

Date: Friday, 13 March 2026 14:22

Subject: Re: [REDACTED] et al. v. The State et al. Your ref.: File reference C/17/190788 Case number 23/172 [D100607_I68483254]

Attachments: Judgment_2026-11-03_District Court of the Northern Netherlands.pdf; Statement of the parties.pdf Case reference C/17/190788 Case number 23/172.pdf;

**Application for supplementation/correction of the judgment pursuant to Articles 31 and 32 of the Code of Civil Procedure
Also a request for a live stream**

Your Honour,

I have now taken note of your judgement dated 11 March last.

This judgement contains a number of apparent errors that can be easily rectified (Article 31 of the Code of Civil Procedure) and/or fails to rule on a number of points raised in my statement of 14 January last. That statement includes, insofar as relevant here:

Furthermore, [REDACTED] et al. request that the court ensure that [REDACTED] et al. may bring the experts they have proposed – Michael Yeadon, Catherine Austin Fitts, Sasha Latypova, Katherine Watt and Joseph Sansone – to the hearing as witnesses and/or experts and allow them to take their seats in the courtroom.

For the record, it is hereby noted that your court's decision to refuse to hear party-appointed experts under oath does not prejudice the claimants' right to bring witnesses and experts to the hearing. No prior authorisation from your court is required to exercise this right. The requirements of proper court procedure demand no more than a timely notification to the judge, which notification has been given.

Furthermore, [REDACTED] et al. request that, in the event that one or more of the experts they have nominated are unable to be physically present at the hearing, permission be granted to establish an online connection with that expert or those experts during the hearing. The court is hereby respectfully requested to play a facilitating role in this regard.

Furthermore, the court is requested to authorise an interpreter to enable the experts brought by [REDACTED] et al. to follow the hearing, as these experts do not speak Dutch. The court is also respectfully requested to play a facilitating role with regard to that interpreter.

[REDACTED] et al. have a significant interest in being able to bring the experts they have nominated, as these experts, who possess knowledge that is relevant and crucial to the assessment of the case, are able to further explain their statements – which are already part of the proceedings – and to address any objections the State et al. may raise against their findings. Furthermore, being able to consult with these experts during the hearing is of great importance to [REDACTED] et al. in order to respond adequately to arguments put forward by the State et al. – and any arguments they may put forward during the hearing – regarding the competence and integrity of these experts and/or the accuracy of their reported findings. Furthermore, their presence is of great importance to the solicitor representing

as he too wishes to have the opportunity to consult with them in the event that the State et al. and/or your court have any questions or comments regarding the evidence submitted by Minks et al. on 7 December 2025, which is of the utmost importance for the assessment of this case.

In its judgment dated 11 March last, your court did not rule on:

- The request to ensure that the witnesses and experts may take their seats in the courtroom;
- The timeliness of the announcement regarding the attendance of the experts;
- The procedural consequences of this notice regarding the attendance of these experts;
- The request for the lawyer representing Minks et al. to be able to consult with the experts;
- The organisational request by Minks et al. for the court to establish an online connection with the experts insofar as they cannot be physically present;
- The organisational request for the court to provide an interpreter for the experts.

Minks et al. request that the judgment of 11 March last be amended or supplemented, taking the above points into account.

Request for a live stream

In view of the significant public interest in these proceedings and the considerable national and international interest in them, as well as the consequent importance of ensuring the openness of these proceedings, Minks et al. also request a live stream of the scheduled oral hearing. Minks et al. hereby note that this request for a live stream falls outside the scope of paragraph 2.14 in conjunction with paragraph 2.13 of the judgment dated 26 November 2025, which concerned requests relating to the substantive part of the oral hearing.

I am sending a copy of this message to the defendants' solicitors.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours faithfully,

Peter Stassen

Stassen & Kemps Advocaten B.V.
Visiting address: Nachtegaallaan 6, 5611 CV, Eindhoven
Postal address: PO Box 7004, 5605 JA, Eindhoven
Tel: +31 40 2676260
Mobile: 06 41663460
stassen@uwadvocaten.nl
<http://www.uwadvocaten.nl>

Stassen & Kemps is registered with the Dutch Trade Register of the Chamber of Commerce under number 17225491.

Any business communication sent by Stassen & Kemps Advocaten B.V. is confidential and may be subject to legal privilege or otherwise protected. If you receive it in error, please inform us and delete it from your system.