

judgement

**NORTHERN
NETHERLANDS
DISTRICT
COURT**



Civil law

C/17/190788 / HA ZA 23-172

Place of hearing:
Leeuwarden

Case number:

Judgment of 11 March 2026

in the case of

1. [REDACTED]
2. [REDACTED]
3. [REDACTED]
4. [REDACTED]
5. [REDACTED]
6. (THE LATE) [REDACTED]
7. [REDACTED]

of Leeuwarden,
claimants,
hereinafter collectively referred to as: the claimants,
solicitor: Mr P.W.H. Stassen,

against

1. EVERHARDUS ITE HOFSTRA,
 2. JAAP TAMINO VAN DISSEL,
 3. MARIA PETRONELLA GERARDA KOOPMANS,
 4. MARK RUTTE,
 5. SIGRID AGNES MARIA KAAG,
 6. HUGO MATTHEÛS DE JONGE,
 7. ERNST JOHAN KUIPERS,
 8. DIEDERIK ANTONIUS MARIA PAULUS JOHANNES GOMMERS,
 9. WOPKE BASTIAAN HOEKSTRA,
 10. CORNELIA VAN NIEUWENHUIZEN,
 14. FEIKE SIJBESMA,
- all electing domicile in The Hague,
17. **THE STATE OF THE NETHERLANDS**,
hereinafter referred to as the State,
with its seat in The Hague,
hereinafter collectively referred to as Hofstra et al.,

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

11. **ALBERT BOURLA**,

residing in Greenwich (United States of America),

hereinafter referred to as Bourla,

solicitors: D. Roessing and Bredenoord-Spoek,

12. **GISELLE JACQUELINE MARIE-THÉRÈSE VAN CANN**, residing in [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

13. **PAUL EDWIN JANSEN**,

[REDACTED]

hereinafter referred to as Van Cann et al.,

lawyers: A. Bekema and P.A. Lichtendahl,

15. **WILLIAM HENRY BILL GATES III**,

residing in Medina, Washington (United States of America),

hereinafter referred to as: Gates

solicitor: Mr W. Heemskerk.

16. **AGNES CATHARINA VAN DER VOORT-KANT**,

having elected domicile in Amsterdam,

hereinafter referred to as: Van der Voort-Kant,

lawyer: Mr A.H. Ekker,

the defendants,

hereinafter collectively referred to as: the defendants.

1. The further course of the proceedings

1.1 The subsequent course of the proceedings is set out in:

- the interim judgment of 26 November 2025,
- the notice of filing submitted by the claimants on 8 December 2025
- the statement of the parties filed by the claimants
- the statement of response following the interim judgment filed by Hofstra et al.,
- the statement of case following the interim judgment filed by Gates,
- the statement of case submitted by Van der Voort-Kant,
- the statement of case following the oral hearing submitted by Bourla,
- the statement of case by the parties following the oral hearing on behalf of Van Cann et al.,
- the order on the list of cases, notified to the parties by letter dated 27 January 2026, stating that the oral hearing will take place on 22 October 2026 at 12.30 pm.

1.2 Finally, judgment has been delivered.

2. Further assessment

2.1. The court has once again reviewed the case documents, including its interim judgment of 26 November 2025 (hereinafter: the interim judgment). The court adopts and stands by the considerations and decisions set out in that interim judgment and in the earlier interim judgments and the order on the list.

2.2. In the interim judgment, the court gave the parties the opportunity to submit a written statement setting out their wishes regarding the substantive part of the oral hearing to be scheduled. All parties have submitted a written statement in that regard.

Furthermore, the court ruled that the claimants must also state in their written submissions who claimant No. 7 is.

Identity of claimant 7

2.3. In their statement, the claimants have explained, with supporting evidence, that claimant No. 7 was given the surname [REDACTED] [REDACTED]. As it is now clear that this is not a different person, the court will continue to refer to claimant No. 7 as [REDACTED] as was done in the summons.

The parties' wishes regarding the oral hearing

2.4. The court will now address the wishes regarding the substantive part of the oral hearing that the parties have set out in their pleadings.

Purpose of the oral hearing

2.5. Van Cann et al. have requested that the court indicate in advance the purpose of the oral hearing and, with regard to which arguments, the court wishes to receive further clarification from which party, in order to ensure that the oral hearing proceeds as efficiently as possible and to limit the speaking time of the numerous parties. They pointed out in this regard that two rounds of written submissions had already taken place and that the claimants had introduced a considerable volume of documents into the proceedings.

2.6. Referring to the interim judgment, the court considers that the oral hearing is primarily intended to allow the parties themselves to be heard, as written submissions have already been made in two rounds. Nevertheless, the court can appreciate that, in a case of this scale, the parties may still wish to emphasise certain points, and they are free to do so, within the limits of the speaking time allowed by the court.

Speaking time

2.7. The claimants have requested an extended speaking time of 120 minutes. Hofstra et al. have requested the same amount of speaking time as the claimants, should the claimants request an extension. The other parties have argued that a speaking time of ten minutes per party should be sufficient.

2.8. In its interim judgment, the court considered whether and why, during the oral hearing, the parties' lawyers may make use of concise speaking notes to further explain 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 scope of the case. Furthermore, it is significant that, despite the fact that there have already been two rounds of written submissions, the defendants have shown no procedural willingness to address the plaintiffs' key assertions, which are 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, with their statement of claim, the claimants have submitted highly crucial evidence for this

key claims in the form of video messages from experts and written expert reports. It must be possible to explain this evidence. 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. The situation is different only insofar as it concerns the wish to provide an explanation of the statements and video messages that have only recently been filed. In the court's opinion, this can 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 et al. and Gates have indicated that ten minutes' speaking time will suffice for them. The court will adjust the schedule for the hearing accordingly.

Deadline for submitting further documents

2.10. Bourla has requested the court to rule that the claimants must submit any new exhibits at least one month before the oral hearing. According to Bourla, this would give the claimants ample opportunity to determine whether, and if so, which further exhibits they wish to submit, whilst at the same time ensuring that the defendants have sufficient opportunity to submit any responses thereto, no later than two weeks prior to the oral hearing.

2.11. The court considers that it may assume that all relevant documents have now been submitted. In the event that a party nevertheless wishes to introduce further documents into the proceedings, the court will, in the interests of proper procedural order, rule as follows: that party must submit the relevant documents no later than four weeks before the oral hearing. If another party wishes to introduce further documents in response to this, it must do so no later than ten calendar days before the oral hearing.

Organisational matters

2.12. The court notes that the claimants and Van Cann et al. have also put forward requests which, in essence, are of an organisational nature. The court will address these in a letter at a later date.

Final considerations

2.13. Any further decision will be reserved.

3. The decision

The court

3.1. orders that, should 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;

3.2. rules that, if any of the other parties, in response to the documents referred to in 3.1., wish 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 **five hours** will be set aside for the oral hearing;

3.4. reserves all further decisions.

This judgment was delivered by C.M. Telman, T.P. Hoekstra and P. van Eijk and pronounced in open court on 11 March 2026.

1.155




11 MRT 2026
De griffier.


DISTRICT COURT OF
NORTHERN
NETHERLANDS
Certified true copy
11 March 2026 The
Registrar.

