (out of approximately 1 billion doses administered). This does not mean that these deaths are therefore the result of the vaccination. Investigations by the EMA and Member States have shown that only in very exceptional cases may a serious side effect from a COVID-19 vaccine have contributed to a death.
- There is no evidence that Comirnaty has any adverse effect on fertility. The plaintiffs do not substantiate this claim but refer in No. 56 of the CvR to Exhibit Minks-114. This exhibit contains a video of Prof. Burkhardt, who has been criticised in the past for spreading inaccurate information about vaccines. In the video, images are shown in which the spike protein is allegedly visible in the testicles of a 28-year-old man who is said to have died approximately five months after receiving Comirnaty, and of an 85-year-old man, in both of whom few spermatocytes are said to be visible. Even if we were to assume these images are accurate, this could (certainly in an 85-year-old man) have all sorts of other causes. Burkhardt then makes a 'personal comment' - but

Main proceedings (court documents)

EXPLANATORY NOTES ON THE MAIN PROCEEDINGS

explicitly states that it is ‘not a scientific comment’ - stating that, as a ‘woman of childbearing age’, she would have no plans to have children with a vaccinated man. Apparently, Burkhardt himself did not dare to put forward the claim that there was any scientific basis for the claim that Comirnaty had adverse effects on fertility.”

21

17 September 2025 **Conclusion of Kant’s rejoinder**

Kant disputes all the plaintiffs’ claims regarding the ‘killer batch’ EM0477, internal memos within the RIVM, a deliberately created capacity shortage and the setting up of a cover-up scheme. Regarding the high number of reports to Lareb, she states:

‘ 21 The number of reports received for Covid-19 vaccinations was indeed relatively high compared to other vaccinations. The considerable focus on side effects and the awareness of the possibility to report them have probably played a part. Furthermore, these were new vaccines and there was a high willingness to report.’

22

Decision **1 October 2025**

In a procedural ruling, the court considers, among others:

‘2. The reasoning

The parties have submitted their pleadings and rejoinders. On the basis of the parties’ submissions, the court finds that there are various procedural issues between the parties. The court will first rule on these in its judgment. To that end, it will refer the case to the docket. At a later stage of the proceedings, and as previously announced, an oral hearing will be scheduled. Once that stage is reached, the parties will be given the opportunity to inform the court of any preferences regarding the conduct of the substantive part of the hearing. The court will subsequently make decisions on this matter...’

23

Judgment of 26 November 2025

The court orders an oral hearing to be held on a date yet to be determined, at which the parties – natural persons in person and the State, duly represented – must be present, accompanied by their solicitors.

24

7 December 2025 **Letter and filing of expert reports and documents**

The claimants’ solicitor writes to the court, among others, and with a copy to the defendants’ solicitors:

- “... Your Honour, In the aforementioned case, I am sending you:
- A B13 form for the filing of documents/items

Main proceedings (court documents)

EXPLANATORY NOTES ON THE MAIN PROCEEDINGS

- and a USB stick containing further documents, namely:
 1. Video messages (with Dutch subtitles) addressed to your court, demonstrating that the Covid-19 injections cannot be distinguished from a biological weapon, as stated by the following experts:

Sasha Latypova
Katherine Watt
Michael Yeadon
Joseph Sansone
Catherine Austin Fitts
 2. Written expert reports showing that the Covid-19 injections are indistinguishable from a biological weapon, drawn up by:
 - plaintiffs - / The State et al.
Sasha Latypova
Katherine Watt
Michael Yeadon
Joseph Sansone

These written statements also contain a large number of hyperlinks, which is why they are provided in the form of digital files. This provides your court with lawful and convincing evidence that the Covid-19 injections are in fact a biological weapon, which is also important for the scope of the procedural debate at the oral hearing yet to be scheduled and in the further proceedings of this case. In the plaintiffs' view, this information necessitates that an oral hearing be scheduled at the earliest possible opportunity. Furthermore, it should be reiterated that, in the plaintiffs' view, it is incumbent upon you, as the presiding and responsible judges in this case, to lodge a criminal complaint against the defendants on the grounds of suspicion of democide and genocide respectively.

In view of the fact that it is of great importance, both procedurally and socially, that you take note of the video messages addressed to you, I am also sending them to you in the form of a download link. The importance of taking note of these video messages naturally also applies to the legal representatives of the defendants."

25

Pleas of the claimants 14 January 2026

By this document, the claimants give notice of the attendance of the experts, request an interpreter for the experts, and emphasise the importance of the experts' presence at the hearing so that the claimants' solicitor may consult with them, not least in light of the evidence submitted on 7 December 2025.

26

14 January 2026 22 Statement by the State et al.

Hofstra et al. submit their observations in response to the interim judgment of 26 November 2025, in accordance with the opportunity provided for that purpose by the court. None of the defendant parties takes offence at the letter of 7 December 2025

Main proceedings (court documents)

EXPLANATORY NOTES ON THE MAIN PROCEEDINGS

27

14 January 2026

The Same 26 Jansen and Van Cann

28

14 January 2026

The Same 26 Gates

29

14 January 2026

The Same 26 Kant

30

19 January 2026
Letter from the court

Letter from the court regarding the setting of a date for the hearing and the fact that a subsequent judgement will address matters other than those raised in the documents of 14 January 2026.

31

27 January 2026
Letter from the court

Hearing scheduled for 22 October 2026 at 12.30 pm.

32

11 March 2026
Interim judgment

The court considers, amongst other things:

‘... 2.8. In the interim judgment, the court considered that, and why, during the oral hearing, the parties’ lawyers may make use of concise speaking notes to further clarify the parties’ legal positions. The claimants substantiate their request for an extended speaking time of 120 minutes first and foremost by referring to the enormous public interest and the size of the case file. Furthermore, it is significant that the defendants, despite the fact that there have already been two rounds of written submissions, have shown no procedural willingness to address the plaintiffs’ key assertions, supported by evidence, including that Covid-19 is not a disease but a project, and that the Covid-19 injections are indistinguishable from a biological weapon.

Furthermore, in their statement of claim, the claimants have presented highly crucial evidence in support of these key claims in the form of video messages from experts and written expert reports. It must be possible to explain this evidence.

Main proceedings (court documents)

EXPLANATORY NOTES ON THE MAIN PROCEEDINGS

A speaking time of 120 minutes is therefore not excessive, the claimants maintain. The court does not share this view, as the need for a longer speaking time does not follow from these arguments. This is only different insofar as it concerns the wish to provide an explanation on the statements and video messages that have only recently been filed. This can, in the court's view, be done concisely.

2.9. The court will set the speaking time for all parties at the first hearing at half an hour per party. The court notes in this regard that Van der Voort-Kant, Bourla, Van Cann and Gates have indicated that ten minutes' speaking time will suffice. The court will adjust the schedule of the hearing accordingly.

...

3. The decision

The court

3.1. rules that, if the parties wish to rely on documents not yet submitted during the oral hearing, these must be sent to the court and the other parties no later than four weeks before the oral hearing;

4 Case number: C/17/190788 / HA ZA 23-172

11 March 2026

3.2. rules that, if any of the other parties, in response to the documents referred to in 3.1., wishes to introduce further documents into the proceedings, these documents must be sent to the court and the other parties no later than ten calendar days before the oral hearing;

3.3. draws the parties' attention to the fact that 5 hours will be;

3.4. reserves all further decisions.

This judgment was delivered by Mr C.M. Telman, Mr T.P. Hoekstra and Mr P. van Eijk and was pronounced in open court on 11 March 2026'

33

13 March 2026

Request by the plaintiffs' solicitor for the restoration of the interim judgment, together with a request for a live stream

34

1 April 2026 interim judgment

Request to set aside the interim judgment rejected (document to follow)

35

**7 May 2026
Letter from the court**

The court states that the experts put forward by the claimants have no procedural status other than that of members of the public and that the announcement to bring them along has no procedural effect, contrary to the view of the claimants' solicitor. Thus the court. However, provision is made for consultation with the experts in a separate room. A live

Main proceedings (court documents)

EXPLANATORY NOTES ON THE MAIN PROCEEDINGS

stream is permitted by the court. The court will not provide an interpreter for the experts. The parties may submit further comments regarding online participation and restrictions on the live stream

36

25 August 2026
Letter from the court

A request from Van Cann, Jansen and Van der Voort Kant to be neither visible nor audible on the live stream has been rejected.
