

District Court of the Northern
Netherlands, Leeuwarden
For the attention of Mr C.M. Telman, Mr T.P.
Hoekstra and Mr P. van Eijk

By registered email only

Leeuwarden Commercial Register (District Court of the Northern Netherlands)

[REDACTED]

With a copy to:

[REDACTED]

Re: [REDACTED] **et al. v. The State et al.**
Your ref.: C17/190788 / HA ZA 23-172
Our ref.: PS/ D100607
Email: stassen@uwadvocaten.nl

Eindhoven, 17 December 2024

Your Honour,

[REDACTED]. have taken note of the 'procedural order' handed down by the Full Court on 11 December 2024, whereby the document submitted by Minks et al. on the docket of 11 December 2024—consisting of copies of vaccination certificates pursuant to Article 85(1) of the Code of Civil Procedure, which also served as a deed of amendment to the claim pursuant to Article 130 of the Code of Civil Procedure and as a request for a preliminary hearing pursuant to Article 87(2)(d) of the Code of Civil Procedure, **was 'rejected' in its entirety.**

██████ et al. v. The State

et al.

██████. are of the opinion that the refusal of their document has **no** legal effect. ██████. will elaborate on this argument in due course, but wish to make the following observations in this regard at this stage.

- Amendment of the claim –

Article 130 of the Code of Civil Procedure reads:

1. *As long as the court has not yet delivered a final judgment, the claimant is entitled to amend or increase his claim or the grounds thereof in writing, by way of a statement of case or a document filed with the court. The defendant is entitled to object to this **on the grounds** that the amendment or extension **is contrary to the requirements of proper procedural order**. The court shall decide, after hearing the parties, as soon as possible. The court may also, on **the same grounds**, disregard an amendment or extension of the claim of its own motion.*
2. *No appeal lies against the judge's decisions referred to in the first paragraph.*
3. *If a party has not appeared in the proceedings, an amendment or extension of the claim against that party is precluded, unless the claimant has notified the party of the amendment or extension in good time by service of a writ. In the latter case, Article 120(3) applies mutatis mutandis.*

Article 2.7 of the applicable rules of procedure provides accordingly:

2.7 Amendment or extension of a claim

A party that amends or extends its claim or the grounds thereof must state this clearly in the heading of its pleading and on

██████ et al. v. The State
et al.

Form B. A party wishing to object to an amendment or extension of the claim and seeking a ruling on that objection before proceeding further must lodge its objection within two weeks of the court date on which the claim was amended. This time limit shall not be extended. The court shall rule as soon as possible. If that party raises an objection in any other manner, a decision on the objection will be given in the next judgment.

It follows from the above provisions that the amendment of a claim is a right of the claimant. ██████ have exercised that right by expanding their claim and the grounds therefor in accordance with the provisions cited above.

In response to this power conferred on ██████ l. by the Act, the court may rule **by judgment**, not by a procedural order. It is not possible to ‘reject’ the document in so far as it relates to the amendment of the claim. Your court fails to recognise that ██████ filed their document on the basis of the power conferred upon them by law to do so and did not, as considered in the ‘procedural order’ by the full bench, submit **a request** for permission to file the document. For these reasons, the amendment to the claim constitutes a legal act. The fact that your court has returned the document, which was submitted in quadruplicate to the registry on 9 December 2024, does not alter this.

It is, to say the least, remarkable that the full bench of the court reached its ‘docket decision’ without waiting for the two-week objection period set out in the rules of procedure to expire. ██████ note that this period is still running and that the defendants are still free to raise their objections. If the defendants lodge objections within this period, your court is obliged to rule on them. Should the defendants’ objections

██████ et al. v. The State
et al.

within this period, then, as stipulated by the provisions cited above, any objections raised by them after the expiry of this period will be decided upon in the next judgment.

Furthermore, the amendment to the claim is of great importance to ██████ et al., and the only legal ground on which an amendment to the claim could be refused *by judgment* relates to **an abuse of procedural rights**. Nor, as is evident from the reasoning given by the court in its ‘procedural decision’, is this the case. The court’s consideration that the amendment to the claim is ‘premature’ is devoid of any legal logic, as the claimants have substantiated their interests in amending the claim and there is absolutely no question of a breach of the principles of proper procedural order.

- Deed of submission of copies of vaccination certificates –

Your court has returned the vaccination certificates whilst ‘refusing’ the deed without providing any reasons. ██████ et al. would like to know the reasons for this and regard the vaccination certificates as part of the case file.

- Request for a preliminary hearing –

It is abundantly clear from the diametrically opposed arguments of the parties, including those set out in the document returned by your court, that ██████ et al. now base the factual grounds of their claims in part on the assertion that there is no such thing as a so-called ‘vaccine’ as claimed by the defendants, but rather a biological weapon. ██████ et al. have produced evidence in support of this claim and have expressly offered further evidence.

Since the summons was served, a great deal of evidence has come to light in support of the claim that this is a biological weapon. In the document 'rejected' by your court, [REDACTED] et al. made the following statement in this regard:

'... Without claiming to be exhaustive at this stage of the proceedings, it is already pointed out here that the evidence to be adduced in this regard relates, amongst other things, to scientific works and statements aimed at establishing the truth, including those by Professor Dr Francis Boyle, which show that the Covid-19 injections qualify as a biological weapon in the legal sense. Further evidence supporting the claimants' assertion that there has been deliberate deception in the aforementioned sense can be found in the statement by Dr Michael Yeadon, former chief scientist and director of Pfizer's allergy and respiratory research division, which shows that the Covid-19 injections were designed and manufactured 'by design' with the aim of causing serious harm to people's health and fertility. Among other things, further important evidence from the Netherlands that must not be overlooked can be found in the statements made by Minister Agema on 23 October 2024, in which she stated that, upon her appointment as minister, she had subordinated herself in her role as Minister of Public Health to directives from a supranational military organisation (NATO) and that, under the direction of the NCTV, she was required to draw up a list of all measures to be taken within the framework of the Covid-19 project: The Great Reset and the so-called 'pandemic preparedness' measures established in this regard by the UN/WHO and the WEF. The claimants wish to introduce this and other evidence (including, amongst other things, statements to be given before your court by several expert witnesses) into the proceedings in order to*

██████ et al. v. The State
et al.

'to examine in greater depth the defendants' tortious conduct, which consists of their ongoing deceptive role in the Covid-19: The Great Reset project, and to enable this court to carry out its most fundamental duty, namely the search for the truth...'

(Budget debate on Health, Welfare and Sport in the House of Representatives on Thursday 24 October 2024)*

██████ et al. may remind Mr Hoekstra that, during the oral proceedings in the interlocutory proceedings, ██████ et al. argued in their closing submissions that there is a 'preferential reality', or in other words, a wholesale lie so vast that it completely distorts the public's perception of what is and is not true. It is a serious yet simple fact that a 'vaccine' cannot also be a biological weapon. This means that *either* the claimants are correct in their assertion that the project-based deployment of the biological weapon within the framework of the 'Covid-19: The Great Reset' project leads to genocide, *or* the defendants are correct and it is in fact a matter of a deadly disease, 'Covid-19', and a 'vaccine' developed against it. There is no middle ground here. After all, the use of a biological weapon cannot be based on any form of negligence, but is, by definition, deliberate. Given this state of affairs, a pre-trial conference at which arrangements are made regarding the presentation of evidence on this point is called for.

Finally, ██████ et al. remind your court of its obligations under Article 162 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. For the record, it should be noted that this obligation rests with all bodies and 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.

Case 7 of 7
 [REDACTED] et al. v. The State
 et al.

17 December 2024

A copy of this letter is also being sent to the email addresses mentioned above.

Yours faithfully,



Peter Stassen
 (solicitor)



Arno van Kessel
 (solicitor)