

District Court of the Northern Netherlands, Leeuwarden
branch,
Hearing: 14 January 2026
Case reference: C/17/190788
Case number: 23/172
PS/D100607

STATEMENT BY THE PARTIES

concerning:

Claimants:

1. Mr **ALWIN MINKS**, residing in Sneek;
2. Ms **MARGJE GEERTRUIDA BOSMA**, residing in Sneek;
3. Mr **ROBERT WILLEM DE VRIES**, residing in Sneek;
4. Mrs **EVA OUDAKKER – BEKKERS**, residing in Doetinchem;
5. Mr **MARK OUDAKKER**, residing in Doetinchem;
6. Mrs **MONIQUE TIEKEN**[†], residing in Zaandam;
7. Mr **GEORGE REGINALD VLEGELS**, residing in Leeuwarden;

Lawyer P.W.H. Stassen, LL.B.

v:

Defendants:

(public officials)

1. Mr **EVERHARDUS ITE HOFSTRA**, residing at (9084 EB) Goutum;
2. Mr **JAAP TAMINO VAN DISSEL**, residing at (2431 JB) Oegstgeest;

3. Ms **MARIA PETRONELLA GERARDA KOOPMANS**, residing at (3712 AG) Huis ter Heide, municipality of Zeist;
4. Mr **MARK RUTTE**, residing in Brussels, Belgium;
5. Ms **SIGRID AGNES MARIA KAAG**, residing in Rijswijk (ZH);
6. Mr **HUGO MATTHEÛS DE JONGE**, residing in (3072 ND) Rotterdam;
7. Mr **ERNST JOHAN KUIPERS**, residing in Singapore / Malaysia;
8. Mr **DIEDERIK ANTONIUS MARIA PAULUS JOHANNES GOMMERS**, residing at (3366 BL) Wijngaarden;
9. Mr **WOPKE BASTIAAN HOEKSTRA**, residing in Bennekom, in the municipality of Ede;
10. **CORNELIA VAN NIEUWENHUIZEN**, residing at a confidential address;
Solicitors: Mr R.W. Veldhuis and Mr M.E.A. Möhring

(pharmaceutical industry)

11. Mr **ALBERT BOURLA**, residing in New York, United States of America;

Lawyer: D. Roessingh, LL.B.

(mass media)

12. Ms **GISELLE JACQUELINE MARIE-THÉRÈSE VAN CANN**, residing at (3722 GX) Bilthoven;
13. Mr **PAUL JANSEN**, of no known address or place of residence;

Lawyer: Mr A. Bekema

(non-governmental organisation (NGO, WEF))

14. Mr **FEIKE SIJBESMA**, residing at (5631 ND) Eindhoven;

Lawyers: Mr R.W. Veldhuis and Mr M.E.A. Möhring.

15. Mr **WILLIAM HENRY BILL GATES III**, residing in Washington, United States of America.

Lawyer: W.H. Heemskerk, LL.M.

(semi-public body)

16. Ms **AGNES CATHARINA VAN DER VOORT-KANT**, of no known address or place of residence;

Lawyer: Mr A.H. Ekker

(government)

17. The **STATE OF THE NETHERLANDS**, a legal entity under public law, having its seat in The Hague ("the State") and with its registered office at Korte Voorhout 8, The Hague (2511 CB);

Lawyers: R.W. Veldhuis, LL.M., and M.E.A. Möhring, LL.M.



The Claimants, hereinafter also referred to as 'Minks et al.', hereby give notice for **DEED**

1. In paragraph 2.14 of the interim judgment dated 26 November 2025, your court considered referring the case for 'statements of case from both parties' and stated in that regard that:
 - i. The parties are to be given the opportunity to make known their wishes regarding the substantive part of the oral hearing, such as speaking time, etc. (paragraph 2.13 of the interim judgment)
 - ii. The parties must provide a list of the dates on which the respective parties and their solicitors are unavailable
 - iii. The claimants must provide details regarding the identity of claimant No. 7.

Re i

2. Minks et al. request a speaking time of 120 minutes for their counsel. Furthermore, Minks et al. request that the court ensure that they may bring the experts they have nominated – 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.
3. 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.
4. Furthermore, Minks et al. request that, in the event that one or more of the experts they have proposed are unable to attend the hearing in person

, that an online connection be established with that expert or those experts during the hearing.

The court is hereby respectfully requested to play a facilitating role in this regard.

5. Furthermore, the court is requested to authorise an interpreter to enable the experts brought by Minks 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.
6. Minks 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 Minks 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 lawyer representing Minks et al., 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.
7. The requested speaking time of 120 minutes is intended to enable us to explain this case, which is of enormous public importance. Contrary to what your court appears to suggest in paragraph 2.11 of the interim judgment, the fact that there have been two rounds of written submissions has had no or

hardly contributed to the State et al. demonstrating a procedural willingness to address the evidence-backed key assertions of Minks et al., including the assertions that Covid-19 is not a disease but a project and that the Covid-19 injections are indistinguishable from a biological weapon. Furthermore, on 7 December 2025, Minks et al. presented your court and the State et al. with highly crucial evidence in support of these key assertions in the form of video messages from the aforementioned experts and written expert reports. The registrar of your court drew up a certificate of deposit in respect of this on 8 December 2025. The lawyer for Minks et al. must also be able to explain this evidence. Given the volume of the case file and the evidence submitted by Minks et al. therein, a speaking time of 120 minutes for the lawyer representing Minks et al. is by no means to be regarded as excessive.

Re ii

8. In view of the enormous public importance of this case and the associated urgency of a prompt hearing, Minks et al. and their lawyer have no dates on which they are unable to attend.

Re iii

9. As regards the identity of claimant 7, the surname he has held since birth is 'Vlegels'. Since marrying his wife, he has also taken the surname 'Dijkstra', his wife's surname. For further clarification, a copy of claimant 7's passport is included below¹.

¹ For privacy reasons, the lawyer for Minks et al. has redacted the document number and the BSN number on this copy.

10. Claimant No. 7 was thus correctly identified by his (family) name in the writ of summons dated 14 July 2023. It is correct that Claimant No. 7 was referred to as George Reginald Dijkstra in the reply.
11. Claimant No. 7 further wishes (also in relation to his identity) to leave no room for misunderstanding as to which Covid-19 injections (a biological weapon) were administered to him through deception. To this end, a copy of the message he received on this matter is included below:



G.R. Vlegels

19 December 2024

Dear Mr/Ms Vlegels,

Please find enclosed your COVID-19 vaccination registration card. For further information and answers to frequently asked questions, please visit: www.coronavaccinatie.nl.

Please note: your registration card is not an official proof of vaccination, but a confirmation of your vaccination. You cannot use it as a legal document or derive any rights from it, such as the right to travel or gain access to venues or events.

Here is your coronavirus vaccination registration card. Would you like to know more? You can find answers to the most frequently asked questions at: www.coronavaccinatie.nl.

Please note: your registration card is not an official proof of vaccination, but a confirmation of your vaccination. You cannot use it as a legal document or to gain any rights, such as travel or admission to a venue or event.

 National Institute for Public Health and the Environment Ministry of Health, Welfare and Sport	
Coronavirus vaccination registration card	
Keep this card safe and bring it with you to your next appointment!	
Name: G.R. Vlegels	
Date of birth: 18 February 1976	
Date of vaccination: 1 April 2021 13:55	
Product name:	Batch number:
COVID-19 VACCINE ASTRAZENECA INJVLST	ABV7764
Date of second vaccination: 30 September 2021 11:11	
Product name:	Batch number:
COVID-19 COMIRNATY VACCINE INJVLST T 0.3ML	FF2834
Further information about the COVID-19 vaccination can be found at coronavaccinatie.nl	

So be it!

A handwritten signature in blue ink, consisting of a large, sweeping loop followed by a series of smaller, more intricate strokes.

Mr P.W.H. Stassen