

This case is being handled by Mr A [REDACTED]
Advocaat [REDACTED] Mr P.W.H.
Stassen, of the law firm [REDACTED]
CV);

District Court of the Northern
Netherlands, Leeuwarden Division

Date of hearing: Wednesday 11 June 2025 at 10:00

Case reference : C/17/190788

Case number : 2023/172

STATEMENT OF REPLY

and

**INCREASE IN CLAIMS PURSUANT TO SECTION 130 OF THE CODE OF CIVIL
PROCEDURE**

concerning:

1. M [REDACTED]
2. Ms [REDACTED]
3. Mr [REDACTED]
4. Ms [REDACTED]
5. Mr [REDACTED]
6. Mrs [REDACTED]
7. Mr [REDACTED]

– claimants –

Solicitors: Mr A.G.W. van Kessel, LL.M., and Mr P.W.H. Stassen, LL.M.

v:

(public officials)

1. Mr EVERHARDUS ITE HOFSTRA, [REDACTED]
2. Mr JAAP TAMINO VAN DISSEL [REDACTED]
3. Ms MARIA PETRONELLA GERARDA KOOPMANS [REDACTED]
4. Mr MARK RUTTE, re [REDACTED]
5. Ms SIGRID AGNES MARIA KAAG, residing [REDACTED]
6. Mr HUGO MATTHEÛS DE JONGE, residing [REDACTED]
7. Mr ERNST JOHAN KUIPERS, currently of [REDACTED]
8. Mr DIEDERIK ANTONIUS MARIA PAULUS JOHANNES GOMMERS,
residing [REDACTED]
9. Mr WOPKE BASTIAAN HOEKSTRA, currently of no known address or place of
residence;
10. CORNELIA VAN NIEUWENHUIZEN, currently of no known address or place of
residence;

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;

Lawyers: D.C. Roessingh, LL.B., and M.G. Bredenoord-Spoek, LL.B.

(mass media)

12. Ms GISELLE JACQUELINE MARIE-THÉRÈSE VAN CANN, residing in
[REDACTED]
13. Mr PAUL JANSEN, currently of no known address or place of residence;

Lawyers: L. Broers, LL.B., and R.H.W. Lamme, LL.B.

(non-governmental organisation (NGO, WEF))

14. Mr FEIKE SIJBESMA, residing in [REDACTED]

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

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

Lawyer: W. Heemskerk, LL.B.

(semi-governmental)

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

Lawyer: Mr A.H. Ekker

(government)

17. THE STATE OF THE NETHERLANDS, with its seat in The Hague;

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

- defendants -

The claimants, hereinafter referred to as ‘Minks et al.’, respectfully state and submit in their reply:

I. General Part 1

1. Minks et al. contest everything set out by the defendants, hereinafter referred to as ‘Hofstra et al.’ or ‘the defendants’ respectively, in their Statement of Defence, unless the facts alleged are consistent with those set out in Minks’ writ of summons et al. or are explicitly acknowledged as true in this Rejoinder. In this regard, Minks et al. maintain the arguments set out in the writ of summons. The reasoned challenge to all the facts, circumstances and information put forward by the State et al. is based on the fact that the facts, circumstances and information put forward by Minks et al. are incompatible with those put forward by the defendants. In view of this, Minks et al. address only a limited number of (sub)issues from the statement of defence explicitly in their reply.
2. The reading guide included in the introductory writ of summons also applies to this reply. This is on the understanding that the arguments set out outside the general section of this reply also apply to all defendants, so that in assessing the liability of any one of the defendants, account must also be taken of the arguments put forward by Minks et al. regarding the other defendants and the evidence they have submitted.
3. Minks et al. expressly state that all the defendants were and are aware of the ‘Covid-19: The Great Reset’ project and are (co-)implementers thereof; what one defendant knows and knew, the other defendant also knows and knew. Against this background, Minks et al. have based their claims against the defendants in part on joint and several liability, on the grounds that the defendants, as members of the group (implementers of the ‘Covid-19: The Great Reset’ project), committed their unlawful acts and/or omissions.
4. In their statements of defence, the defendants demonstrate that they would rather cling to a lie than to the Truth. In their statements of defence, the defendants allow the lie to prevail. That lie has already been raised by Minks et al., namely at the conclusion of the oral hearing on the jurisdictional objection raised by Gates. At the conclusion of that oral hearing, Mr Van Kessel, acting on behalf of Minks et al., remarked that they would return to the ‘preferred reality’ in these proceedings. That preferred reality is a large-scale lie (co-)created and perpetuated by those who hold the real power and their agents, including the defendants.
5. That, having read the writ of summons, the defendants persist in their denials and are unable to muster any empathy for the terrible situation in which many people worldwide, including Minks et al., find themselves as a result of the measures taken in response to the Covid-19 pandemic—which is merely a pretence in the ‘preferred reality’—and the toxic Covid-19

¹ With reference to paragraph 3.2 of your court’s judgement dated 5 February 2025

mRNA injections, speaks volumes. This fact constitutes significant evidence against the defendants.

6. In their defence, the defendants raise the ^{question²} *as to why* these events, as alleged by Minks et al. in the context of the Great Reset, would (or could) actually manifest themselves, noting in this regard that this remains unclear after reading the writ of summons. Specifically in response to this question raised by the defendants, Minks et al. address the subject of ‘preferential reality’ in this introductory chapter of their reply, for the sake of the procedural debate and the mutual understanding required for it.
7. On the programme ‘Wakker Nederland’ (WNL) on Sunday 15 April 2018, Major General (retired) Mr Van Kappen, who has also been an adviser to NATO since 2003, confirmed the existence and purpose of ‘preferred reality’. He stated that ‘preferred reality’ is nowadays created on a project basis with the aid of large-scale information operations. These information operations are used to manipulate facts and events in such a way that a ‘preferred reality’ is projected onto the civilian population, including Minks and others. Van Kappen refers to this as ‘telefast reality’. Van Kappen leaves no room for doubt that the defendants are participating in this. The reason for the existence of what Van Kappen terms the ‘information operation’ is a strategic interest. Van Kappen did not specify exactly which strategic interest is being served, but his statements confirmed a strategic interest in bringing about large-scale social change. In this interview, Van Kappen also acknowledged the existence of secret, large-scale, top-level information operations designed to serve this covert strategic interest. It was also noteworthy that Van Kappen left no room for doubt that ‘*all parties*’ are participating in these so-called information operations. By speaking of the manipulation of facts and events, Van Kappen clearly confirmed that the aim is to distort true facts and events into disinformation, with (among other things) the strategic objective of imposing a preferred reality on the country’s own population (including Minks et al.). As set out in the summons, this is, in essence, precisely the deception of which a large section of the Dutch population, including Minks et al., fell victim. As evidence of the foregoing, the recording of the WNL programme on Sunday 15 April 2018 and a Wikipedia printout relating to Van Kappen’s curriculum vitae are submitted as **Exhibit 92**.
8. The preferred reality has many facets. One important aspect of the preferred reality is a false impression of who the actual holders of power and their agents are. In the preferred reality, parties operate within a democratic constitutional state; ultimate power lies with the representatives of the people, and ministers are tasked with carrying out the will of the people. In a democratic constitutional state, that power is limited by the law to which the State is bound and over which the representatives of the people have no influence (fundamental rights). If that law is called into question, the courts have the final say on the matter.

² See, for example, the closing sentence of paragraph 1.4 of the State et al.’s statement of defence: ‘Why all this should be happening, incidentally, remains unclear after reading the writ of summons.’

9. In the preferred reality, alongside or above (supranational to) the rule of law, there exist only intergovernmental organisations whose purpose is to safeguard the interests of the member states governed by the rule of law through international cooperation. Key players in this field are the United Nations and NATO. These intergovernmental organisations collaborate with private bodies referred to in the writ of summons as NGOs. NGOs relevant to this case include the World Economic Forum (WEF) and the World Health Organisation (WHO). In the preferred reality, these NGOs too would serve exclusively the interests of democratic states governed by the rule of law and their citizens.
10. In reality, however, the actual holders of power and their agents are neither the elected representatives of the people nor the judiciary. None of the other parties mentioned above are subject to democratic scrutiny. Consequently, the Dutch population, including Minks et al., has no substantive influence over the administration. However, these organisations, supported by the defendants, are all involved in manipulating facts and events in such a way that the Truth is erased and replaced by a preferred reality. The Great Reset is driven precisely by these powers and forces to which the de facto rulers and their agents – including the defendants – have, as evidenced by their submissions, completely surrendered.
11. The Minister for Health, Welfare and Sport and First Deputy Prime Minister in the now outgoing Schoof cabinet, Marie-Fleur (Fleur) Agema, stated on 27 October 2024 before the House of Representatives that, shortly after taking office as Minister, she had been briefed on resilience and its significance for her role in ‘pandemic preparedness’. In doing so, the Minister publicly acknowledged that, by accepting her mandate, she is under the authority of the National Coordinator for Counter-Terrorism (NCTV) and, under the latter’s direction, carries out the NATO mandates she has accepted, *‘and that is painful’*. A video relating to this public admission by the Minister for Health, Welfare and Sport dated 27 October 2024 is submitted as **Exhibit 93**. The nature of the NATO mandates referred to in her mention of ‘pandemic preparedness’ is evident, amongst other things, from interdepartmental email correspondence from her ministry dated 3 June ²⁰²⁰³. A copy of this email is submitted as **Exhibit 94**. This email shows that inter-departmental consultations took place regarding the preparation of a political position on a proposal initiated by the USA (Pentagon) to establish emergency stockpiles within the NATO framework in relation to Covid-19. In this correspondence, the question is raised as to whether this proposal initiated by the USA (Pentagon) actually falls within NATO’s mandate. This clearly concerns the stockpiling of Covid-19 injections as part of the project ‘Covid-19: The Great Reset’.

³ This correspondence therefore dates from before the start of the Covid-19 vaccination campaign, during which the preferred narrative projected the message that ‘vaccination is the only way out of the crisis’. This was a period in which, in the Netherlands, large-scale testing for ‘coronavirus infections’ was taking place within the preferred narrative. See, in this regard, Exhibit 23 to the summons: Frank Ruesink’s plea to Hugo de Jonge dated 16 April 2020.

12. The UK government's website has published NATO guidance regarding the NATO doctrine for StratCom, PsyOps and InfoOps as methodologies for establishing a preferred reality. Member states are required to implement this NATO doctrine in their own way, in accordance with a blueprint imposed by NATO. Given the extreme nature and large-scale scope of the activities taking place within the framework of this doctrine, there is an immense influence on the perceptions and experiences of the civilian population. This NATO doctrine concerns precisely the same information operations and 'telefast reality' about which Van Kappen, as a NATO adviser, made his public confession.
13. StratCom (Centre of Excellence for Strategic Communication) is a NATO unit based in Riga, Latvia, whose task is to conduct Information Operations (InfoOps) and Psychological Operations (PsyOps). These activities constitute a modern form of propaganda.
14. It is within StratCom that the narratives are forged which are then implemented and safeguarded through InfoOps and PsyOps. A consistent narrative is crucial to the effectiveness of these clandestine military operations. In the context of Covid-19: The Great Reset, NATO, acting on behalf of the USA (the Pentagon), has implemented and safeguarded the narrative *that Covid-19 is a disease that originated as a result of the SARS-CoV-2 virus, which was transmitted from a bat to a human at an animal market in Wuhan.*
15. Since the defendants in these proceedings, as Agema also states, are bound by NATO objectives and must therefore serve the 'Covid-19: The Great Reset' project, the defendants – and, it may be assumed, their respective legal representatives – are not permitted to deviate from this narrative. Their statements of defence bear witness to this. The documents published on the United Kingdom's website regarding NATO doctrine are submitted as **Exhibit 95**.
16. As regards the role and objectives of StratCom, there is likewise a **significant difference** between the Truth and the preferred reality. In the preferred reality, StratCom operates within NATO's mandate as a defensive alliance against foreign military attacks. The Truth, however, is that NATO is a ruthless executive body serving the de facto rulers to implement, or have implemented, among other things, the Covid-19: The Great Reset project. A defining feature of these projects, which are partly carried out by StratCom, is that they are directed against the alliance's own civilian population, with the ultimate aim of achieving a **New World Order** through a Great Reset. This proves that NATO's so-called mandate – which is also referred to in the interdepartmental email dated 3 June 2020 (Exhibit 94) – is a farce. StratCom's Programme of Work for the year 2024 (**Exhibit 96**) shows that StratCom's information operations and PsyOps also extend to the narratives established and implemented by StratCom concerning climate change, mass immigration and the Ukraine conflict.

It should be clear that, in the preferred reality, it is not NATO's role to engage in the manipulation of the populations of its member states in order to keep them within a preferred reality. The truth, however, is that NATO, as a ruthless executive organisation, targets its own civilian populations, and the defendants fully support these actions and help to carry them out as part of the 'Covid-19: The Great Reset' project.

17. With regard to NATO's role as discussed in this introduction in relation to NATO doctrine, it should be noted that NATO, too, forms part of the 'Covid-19: The Great Reset' project set out in the summons, and that the implementation of the Great Reset is a project in which, as Van Kappen puts it, *all parties* are participating. These parties include, amongst others, the UN, the WEF, NATO, the WHO, the EU and the State of the Netherlands. In this context, the writ of summons discusses at length the roll-out of the UN's Agenda 21 and Agenda 2030, with the aim of ultimately achieving the New World Order through a Great Reset. The Great Reset is therefore not an exclusively NATO project, but one whose implementation is partly carried out with NATO's involvement.
18. The clandestine InfoOps and PsyOps are manifestations of an underlying spiritual battle. This spiritual battle is described in the Apostle Paul's letter to the ^{Ephesians 4:}

*For we do not wrestle against flesh and blood, but
against the principalities, against the powers, against the
rulers of this world, against the spiritual forces of evil in the
heavenly realms.*

*Therefore, take up the full armour of God, so that you may be
able to stand your ground on the day of evil, and having done
everything, to remain standing.*

*Stand, therefore, with your loins girded with the
truth, and having put on the breastplate of righteousness;*

*and having your feet shod with the readiness to
proclaim the Gospel of peace;*

*Above all, having taken up the shield of faith, with which you
will be able to extinguish all the flaming arrows of the evil one.*

*And take the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit, which
is the Word of God.*

⁴ Ephesians 6:12–17

19. The lie that constitutes the preferred reality goes so far that most people are unaware that everything which the actual rulers and their agents—including the defendants in their statements of defence—present as truth regarding the origin and functioning of Creation ('science') is deliberately deceitful and false. In reality, this constitutes a deliberate attack on the Creator and creation (including, in particular, humankind itself). The ultimate aim here is the complete eradication of the animated human being—created in the image of his Creator and connected to Him.
20. In order to achieve a complete severance between humankind and its Creator (with the intended consequence being the end of the animated human being), a 'Great Reset' is underway in which the animated human being is being transformed through a false faith in technology and technological possibilities. The Great Reset aims for a 'Human 4.0', a human being whose bodily functions and thinking (cognition) have been technically influenced to such an extent that they can no longer be considered an animated human being. In the preferred reality, this Great Reset is completely denied by those actually in power and their agents, so that its underlying spiritual significance cannot be debated. In the preferred reality, technological changes are presented as 'scientific progress' that can bring people many benefits. In doing so, the underlying intentions behind these costly technological – and, above all, digital – developments are concealed.⁵ It is telling that this technology is made available to the public 'free of charge'.
21. This genocide against the spiritual human being thus takes place, first and foremost, on a spiritual level. By instilling in people within the preferred reality the idea that it is not the Creator (in whose image they were created) and creation that determine their ability to live a good life, but rather their (compulsory) participation in the preferred reality (the large-scale lie), people become increasingly estranged from their Creator and lose their zest for life. As a result, people literally lose their soul. In a spiritual sense, this means that the inspired human being is lost, or 'separated from God'.
22. Secondly, this genocide is being carried out physically, including through the use of the Covid-19 (mRNA) injections. Through the various batches of this poison, people are being weakened, made ill, altered, sterilised and/or killed, thereby preventing them from reaching their full potential as human beings. People are also being made ill through the manipulation of (other aspects of) their living environment. This conclusion emphasises the toxic Covid-19 (mRNA) injections promoted by the defendants.
23. The fact that the Covid-19 injections contain mRNA technology and nanotechnology is a clear indication that those actually in power and their agents also wish to use mRNA to alter human beings themselves (their DNA) and (through nanotechnology) make them part of the 'Internet of Bodies'⁶ referred to in the summons. As

⁵ Consider, too, the emergence of AI technology which citizens and businesses – or rather, their employees – can use 'free of charge'. A striking similarity here is that the Covid-19 injections were also 'free of charge'.

In footnote 97, Minks et al. refer to the WEF Briefing Paper on the Internet of Bodies. The spiritual aspect at play here is evident to anyone who ‘wishes to see and hear’: the de facto rulers aim, through this, to create a situation in which human beings are no longer (purely) created in the image of their Creator. This agent (mRNA) is being deployed by those who actually hold power and their agents (in part) for the purposes of the spiritual battle, with the aim of (by altering the DNA) completely turning humanity away from its Creator. Nanotechnology serves to offer, within the preferred reality, an ‘alternative’ to a person’s natural bond with their Creator, whereby they can form a bond with a ‘new creation’, namely, becoming one with the Internet of Bodies (part of the all-encompassing World Wide Web), through which, in the preferred reality, humankind is fused with technology and could thereby even become ‘immortal’. In this context, those who actually hold power speak of the ‘Fourth Industrial Revolution’ and ‘transhumanism’. The WEF also explicitly mentions this on its website (**Exhibit 98**). The physical and spiritual aspects of these false promises cannot be understood in isolation from one another.

24. The struggle in which the de facto rulers and their agents, including the defendants, are engaged is therefore a struggle against the spiritual human being (including Minks et al.).
25. The contrast between the Truth and the preferred reality is manifested in these proceedings in the irreconcilable positions of the parties regarding what the Covid-19 injections actually are. Minks et al. take the view that this demonstrably and provably involves a biological weapon with which the de facto rulers and their agents, including the defendants, are committing genocide against, amongst others, the Dutch people, including Minks et al. The deployment of this biological weapon forms part of the ‘Great Reset’ described in the summons. The defendants counter this with their own, consistent narrative, namely that of the ‘preferential reality’.
26. In the context of the ‘preferential reality’, Minks et al. draw the attention of your court and the parties to the fact that a request for provisional evidence-taking ^{is pending} before your ^{court}⁷, in which the defendants in these proceedings are the respondents and in which international experts have been nominated to provide evidence of the existence of the Great Reset, the biological weapon and the genocide as referred to herein. Minks et al. also offer the same expert evidence in these proceedings, with reference to Chapter III and paragraph 44 of this Statement of Rejoinder. Irrespective of this, it must be noted that the assertions made by Minks et al. regarding the Great Reset, the biological weapon and the genocide are based on valid evidence. Since the writ of summons was served, the evidence available to Minks et al. has only increased.
27. As a result of this increased body of evidence, Minks et al. have undertaken a further process of in-depth analysis over the period of almost two years following the service of the writ, leading to an even deeper awareness that has made them conscious, amongst other things, of the true significance of a number of institutions involved in the project ‘Covid-19: The Great Reset’

⁷ C/17/199273/HA RK 25/17. The oral hearing of this application is scheduled for 9 July 2025 at 1.15 pm.

. This concerns, in particular, NATO and the European Union. As the defendants are implementing the ‘Covid-19: The Great Reset’ project, of which the Covid-19 (mRNA) injections form a crucial part, Minks et al. consider it of great importance to present this deepened awareness to your court and to have it form part of the arguments put forward by Minks et al. in these proceedings.

28. The role of NATO in conducting information operations aimed at projecting a preferred reality onto the public has already been addressed in this regard. It has been noted that the ‘Covid-19: The Great Reset’ project is not exclusively a NATO project, but a global project being implemented by (virtually) all international organisations. The European Union, of which the Netherlands is a Member State, is also a key implementer of this project, and can count on the full cooperation of all the defendants. Here too, the European Union is not what the preferred reality would have the civilian population of the Netherlands – including Minks et al. – believe. In this regard, the following applies.
29. On 14 June 2022, European Commission President Ursula van der Leyen received a so-called ‘honorary doctorate’ from Ben-Gurion University in Israel. In the speech she delivered on that occasion, Van der Leyen stated *that Europe embodies the values of the Talmud*. For this reason, according to Van der Leyen, Europe and Israel are close friends and allies. As **Exhibit 99**, Minks et al. submit a copy of the video recording of her admission during Van der Leyen’s speech dated 14 June 2022.
30. The significance of Van der Leyen’s statement that Europe embodies the values of the Talmud is not understood in the preferred reality, because most people do not know what the Talmud is or what it truly stands for. With this public admission, however, Van der Leyen has spoken the whole truth about what the EU actually stands for, namely the values of the Talmud. Because Van der Leyen declares that the EU embodies the values of the Talmud, it is clear that the EU population, including Minks et al., is being misled and deliberately placed within a ‘preferred reality’.
31. Before delving further into the values of the Talmud/EU as described in the Talmud, Minks and others wish first to draw attention to a number of examples of the ‘values’ promoted by the EU itself in its architecture, art, events and exhibitions.
32. The most striking and symbolic building representing the EU is the Parliament building in Strasbourg. Through its architecture, this building clearly depicts the biblical Tower of Babel. Located in ^{Babylonia}, Babel is described in the Old Testament as the place where humankind rebelled against its Creator by building the Tower of Babel. In that rebellion, mankind united to form a single people, with a single official religion and a single language. Biblical history recounts that the Creator intervened to thwart this wicked plan of mankind, as a result

⁸ Biblical Babylonia encompasses an area situated in the region of present-day Iraq and Syria.

as a result of which the construction of this tower was never completed. The EU Parliament building in Strasbourg is shaped like the unfinished Tower of Babel and thus symbolises a continuation of Biblical Babylon. As **production 100**, Minks et al. present a photograph of both the EU Parliament building and the Tower of Babel as painted by Bruegel.

33. In front of the EU building in Strasbourg, a life-size ‘work of art’ has been installed depicting a woman sitting backwards on a ^{bull}.⁹ This woman symbolises Princess Europa, a figure known from Greek mythology. In mythology, the bull is associated with the Greek god Zeus. In the preferred reality, this ‘work of art’ is explained by the myth that Zeus fell in love with Princess Europa after seeing her on the beach at Sidon¹⁰ and, for this reason, took the form of a white bull. According to the myth from the preferred reality, Zeus seduced Princess Europa into climbing onto his back so that they could swim together to Crete, where they are said to have had loving intercourse. However, this explanation/myth, projected into the ‘preferential reality’, conceals the Truth that, in mythology, Zeus is equivalent to Satan; consequently, one must speak not of loving union, but of the abduction and rape of Princess Europa. With this artwork, for those who ‘wish to see and hear it’, this abduction and rape of Europa is elevated to the status of ‘art’. As **Production 101**, Minks et al. reproduce a photograph of the aforementioned ‘work of art’ depicting Zeus in the form of a bull with Princess Europa on his back.
34. Another example of how the EU promotes its Talmudic values concerns the organisation of the 2024 Olympic Games in Paris. During the opening ceremony of this event, a large set was displayed in which people took their places in a composition mirroring that of Jesus Christ and his disciples at the Last Supper, an event of great significance to Christians. From a Christian perspective, the manner in which this set was formed by drag queens during the Olympic Games can only be described as extremely grave blasphemy. After all, in this composition, the person of Jesus Christ was portrayed as an obscenely dressed and made-up, overweight drag queen with a seven-pointed crown on his large head. The number seven has multiple meanings in the Bible, including divine completeness. In Genesis, the creation narrative, it concerns the creation of, amongst others, man and woman, who were created in the image of the Creator Himself. In the Bible, the covenant between man and woman is a holy covenant, and it is only within that covenant that man and woman are complete. By placing a drag queen wearing a seven-pointed crown in the place of Jesus Christ in the depiction of the Last Supper, the creation story, the Creator and his Son (Jesus Christ) are utterly ridiculed, and it is made explicitly clear which values, contrary to the Bible, the EU espouses. During the opening ceremony, this single, very serious act of blasphemy was not the only incident. Furthermore, the procession of a depicted pale horse made explicit reference to the Book of Revelation in the Bible, in which this horse symbolises death. In addition, use was made of the

⁹ This is also a frequently recurring motif on the Greek two-euro coins.

¹⁰ A region situated in present-day southern Lebanon.

image of a golden calf as a symbol of rejection of the Creator and an object for the worship of a false god. An explanation convincingly demonstrating that this cannot be a mistake or an artistic choice can be found on ^{YouTube}¹¹ and Minks et al. refer to it. Here too, the EU has demonstrated the Talmudic values from which it originated and which continue to govern the EU to this day. As **Exhibit 102**, Minks et al. submit a photograph of part of the opening ceremony of the Olympic Games.

35. The examples discussed above of the Talmudic values promoted by the EU tie in seamlessly with the values enshrined in the texts of the Babylonian Talmud. Minks et al. are aware that a distinction can be made between the Babylonian Talmud and the Jerusalem Talmud. Given that the EU's most striking building represents the Tower of Babel, it is clear that the President of the European Commission, Van der Leyen, who knows this building better than anyone, was referring to the Babylonian Talmud. For this reason, Minks et al. will base their discussion below on the Babylonian Talmud.
36. The Talmud is the Talmudic interpretation of the Torah. The Torah, also spelled as Tora or Torah, comprises the first five books of the Tanakh (Hebrew Bible) and, respectively, the first five books of the Old Testament.¹² In the Babylonian Talmud, 'teachers' of the Jewish faith (rabbis) set out their worldview and convictions regarding the nature of humanity on the basis of their interpretation of the Torah. In doing so, these 'teachers' draw a strict distinction (resulting in dualism) between people of their own 'religious background' and others. The others, including Minks and his associates, are referred to by these 'teachers' as 'Goyim'¹³.
37. Below, a number of views from the Babylonian Talmud regarding the perception of goyim (including Minks et al.) will be cited, along with their sources. This is possible because the Talmud was first translated from Hebrew (into Latin) by the Polish-Russian Catholic priest I.B. Pranaitis in the late nineteenth century. It was this priest, Pranaitis, who, in his 1892 book **Christianus In Talmude Iudaeorum**¹⁴, exposed the true intentions behind the interpretation of the aforementioned 'teachers' of the Jewish faith as an attack on Christianity. A copy of the cover of this book, together with a reference to its source, is submitted as **Exhibit 103**.

Goyim are not human beings
(Baba Metzia, 114b)

¹¹<https://youtu.be/scWiByscY-k?si=0gE9xYZJEnLH0NF6>

¹³ Found in the section of the Talmud entitled Baba Metzia, 114b.

¹⁴ *Christianus in *Talmude Iudaeorum**. **The Talmud Unmasked**. **The Secret Rabbinical Teachings Concerning Christians** ... Translation of the Author's Latin Text, ISBN: 9781466238831, ISBN-10: 1466238836

Goyim may be put to death without being punished for doing so
(Sanhedrin 57a)

Goyim are pagans and must all be killed
(Soferim 15).

Sex with girls from the age of three, involving sexual intercourse, is permitted
(Sanhedrin 54b and Kethuboth 11b)

It is permitted to steal from goyim
(Baba Mezia 24a)

Deceiving and lying to non-Jews is permitted in order to outwit them
(Baba Kamma 113a)

Jesus Christ was sexually immoral and the God he worshipped was a brick
(Sanhedrin 107b)

38. The spiritual significance of these exemplary interpretations from the Talmud corresponds to the spiritual significance of the way in which, in the implementation of the 'Covid-19: The Great Reset' project, humanity is being murdered, robbed, sterilised and deceived. For this reason, the defendants, who are all participating in this project, are acting unlawfully. This unlawful conduct will continue for as long as this project persists and the defendants do not refuse to oppose its implementation, which is their civic duty.
39. With this introduction, Minks et al. also aim to share their views with the court regarding the how and why of the extreme manipulations and deceptions that led them to receive a Covid-19 injection, which would not have happened had the defendants not cooperated in the implementation of the 'Covid-19: The Great Reset' and/or had opposed it in accordance with their civic duty. As regards those insights, Minks It should not go unmentioned that the sinister project 'Covid-19: The Great Reset', which aims to establish a New World Order, is symbolised by a newly introduced flag. In the preferred reality, this flag is presented as an affirmation of the importance of equal opportunities, diversity and inclusion, and is embraced by all authorities worldwide, including, for example, the judiciary, the Netherlands Bar Association (NOvA), the Public Prosecution Service and the police. As an example of this, a photographic portrait of the members of the NOvA's General Council is submitted as **Exhibit 104**, along with a number of other photographs in which this flag is displayed.
40. According to the projection in the preferred reality, the colours of this flag (see Exhibit 104) are derived from the rainbow, which in the preferred reality also explains the name of this flag, namely the 'Rainbow Flag'. The Truth, however, is that this flag has nothing to do with equal opportunities, diversity and inclusion

. In reality, this flag represents a malicious and false interpretation of the spiritual significance of the rainbow, which is important to Christians. This Christian significance is explained in the biblical book of Genesis. For Christians, the rainbow is the sign given by Almighty God to confirm His promise that humanity will never again experience a flood. The Divine rainbow, which every human being can behold, has seven colours, the most important of which is Heavenly Light Blue, symbolising the Heavenly Kingdom. The Rainbow Flag, projected onto humanity in the preferred reality, consists of six rather than ^{seven}¹⁵ colours, with the Divine Heavenly Light Blue deliberately omitted. In a symbolic sense, therefore, it is depicted that the Tower of Babel will be completed and that soulless humanity will succeed in its rebellion against the Almighty God.

41. This is, in reality, the meaning of the New World Order, which is to be brought about through a Great Reset, and within the framework of which the defendants are cooperating in the implementation of the project ‘Covid-19: The Great Reset’.

II. For the submission of copies of vaccination certificates, an amendment to the claim and a request for a preliminary hearing.

42. At the hearing on 11 December 2024, Minks et al. submitted further documents to the proceedings by way of a deed, increased their claim and made a request for a preliminary hearing. This document is hereby submitted as **Exhibit 105**. Minks et al. request that your court regard the contents of this document as repeated verbatim and incorporated herein. **Duly noted!** At this stage of the proceedings, Minks et al. assume that this Court will also accept this increase in the claim as a procedural fact, so that the claims of Minks et al. read as follows:

May the court be pleased, by judgment,

- 1. declare that the defendants, as a group and each individually, have continued to act unlawfully towards the claimants (including unlawful omissions) by deliberately and unlawfully misleading them and the Dutch people in order to induce the claimants and/or the Dutch people to receive Covid-19 injections, of which the defendants knew, or at least ought to have known, that these injections are not safe and effective, or at least that the false and misleading narrative propagated by the defendants in the context of the Covid-19: The Great Reset, and/or that the Covid-19 injections introduced as part of this project are harmful to the health, fertility and mental well-being of the defendants and/or the Dutch people.*
- 2. to order the defendants, jointly and severally – such that payment by one shall discharge the other – to compensate the claimants for their damages, to be determined by the court and settled in accordance with the law.*
- 3. Order the defendants to pay the costs of these proceedings pursuant to a provisional order for costs to be made by your court for that purpose.*

¹⁵ The number seven occurs frequently in the Bible and symbolises, amongst other things, divine completeness.

43. In addition to the documents submitted with the deed dated 11 December 2024, Minks et al. hereby submit, as **Exhibit 106**, a copy of the COVID-19 vaccination registration card relating to claimant No. 7.

III. Specific offer of evidence in relation to the application pending before your court under reference C/17/199273 / HA RK 25/17.

44. As **Exhibit 107**, Minks et al. submit a copy of the application for interim evidence in the aforementioned case before your court, reference number C/17/199273 / HA RK 25/17. Minks et al. fully endorse the findings and arguments of the applicants in these proceedings, which amount to the assertion that the Covid-19 (mRNA) injections are biological weapons being used by those who actually hold power and their agents to commit genocide for the sake of the Great Reset. In particular, it also applies to Minks et al. that, if, under the influence of a misrepresentation of the facts (a false narrative) deliberately presented to them, and under social pressure caused by this false narrative, and in contravention of Article 7 in conjunction with Article 4(2) of the ICCPR, the Covid-19 (mRNA) injections turn out not to be vaccines in the context of public health, but that these injections were in fact developed as a biological weapon with the primary aim of causing medical harm to the claimants and, in effect, to the (global) population, and to reduce life expectancy amongst people, then there is only one possible conclusion, namely that this constitutes the deliberate commission, in an organised group, of a wrongful act against the claimants and, in effect, against the entire (global) population. Minks et al. are of the opinion that the witness and expert evidence put forward by the applicants in these proceedings must not be disregarded by your court in these proceedings either. Minks et al. expressly offer to have these international witnesses and experts, as set out in the petition, heard in support of their claim that the defendants, as implementers of the ‘Covid-19: The Great Reset’ project (acting as a group), have acted unlawfully towards Minks et al.

IV. Response to the statement of defence of defendants 1 to 12 (the State et al.)

45. The statement of defence submitted by the State et al. essentially amounts to a repetition of the official narrative surrounding Covid-19, which is to be disseminated in unison worldwide by those implementing the ‘Covid-19: The Great Reset’ project. In no way do the State et al. seriously address the comprehensive and well-reasoned arguments and evidence put forward by Minks et al. In their statement of defence, the State et al. thus attempt to nip the procedural debate initiated by Minks et al. in the bud by dismissing Minks et al.’s arguments with the now standard, meaningless defence that these are ‘conspiracy theories’ without any factual basis. Insofar as the State et al. rely on ‘facts and circumstances’, these consist of manipulated data compiled through bodies controlled by the State et al. themselves. All these bodies, like the State et al., have committed themselves to the ‘Covid-19: The Great Reset’ project, meaning it must be assumed that these ‘facts and circumstances’ are nothing other than the preferred reality that the State et al., as

co-implementers of this project project onto the population, including Minks et al. For this reason, the evidential value of the facts and circumstances or data put forward by the State et al. is to be regarded as nil; in reality, this constitutes the ‘telefast reality’ identified by Major General (Field Service) Van Kappen.

46. The State et al. open their statement of defence with the opening sentence: *‘The Covid-19 pandemic was a turbulent period, during which various, sometimes far-reaching, measures were necessary to protect public health and society’*. This is demonstrably a wholly criminal and mendacious assertion, which the State et al. are compelled to adopt because projecting precisely this preferred reality is essential for the continued implementation of the ‘Covid-19: The Great Reset’ project. The Truth is that there was nothing other than a ‘political pandemic narrative’ planned and executed globally with malicious intent. This was done without any medical justification and with the aim of making as many people as possible worldwide ‘willing to be vaccinated’, only to subsequently kill, injure and sterilise them with toxic Covid-19 mRNA injections. All of this with the ultimate aim of ushering humanity into the reality of the New World Order via a Great Reset.
47. Conclusive evidence that, in the sense described above, this was purely a ‘political pandemic narrative’ – a PsyOP – can be found in the German internal COVID-19 crisis team minutes of the Robert Koch Institute. More specifically, these consist of minutes of meetings of the RKI Crisis Management Team, supplementary information and email correspondence. The RKI Crisis Management Team is essentially equivalent to the Dutch Outbreak Management Team and fulfilled exactly the same role in the ‘Covid-19: The Great Reset’ project. This information has entered the public domain uncensored¹⁶ thanks to the courageous efforts of, amongst others, the Berlin-based journalist Aya Velázquez¹⁷. This information amounts to tens of gigabytes and was explained at a press conference on 23 July 2024 by Prof. Dr Stefan Homburg¹⁸, Aya Velázquez and Bastian Barucker¹⁹. The minutes of the RKI crisis management team are submitted as **Exhibit 108**. For the full information, including a video of the press conference, supplementary material, email correspondence and the RKI minutes, please refer to the website <https://rki-transparenzbericht.de/>, where all these documents are freely available for viewing and downloading. Given the volume of these documents, Minks et al. request that your court and the parties agree to these documents, including the video of the press conference, being introduced into the proceedings via this link so that they form part of the case file. As **Exhibit 109**, a screenshot relating to the aforementioned website on the internet domain rki-transparenzbericht.de is submitted.

¹⁶ The German freelance journalist Paul Schreyer, born in 1977, had previously made considerable efforts in this regard and succeeded in obtaining the RKI minutes through legal channels; however, these were heavily redacted copies of the minutes, as large sections of the text had been blacked out.

¹⁷ Aya Velázquez is a pseudonym for the brilliant publicist Magdalena Jany, born in 1986.

¹⁸ Professor Emeritus Stefan Homburg (born on 10 March 1961) is a retired German professor of economics. Until his early retirement in 2021, he was director of the Institute for Public Finance at the Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz University of Hanover in Lower Saxony, Germany.

¹⁹ Mr Barucker specialises in wilderness education, emotional and body-based work, and truly independent journalism, and publishes his work on his website <https://bastian-barucker.de/>, amongst other platforms.

48. The minutes of the RKI Crisis Management Team show that the team was initially taken completely by surprise by the fact that, without any medical justification, politicians were talking about a pandemic and the need for far-reaching measures in that regard. The RKI's internal assessment was therefore that there was no pandemic. However, in order to implement the 'Covid-19: The Great Reset' project, so much pressure was exerted on the RKI Crisis Management Team that the recommendations it issued were contrary to its own findings, namely that there was no justification for any measures whatsoever. In this way, the RKI crisis management team and its staff became, against their will, the implementers of the 'Covid-19: The Great Reset' project. This course of events was exactly the same in the Netherlands, more specifically within the Dutch OMT. This explains why former Minister Ernst Kuipers, in his decision dated 17 March 2023 in response to a Woo request to that effect, refused to disclose the transcripts of the audio recordings of the OMT meetings held between June 2020 and March 2021 (**Exhibit 110**).
49. The situation regarding the non-existent pandemic was explained with crystal clarity by Professor Emeritus Stefan Homburg at the aforementioned press conference. The video of this press conference is submitted as **Exhibit 111**.
50. Following the release of the RKI documents, the German Doctor (med.) Bodo Schiffmann²⁰ wrote the book *'Die RKI-Files: Das ENT-SCHWÄRZTE VERBRECHEN, was die Menschen in der "Pandemie" nicht wissen sollten'*. This book quotes and explains the RKI minutes. A copy of this book is submitted as **Exhibit 112**. Based on the RKI minutes, this book sets out:
- That as early as 19 March 2021, the RKI recognised that fewer people die from 'corona' than from the flu, and that the Covid-19 injections have no positive effects (page 5);
 - That, in a protocol dated 24 March 2020, the RKI mandated that, in the case of cremations, a second coroner should not be called upon to determine the (actual) cause of death, and that as early as 31 March 2020 it was clear to the RKI that wearing face masks offered no protection against 'coronainfections' (page 26);
 - That patients in hospitals and residents of care homes were murdered by emergency services on the orders of the German State (page 194);
 - That politicians paid no heed to the RKI and its findings (page 196);
 - That the RKI internally assessed the situation as not dangerous, but decided that this finding should not be communicated to the public (page 9);
 - That the RKI questioned what the actual danger of this 'pandemic' was (page 23);

²⁰ Until the launch of the 'Covid-19: The Great Reset' project, Dr Bodo Schiffmann (MD) was an internationally recognised expert, much sought after by the media, in the fields of vertigo disorders, ENT and emergency medicine.

- That every deceased person was recorded as a ‘coronavirus death’ if they had ever, even once in their lifetime, tested positive in a PCR test, in order to inflate the numbers of ‘coronavirus deaths’ (page 102);
- That the RKI was instructed by the Ministry of Health (BMG) to draw up a document in case the BMG came under investigation (page 103);
- That the figures for available ICU beds were manipulated and the RKI was aware of this (page 131);
- That the RKI was involved in ‘insider trading’ (page 138);
- That the RKI feared a relaxation of measures because this could expose its own criminal role (page 148);
- That the RKI instructed that the term ‘PCR test’ should no longer be used, but that a different name should be chosen for the same test, as it was aware that no conclusions regarding the presence of ‘viruses’ can be drawn from a PCR test (page 156);
- That by 3 February 2021, it was already perfectly clear from the figures that people were not dying from ‘Covid-19’, but from the toxic Covid-19 mRNA injections (page 170);
- That the RKI assumed that, when administering Covid-19 mRNA injections, deaths attributable to them would have to be taken into account in any case (page 176);
- That the RKI recognised that the main risk of dying from ‘Covid-19’ was advanced age, just as with the flu, and that the Covid-19 mRNA injections did not protect elderly people against this (page 177);
- That four months after the start of the Covid-19 injection campaign, sudden, unexpected deaths and hospital admissions rose sharply (page 183).

51. The uncensored RKI data allow no other conclusion than that this is a maliciously orchestrated global project – Covid-19: The Great Reset – which is being rolled out everywhere, including in the Netherlands, according to the same script. It is clear to anyone willing to see and hear that the official narrative is a farce. Now that more than five years have passed, to date not a single SARS-CoV-2 virus has ever been isolated, nor has it been demonstrated via the so-called scientific gold standard that people contract the alleged disease Covid-19 through infection with this non-existent virus. Anyone willing to see and hear will observe and acknowledge that, following the large-scale Covid-19 vaccination campaign, public health has deteriorated significantly and far more people are dying than before this campaign. The effects of this are manifested, amongst other things, in a massive increase in all manner of serious illnesses such as aggressive cancers, cardiovascular diseases, diabetes and sudden deaths, often among people in the prime of their lives. The truth is that the denial of all this by the State and its associates is all part of the official narrative and the preferred reality projected within that framework.
52. The information projected by the State and its allies into the preferred reality regarding the ‘side effects of the Covid-19 vaccines’ is based on a great deal of manipulation. Minks and others point out the following in this regard. For the purposes of the

statistical research, as conducted within the preferred reality, into the side effects of the falsely labelled ‘Covid-19 vaccines’, the lie is propagated that, in the first two weeks following administration of the injection in question, the ‘vaccine’ is not active and therefore has no ‘side effects’. For this reason, in the ‘preferred reality’, people who were injected with this poison were registered as ‘unvaccinated’ during the first two weeks following the injection. The RKI documents discussed above reveal just how malicious this immense manipulation is; the State and others have literally walked over dead bodies to achieve this.

53. Minks and others are aware of several highly renowned medical scientists who, with hard research findings, have pierced through the ‘preferred reality’ described above.
54. In 2022, a German team of pathologists, including Dr Ute Krüger and Professor Walter Lang, launched a comprehensive scientific pathological study on the initiative of the research leader, Professor Arne Burkhardt ^(†) and lawyer Mag. Elmar Becker. This study was completed in June 2023. The study focused on tissue samples from 89 deceased patients and biopsies from 75 living patients. All of these patients had (during their lifetime) received one or more COVID-19 mRNA injections. The study provides scientific, peer-reviewed evidence that, in 77 per cent of cases, the COVID-19 mRNA injection was the cause of death or the cause of their illness.
55. Professor Arne Burkhardt, MD, died in the very final stages of this study on 30 May 2023 under undisclosed circumstances on Lake Constance in Germany, before he had had the opportunity to publish the results of his research. Burkhardt had also intended to present the research findings publicly at a pathology conference, which he was unable to do due to his death. Posthumously, the peer-reviewed research findings were published on 4 September 2024 by Dr Ute Krüger and Professor Walter Lang under the title ‘vaccinated-dead’²¹. A copy of this book is submitted as **Exhibit 113 (to be provided via UT)**.
56. At a previous pathology conference in Germany, Prof. Burkhardt, drawing on his professional findings – including, amongst other things, the tissue damage he had observed in the testicles of men who had received a Covid-19 mRNA vaccine – issued stark warnings regarding the consequences for their health, fertility and life expectancy. A video concerning this warning by Prof. Burkhardt is submitted as **Exhibit 114**.
57. Those actually in power and their agents, including the State et al., have done everything in their power, through InfoOps and PsyOps, to undermine Prof. Burkhardt’s findings and warnings in pursuit of the ‘Covid-19: The Great Reset’ project.

²¹ ISBN-13: 978-90-835259-5-2, published by Corage Media; Martin Z. Schröder Verlag

58. Not only in Germany, but also in the United States of America, a renowned medical scientist has come forward to take the initiative to set up a large-scale, peer-reviewed study into people who died after receiving a Covid-19 mRNA injection. The initiator of this study is Dr (med.) Peter Andrew McCullough.²² The study is based on peer-reviewed autopsy reports of 325 people who had received one or more Covid-19 injections shortly before their sudden death. Of these 325 deaths, it was established that 73.9 per cent were caused by the Covid-19 injections, thereby demonstrating a causal link between these deaths and the administration of the Covid-19 injections. This peer-reviewed study, which could only be published on 17 November 2024 in a scientific issue of the medical journal ‘Science, Public Health Policy and the Law’ after years of censorship, is submitted as **Exhibit 115**.
59. Dr Peter Andrew McCullough (MD) published another important peer-reviewed autopsy study on 8 February 2025. This study is of particular importance in debunking one key lie that has been propagated in the official narrative regarding Covid-19 mRNA injections. Minks et al. refer here to the lie that the mRNA in the Covid-19 mRNA injection – which, according to WHO protocol²³, is administered into the deltoid muscle of the upper arm – would remain in the deltoid muscle of the upper arm for only a short time because this mRNA would be broken down by the body at the injection site. The autopsy findings prove that this claim – which played a major role in people’s so-called willingness to be vaccinated, including Minks et al. – is a complete lie, as the spike proteins are expressed in all parts of the body and this process demonstrably continued unabated even 555 days after the injection was administered, in the heart of the deceased patient examined in this study. As **Exhibit 116**, Minks et al. submit the peer-reviewed autopsy report by Dr Peter Andrew McCullough, dated 8 February 2025.
60. The pathologist associated with Prof. Burkhardt’s†, reported on 2 October 2024 in a scientific article in the Berliner Zeitung on her professional observation that, from autumn 2021 onwards, there was a sharp increase in the number of cases of fast-growing breast cancers among women aged between 30 and 50 who had received Covid-19 mRNA injections. She observed that the cancerous tumours differed from anything she had seen or experienced in her long career. The article in question also discusses other studies which, amongst other things, indicate that 30 per cent of deaths occurring within two weeks of receiving a Covid-19 mRNA injection are causally linked to the Covid-19 mRNA injection, and that the increase in severe auto-

²² Dr Peter Andrew McCullough (born 29 December 1962) is a former American cardiologist. He was associate chief of internal medicine at Baylor University Medical Centre and a professor at Texas A&M University.

²³ The WHO protocol regarding the administration of the toxic Covid-19 injections stipulates that the person administering the injection must not check whether the needle has struck a blood vessel. This carries the risk that the Covid-19 mRNA injection will be injected directly into the bloodstream, meaning it would not be able to remain in the deltoid muscle in any case.

Immune disorders are caused by the Covid-19 mRNA injections. A copy of this article in the Berliner Zeitung dated 2 October 2024 is submitted as **Exhibit 117**.

61. In the implementation of the ‘Covid-19: The Great Reset’ project, a number of those involved, in their utter arrogance and hubris, have made extremely serious blunders. A striking example of this is the public admission made by Moderna’s CEO during a WEF panel discussion in Davos, Switzerland, in 2023. He stated that, in 2019, Moderna had a production capacity of just 100,000 vials of Covid-19 mRNA injection solution and that, in that very same year, 2019, he had instructed Moderna to scale up production from 100,000 to one billion vials by 2020. When asked by Moderna’s production department what this was for, the CEO replied that it was necessary because he knew a pandemic was planned for 2020. The video of the WEF meeting in which Stéphane Bancel, Moderna’s CEO, made this public admission is submitted as **Exhibit 118**.

Excess mortality

62. In paragraph 2.7, the State et al. address the arguments put forward by Minks et al. regarding excess mortality. Minks et al. respond to this as follows. As indicated above, the facts, circumstances and data presented by the State et al. are derived from the ‘preferred reality’ (CBS and RIVM) and, for that reason, cannot serve as the basis for a purely scientific debate on what exactly excess mortality is. What can be demonstrated, however, is that the concept of excess mortality is not a fixed mathematical criterion, but a figure that merely expresses how the recorded numbers of deaths relate to a previous forecast of those figures. In the method employed by the State et al., the mortality forecast is therefore decisive in determining whether excess mortality exists. Because the State et al. also determine this forecast using varying definitions and calculation methods, it is impossible to make head or tail of the positions taken by the State et al. regarding excess mortality.
63. A number of independent experts, including Prof. Dr Ronald Meester and Drs Herman Steigstra, who are eminently qualified and willing, and who possess the knowledge and resources to conduct a scientifically sound investigation into excess mortality based on pure, unprocessed data, have offered to carry out this investigation. The State et al., and Lareb respectively, have refused to make the data available for such a study. This proves that the State et al. are doing everything in their power to prevent the claim—projected onto their preferred reality—that there was excess mortality during the so-called COVID-19 pandemic but not afterwards, or only to a negligible extent, from being refuted on the basis of thorough research. As **Exhibit 119**, Minks et al. submit a printout of a post on platform X by a Member of the House of Representatives dated 21 May 2025, which demonstrates this.
64. Minks et al. have set out in the writ of summons, on the basis of data that is as objective as possible, that this excess mortality exists. The finding that there is a high level of excess mortality is

entirely in line with the factual observations made by Minks et al. and many others that the numbers of sudden deaths and serious illnesses – particularly amongst people who have received a Covid-19 injection – have risen sharply.

65. Furthermore, Minks et al. note that determining the exact extent of excess mortality is not crucial to the present proceedings, in which the answer to the question of whether the Covid-19 mRNA injection is a ‘vaccine’ or a ‘bioweapon’ is of crucial importance; consequently, the procedural debate should focus on this issue. After all, if the defendants have facilitated the administration of a biological weapon, their liability and the damage are established, and the causal link between the damage and the tortious act is also established. Against this background, the offer of evidence made in Chapter III of these submissions is of great importance.

Authorisation and marketing authorisation

66. In paragraph 5.1 of the statement of defence, the State et al. address the development of the Covid-19 mRNA injections. This account is diametrically opposed to the assertions made by Minks et al. in the writ of summons, from which it follows that there was no medical pandemic, as demonstrated, amongst other things, by the RKI minutes.
67. The question of whether a valid marketing authorisation was granted by the EMA is not decisive in determining whether the State et al. acted unlawfully. It should be clear that Minks et al. have substantiated, with supporting evidence, that the so-called pandemic was projected onto the civilian population solely within the ‘preferred reality’, so that a formally granted marketing authorisation carries no weight. Furthermore – and the specific offer of evidence made in Chapter III of these submissions is relevant here – US regulations assume that a ‘vaccine’ by definition causes harm to public health and that, under US medical law, there is no precautionary principle in place to protect people against ‘vaccine damage’. Furthermore, it can be demonstrated that, under US law, the production of the Covid-19 mRNA injections permitted the presence of up to 50 per cent DNA debris, rather than mRNA, as contamination in the injection solution. This was permitted because large quantities of DNA debris were detected in the produced mRNA injection solution during manufacturing, and there were no technical means to prevent this during large-scale production. It should be noted that the production process for Covid-19 mRNA injections is the same throughout the world.
68. The international experts called upon, Katherine Watt and Sasha Latypova, are intimately familiar with all the US documents and regulations on this matter that have been made public and stand ready to provide your court with a fully substantiated explanation on this point, based on official records and documents, under oath, and also to testify as witnesses from their own direct observations regarding the course of events surrounding the production and the granting of US and European authorisations.

69. Another very compelling reason why the formal marketing authorisation is not of decisive significance is the fact that, as evidenced by the data recorded in VAERS and other systems, there are enormous differences in the ‘adverse reactions of different batches of Covid-19 injections²⁴’. This means that the different batches cannot be regarded as the same product. It inevitably follows that the marketing authorisation does not cover the various batches of Covid-19 mRNA injections that were administered.

Unlawful conduct

70. The arguments put forward by the State et al. in paragraph 6.1 et seq. amount to a repetition of the official narrative as projected in the preferred reality in pursuit of the ‘Covid-19: The Great Reset’ project. At a time when there are now countless victims who have lost their health and/or their lives as a result of receiving the Covid-19 mRNA injections, the State et al. persist in propagating this false narrative. The core of the justification in this narrative is that there is a serious global pandemic caused by a new SARS-CoV-2 virus, which is said to cause the new disease Covid-19.
71. The RKI files, which miraculously escaped global censorship, reveal that there has never been a medical pandemic. Against this backdrop, it should come as no surprise that the SARS-CoV-2 virus has never been isolated from a human anywhere in the world, nor has it been identified according to the gold standard as a pathogen that causes the alleged disease COVID-19 in humans. In other words: the Truth is that there is no objective evidence whatsoever to support the narrative put forward by the State and its allies, and all the data they cite in their preferred reality—in pursuit of the ‘Covid-19: The Great Reset’ project—has been fabricated through large-scale manipulation.
72. For those willing to see and hear, it should be clear that if there had truly been a pandemic, the large-scale deployment of the media, influencers, the police, ‘Romeos’ and the judiciary would not have been necessary to make the population aware of the risks to their health.
73. In view of the foregoing, the State et al. knew, or at least ought to have known, that there was no medical pandemic, and that their measures taken against the population – including Minks et al. – on the basis of this non-existent pandemic are, by definition, unlawful. Those measures – including lockdowns, compulsory face masks, curfews, compulsory social distancing, bans on visits and the intensification of social pressure to receive a toxic mRNA injection – severely infringed the most fundamental and inviolable rights of the population (including Article 7 of the ICCPR) without any legal justification.

²⁴ In reality: biological weapons

74. The writ of summons and the facts, arguments and evidence set out in this statement of defence demonstrate that everything put forward by the State et al. is being done in pursuit of the Covid-19 project: The Great Reset, and that the claimants' claims are ready for adjudication now that it has been established that the defendants are disregarding their unlawful conduct despite all the evidence produced in the writ of summons and now in this statement of defence, and are ruthlessly pushing ahead with the Covid-19: The Great Reset project entrusted to them. It is solely in this context that Minks et al. can explain that on 2 June 2025, Agema failed to respond to questions from members of the House of Representatives dated 29 January 2025 concerning the agreements made with NATO. It is worth noting that, in response to the questions from members of the House of Representatives, Agema reported on 18 February 2025 that, to her regret, she was unable to answer the questions within the usual timeframe. The parliamentary documents relating to these parliamentary questions are submitted as **Exhibit 120**.

Graphene oxide

75. In paragraph 6.3 of the statement of defence, the State et al. dispute the presence of graphene oxide in the Covid-19 mRNA injections.
76. In the writ of summons, Minks et al. demonstrated, on the basis of the package leaflet from a manufacturer of Covid-19 mRNA injection solution (Pfizer), that the manufacturer itself states in the package leaflet that the injection solution contains main components with the code names ALC-0315 and ALC-0159. These code names are explained by nothing other than the Chinese patent submitted by Minks et al. as Exhibit 43. The claims of this patent describe how graphene oxide in the injection solution acts as a carrier for the nano-lipid particles (NLPs) in which the mRNA is contained.
77. These NLPs are, amongst other things, produced and sold under these code names by the company Sinopeg in China, which offers them for sale for scientific research purposes under precisely these code names and explicitly states on its website that these NLPs contain graphene oxide. As **Exhibit 121**, Minks et al. submit information regarding Sinopeg which demonstrates this, as well as information regarding the potential applications of graphene oxide as described in patents, the scientific literature and on the internet.
78. In the opinion of Minks et al., this demonstrates beyond doubt that, according to the manufacturer's specifications, the Covid-19 mRNA injections contain graphene oxide as their main component. The fact that the CBG, fact-checkers and other implementers of the Covid-19 project, within their preferred reality, deny the presence of graphene oxide against their better judgement is apparently done for strategic reasons. The very act of concealing the presence of graphene oxide – which is toxic to humans – in the Covid-19 mRNA injections makes it clear that this is, in fact, a biological weapon being used to commit genocide. Damage, unlawful acts, causal link and attribution as legal conditions for the liability of the State et al. have thereby already been established.

Pfizer Report

79. In paragraph 6.4 of the statement of defence, the State et al. address the Pfizer report. This report is based on ‘cases of Adverse Events’ from the period 1 December 2020 to 28 February 2021. These cases were submitted to Pfizer by various third parties and selected, subject to conditions set by Pfizer, for inclusion in the research database used by Pfizer for this report. One of the conditions for the selection of cases was ‘a complete workflow cycle’. This methodology is clearly described on pages 5 and 6 of the report. The Pfizer report was introduced into the proceedings as Exhibit 40 in the writ of summons.
80. It follows from the above that the research database is far from containing all registered cases. The number of vials is therefore irrelevant to this investigation. Nor is this claimed in the Pfizer report. The numbers of doses or vials have indeed been redacted in the version held by Minks et al., but not by Minks et al. The State et al. undoubtedly hold a copy that does show these figures. Minks et al. request that your court order the State et al. to produce an unredacted page 6 of this report in the proceedings.
81. The key point is that an analysis of the 42,086 cases examined revealed that 1,223 people had died following the Pfizer Covid-19 mRNA injection within a short period, 11,361 people suffered adverse events during the aforementioned short period (and had still not recovered from them by the time the report was published), and 520 people had (even then) suffered irreversible damage as a result of Pfizer’s mRNA injections. In short, it is clear that the Pfizer mRNA injections are dangerous and lethal and therefore anything but ‘safe and effective’. Had the State et al. – who had this information at their disposal – not kept these more than a thousand deaths and thousands of injection victims under wraps, Minks et al. would not have had the Covid-19 injection administered. Furthermore, on page 9 of the report, under ‘missing information’, it states that the ‘vaccine effectiveness’ is unknown. The lethal risks were therefore set against an ‘effectiveness’ that, according to this report, was unknown. It follows that under no circumstances should the term ‘safe and effective’ have been used.
82. In the context of the vaccine not being ‘safe and effective’, Minks et al. also refer to Appendix I of the report, which contains nine pages full of life-threatening ‘Adverse Events of Special Interest (AESIs)’ that are horrifying to read and would, without a doubt, have completely dispelled any ‘willingness to be vaccinated’ on the part of Minks et al. had they been aware of them.
83. The concealment, censorship and ridicule of thousands of ‘cases’ concerning people who lost their lives or their health due to a substance which, as this report shows, was wrongly touted as ‘safe and effective’ under the false slogan ‘you’re doing it for someone else’ suggests that this is, in fact, a biological weapon being used to commit genocide. Damage, unlawful acts, causal link and attribution as legal conditions for the liability of the State and others have already been established by this.

84. Meanwhile, a former employee of the Ministry of Defence in the United Kingdom, Mr Nick Hunt, has ensured through legal means that Pfizer was compelled to disclose a further report which it had also sought to withhold. This report is dated 12 March 2024 and is submitted as **Exhibit 122**. In this report, Pfizer investigated a limited number of AESIs. These are primarily heart-related AESIs. The increased risks are expressed in this report as a so-called Hazard Ratio (HR). This Hazard Ratio indicates how much greater the likelihood of the AESI in question is following the Pfizer Covid-19 mRNA injection. For example, a Hazard Ratio (HR) of 1.3 means a 30 per cent greater likelihood of the AESI in question. Furthermore, this report specifies a Confidence Interval (CI) for the relevant AESI in relation to the established HR. This indicates that there is a 95 per cent certainty that the true HR lies within the specified range of HRs. It must be concluded from this report that anyone who received a Pfizer Covid-19 mRNA injection has up to a 40 per cent higher risk of the relevant AESIs occurring as a result. For further clarification, Minks et al. submit, as **Exhibit 123**, an article from the Daily Sceptic dated 8 October 2024, containing a contribution on this subject by the aforementioned Mr Nick Hunt.
85. It is apparent from the foregoing that Minks et al. were right to rely on the Pfizer report and that the (final) conclusions they drew from it are entirely correct.

Aarhus Convention

86. The argument put forward by Minks et al. that the Aarhus Convention was wrongly not applied is correct, regardless of which Covid-19 injection Minks et al. received. The fact that the Dutch population was denied the legal protection guaranteed as a fundamental right under this Convention without any medical justification (no pandemic) renders the actions of the State et al. unlawful.

Excesses

87. In paragraph 6.6 of its submission, the State et al. address the appalling excesses raised by Minks et al., which were broadcast via the public service broadcaster, which is entirely controlled by the State et al. These excesses occurred within the context of the ‘Covid-19: The Great Reset’ project and served the objective pursued by the State et al., namely to coerce people into receiving a life-threatening Covid-19 injection and to divide the Dutch civilian population, including Minks et al., into two camps. Since the State and others, as the implementers of the Covid-19 project, had the power to prevent these excesses and deliberately failed to do so, the unlawfulness of these excesses is established and they must therefore be attributed to the State and others.

Individual allegations against natural persons

88. It applies to all defendants that they implemented the ‘Covid-19: The Great Reset’ project and failed to protect the Dutch population against this attack, in the course of which fundamental rights were violated, material and non-material damage was caused, and a biological weapon was deployed. The unlawfulness of their actions is established because this very failure to act contravenes the social duty incumbent upon them in view of their role and social position. All the allegations in the writ of summons concerning the individual defendants are maintained and have been explained in detail by Minks et al. in this submission. In addition, Minks et al. make a number of specific observations.

Hofstra

89. As a GGD doctor and member of the OMT, Hofstra publicly defended the false Covid-19 narrative and promoted it, for example, through regular appearances on Omrop Fryslan’s TV programmes. This was despite the fact that, as a member of the OMT, he had at least the same knowledge as that contained in the RKI files and autopsy reports discussed above. As **Exhibit 124**, Minks et al. submit an example of a contribution by Hofstra on Omrop Fryslan dated 4 November 2020, in which Hofstra, amongst other things, publicly declared that stricter measures were needed urgently, as well as a contribution by Hofstra on ‘RondOm Drachten’ in which he further propagates the false Covid-19 narrative.

Van Dissel

90. As a member of the OMT, Van Dissel publicly defended the false COVID-19 narrative and propagated it, for example, through regular appearances on TV programmes and at press conferences, whilst, as OMT chair, he had at least the same knowledge as that contained in the RKI files and autopsy reports discussed above.

Koopmans

91. As a member of the OMT, Koopmans publicly defended the false Covid-19 narrative and promoted it, for example, through regular appearances on TV programmes, whilst, as an OMT member, she had at least the same knowledge as can be gleaned from the RKI files and autopsy reports discussed above.

Rutte

92. As Prime Minister, Rutte publicly defended the false Covid-19 narrative and promoted it, for example, through regular appearances on TV programmes and at press conferences, whilst, as Prime Minister, he had at least the same knowledge as can be gleaned from the RKI files and autopsy reports discussed above.
93. Rutte, an implementer of the ‘Covid-19: The Great Reset’ project, has recently risen to become the face of NATO and is thus responsible within that organisation for the information operations and psyops designed to completely destroy the Western world, with the ultimate aim of establishing The New World Order. The continuation of his unlawful conduct is evident.

Kaag

94. Given her role, social standing and responsibility, Kaag's outright denials cannot be taken seriously. Kaag is clearly an implementer of the global project 'Covid-19: The Great Reset'.

De Jonge

95. As regards De Jonge, Minks et al. further point out that before De Jonge unleashed his propaganda for the Janssen Covid-19 injection on the Dutch population, he had already been informed by the RIVM in an email dated 14 June 2021 regarding the serious health effects of this vaccine on young people. Nevertheless, he continued his propaganda campaigns 'Dancing with Janssen' and 'Flirting with Janssen' in support of the Janssen Covid-19 injection. This demonstrates the malicious intent of this implementer of the 'Covid-19: The Great Reset' project. These videos form part of NATO's psyops and InfoOps. A copy of the email from the Ministry of Health, Welfare and Sport dated 14 April 2021, together with three videos relating to De Jonge's propaganda referred to here, is submitted as **Exhibit 125**.

Kuipers

96. With regard to Kuipers in particular, he is the person who, having knowledge of the contents of the RKI files, did everything in his power to prevent such information from being released in the Netherlands, as this could jeopardise the implementation of the 'Covid-19: The Great Reset' project. Kuipers' malicious intent as the implementer of this project is evident here. With regard to the systematic violations of information rights by Kuipers, Minks et al. submit, as **Exhibit 126**, an article from *De Volkskrant* dated 21 November 2023. In this context, reference is also made to Exhibit 109, already submitted, in which Kuipers refused to disclose information, stating: *'I refuse to disclose the OMT documentation you have requested, including the audio recordings, transcripts and a summary of the OMT's other reports'*.
97. Following the aforementioned refusal, the District Court of North Holland, Haarlem Division, in proceedings in which a political party was the applicant, ordered the Ministry of Health, Welfare and Sport, as understood by Minks et al., to file 29 OMT recordings with the court registry. Minks et al. request that your court order the State to consent to these OMT recordings being introduced into these proceedings.

Gommers

98. Gommers clearly participated in a NATO-led PsyOp to neutralise healthcare staff through toxic Covid-19 injections, with the aim of further straining healthcare capacity in order to project a pandemic into the preferred reality.

99. Gommers, who knew everything about the Pfizer trials, the RKI documents, the pathological examinations, etc., is to be held responsible for the death of Monique Tiekens (claimant No. 7), who was one of the first healthcare workers to lose her life as a result of the PsyOp carried out by Gommers using toxic Covid-19 injections.
100. Lizette Verhoeven from Eindhoven reported on the workings of the PsyOp, of which Gommers is a co-organisier. She confidently had a Covid-19 Astra Ze Neca injection because she had no reason to believe it was anything other than safe. Shortly after the injection, she suffered a brain haemorrhage. From her hospital bed, she heard Gommers on TV wholeheartedly praising the injections – which had nearly cost her her life – as ‘safe’. This was reported by Ongehoord Nederland in a television programme. As **Exhibit 127**, Minks et al. submit the video from Ongehoord Nederland dated 15 September 2023.
101. Minks et al. consider the Latin meaning of the name Astra Ze Neca to be clear evidence that the toxic Covid-19 injections sold under her name were specifically produced for the purposes of the project ‘Covid-19: The Great Reset’. In that project, Astra Ze Neca, with her most lethal injections, was ‘The Star of Death’. As **Exhibit 128**, Minks et al. submit a Google translation of the name ‘Astra Ze Neca’, which, when translated from Latin into Dutch, means ‘The Star of Death’, as well as information regarding Astra Ze Neca’s membership of the WEF.

Hoekstra

102. Hoekstra acknowledges being a member of the WEF and admits to not having opposed (‘no unconditional commitment’) the implementation of the Covid-19: The Great Reset project, regarding which he demonstrates in his conclusion that he is fully acquainted with the content of this project. Hoekstra is immersing himself in his new roles as European Commissioner responsible for the ‘Green Conversion’ PsyOp. This forms part of the StratCom information operations and PsyOps in the field of climate change, aimed at implementing the ‘Covid-19: The Great Reset’ project. Hoekstra is continuing with this undeterred in his role as a co-implementer of the ‘Covid-19: The Great Reset’ project, albeit under a different guise.
103. The fact that Hoekstra is a ruthless implementer of the ‘Covid-19: The Great Reset’ project is evident from the apparent ease with which positions he has defended for years are being swapped for new ones – provided those new positions serve the strategic interests of the ‘Covid-19: The Great Reset’ project. For example, during a hearing on 6 October 2023 in connection with his appointment as European Commissioner, Hoekstra presented himself as the driving force behind his party’s shift towards ‘Green’ policies, only to state shortly afterwards, on or around 16 October 2023, that he played only a modest role within his party – despite the fact that he was the group leader and lead candidate of his party.

104. As is the case with all the defendants, Hoekstra, given his positions, is fully aware of everything: the RKI files, the post-mortem reports, the Pfizer studies, the instruction given to Hugo de Jonge to sideline healthcare staff and enforce the highest possible ‘willingness to be vaccinated’, the non-existence of a medical pandemic, etc. The argument that he was unaware of this will not save him, for he is a political opportunist who changes his tune with the wind.

Van Nieuwenhuizen

105. As for Van Nieuwenhuizen, she, like all the defendants, is fully aware of everything: the RKI files, the autopsy reports, the Pfizer studies, the instruction given to Hugo de Jonge to sideline healthcare staff and enforce the highest possible ‘willingness to be vaccinated’, the non-existence of a medical pandemic, etc.
106. Given her position, Van Nieuwenhuizen should not have failed to protect the citizens of the Netherlands against the implementation of the ‘Covid-19: The Great Reset’ project. The fact that she failed to do so, and also completely undermined the legal protection that the Aarhus Convention could have provided, means that, as a co-implementer of the ‘Covid-19: The Great Reset’ project, she is liable towards Minks et al. Van Nieuwenhuizen is continuing with this project in her new role as chair of Energie Nederland, the trade association for energy companies. In this role, she is responsible for the StratCom information operations and PsyOps relating to climate change, in furtherance of the ‘Covid-19: The Great Reset’ project.

Sijbesma

107. As is the case with all the defendants, Sijbesma, given his positions, is also fully aware of everything: the RKI files, the autopsy reports, the Pfizer studies, the instruction given to Hugo de Jonge to sideline healthcare staff and enforce the highest possible ‘willingness to be vaccinated’, the non-existence of a medical pandemic, etc. The suggestion that Sijbesma did not know what he was doing is utter nonsense.
108. Sijbesma is pretending not to have understood that the claimants’ claims relate to the material and non-material damage they have suffered because the defendants, including Sijbesma, placed them in a ‘preferred reality’ and, within that preferred reality, they suffered as a result of entirely unnecessary measures. Creating that preferred reality is precisely what Sijbesma did, for example, by setting up the testing centres and acting as an intermediary in the procurement of Covid-19 injections. The same applies to the broadcast on *Buitenhof*, where he stood in front of students waving his measuring tape to maintain the 1.5-metre distance from others prescribed in the preferred reality.
109. Sijbesma simply denies any conflict of interest arising from his many incompatible positions and interests. A clear example of a massive conflict of interest involving substantial public funds relates to the fact that Hans Sijbesma, Sijbesma’s brother, is a director at Astra Ze Neca. Astra

Ze Neca, like Sijbesma, is a prominent member of the WEF (see Exhibit 128). Regarding his contacts with his brother, Sijbesma stated on 8 June 2020 that he ‘knows the director and chairman of Astra Ze Neca well and has been in contact with him’. Sijbesma further stated in this regard that, during these contacts with Astra Ze Neca, he had expressed the interest shown by the State and other countries in assessing whether they might wish to consider a deal with Astra Ze Neca. The State subsequently made its first purchase of Covid-19 vaccines from Astra Ze Neca for a sum of 700 million euros. A clearer conflict of interest is scarcely conceivable. In Exhibit 129, Minks et al. provide information relating to the purchase from Astra Ze Neca.

110. In August 2020, the State et al. formally stated that Sijbesma carries out his duties as special envoy entirely without personal interest. In response, Sijbesma stated, amongst other things, that he is happy to contribute to the national interest by offering non-binding advice and sharing his insights into relevant developments concerning vaccines. Both statements are therefore projections in the preferred reality and demonstrate that the State and Sijbesma are jointly implementing the project: Covid-19: The Great Reset.
111. In the preferred reality, Sijbesma has offered his services to the government without seeking any personal gain. The Truth, however, is that all parties are participating in the psyops and information operations necessary for the implementation of the project ‘Covid-19: The Great Reset’. In this project, Sijbesma was enlisted as a go-between, given his managerial experience in the industry, his loyalty to the WEF and his important role in the project ‘Covid-19: The Great Reset’. To enable Sijbesma to fulfil this role as a ‘front man’ and to liaise with all parties to that end, he was given the cover role of special coronavirus envoy in the preferred reality.
112. Incidentally, shortly before the introduction of the official Covid-19 narrative—which states that Covid-19 is a disease caused by the SARS-CoV-2 virus, which was transmitted from a bat to a human at an animal market in Wuhan—on 23 August 2019, he joined the Supervisory Board of the WEF with the task of overseeing the WEF’s mission and values. Six months later, in March 2020, he took up the post of ‘special coronavirus envoy’ and did exactly what the WEF expected of him.
113. Sijbesma, now also regarded in the preferred reality as a ‘climate’ advocate, continues unabated with the implementation of the project ‘Covid-19: The Great Reset’. As is the case for all defendants, Sijbesma is also accused of unlawful omission for failing to oppose the implementation of this project.

Causal link

114. The causal link between the material and non-material damage suffered by the claimants and the joint liability for the co-implementation of the ‘Covid-19: The Great Reset’ project is established because, without cooperation in the implementation of this project (in the Netherlands), the claimants would not have been subject to any measures and would therefore not have suffered any material and/or non-material damage.

Damages

115. The claimants' damages are, on the one hand, material and consist of personal injury, psychological harm resulting from the injections, and financial loss resulting from a loss of income and assets due to the measures they were forced to undergo. On the other hand, their damages are non-material due to the grief caused by the injustice inflicted upon them and their loved ones, including claimant No. 7, Monique Tieken, who lost her life as a result of this injustice, as well as sorrow and emotional distress in the form of a loss of joy in life. Even if the claimants had not received a Covid-19 vaccination, they would therefore still have suffered material and non-material damage, albeit to a lesser extent.

V. Response to Bourla's statement of defence

116. Bourla's statement of defence covers no topics other than those already addressed in this statement of reply. Minks et al. have already addressed in detail the 'preferred reality', the marketing authorisation, Pfizer's report dated 30 April 2021, graphene oxide, the unlawful conduct, the causal link and joint and several liability. Minks et al. hereby once again explicitly point out the absence of a medical pandemic and the significant differences between Pfizer batches, meaning that, for that reason alone, there can be no question of a 'vaccine' or a valid marketing authorisation. Minks et al. refer to their position set out above regarding all the topics raised by Bourla in order to avoid unnecessary repetition.
117. Incidentally, it also applies here that Minks et al. maintain all their claims set out in the writ of summons, whilst conceding to Bourla that the Pfizer report of 30 April 2021 was wrongly characterised as a clinical trial by Minks et al. Minks's corrected and accurate view on this matter has been set out in this reply.
118. In addition to what Minks et al. have already stated, they wish to make the following further observations to further substantiate Bourla's liability.
119. Given his knowledge and experience with mRNA products, Bourla must be deemed fully aware of the fact, well-known in the medical world, that medical products based on mRNA technology and NLP's pose a very high risk to human health. For this reason, the mRNA platform used in the Covid-19 mRNA injections is, in itself, a **biological weapon**. Minks et al. provide explicit evidence in support of this assertion and, in this context, refer once again explicitly to Chapter III of this reply.
120. In response to Bourla's arguments in paragraph 95 et seq. regarding the differences between batches, Minks et al. note that these differences are clearly distinct. To this end, data analyst Wouter Aukema used special software to analyse data from official databases, thereby visually illustrating the extent and severity of the 'side effects' of different batches of Pfizer Covid-19 mRNA injections, as

reported to the Paul Ehrlich Institute in Germany. As **Exhibit 130**, Minks et al. submit Aukema's visual representation, which shows that there are very significant differences in the effects of the batches. Furthermore, Aukema has established that injections were administered in various postcode areas which had no effect whatsoever and can have been nothing other than an apparent saline solution. Aukema compiled an overview of these postcodes (**Exhibit 131**). Minks et al. provide explicit evidence of the differences in Pfizer Covid-19 injection batches through the testimony of Mr Aukema and the witnesses/experts referred to in Chapter III. The differences between batches alone – including the apparent saline solutions – make it abundantly clear that this is about carrying out a project and not about combating the alleged medical Covid-19 pandemic.

121. With regard to the arguments put forward by Minks et al. specifically concerning Pfizer batch EM0477, Minks et al. refer to an article from **De Andere Krant** dated 20 December 2024 (**Exhibit 132**). This article reveals that no fewer than forty deaths were reported in the Netherlands over a period of 11 days, all of which were attributable to the administration of a Covid-19 mRNA injection from the Pfizer batch EM0477.
122. As regards this Pfizer batch EM0477, which can only be described as a 'killer batch', there are further remarkable developments. The following points should be noted. No fewer than half of the killer batch EM0477 was withdrawn from general supply in the Netherlands in early February 2021. This is evident from the records relating to this 'killer batch', as only half of it was dispensed, and this dispensing ceased after yet another death linked to this batch was reported to Lareb the previous day, on 5 February 2021. The administration of this vaccine was subsequently suspended, which suggests that, at the very least, the person responsible was aware that this batch was highly lethal. The information regarding the registration of this batch in the Netherlands is submitted as **Exhibit 133**.
123. As regards Bourla's joint and several liability, Minks et al. note that, in his capacity, Bourla is aware of the 'Covid-19: The Great Reset' project, the Pfizer trials, the RKI documents, the pathological investigations, etc. The fact that Bourla persists in denying any involvement or knowledge, whilst continuing to project his preferred reality, renders him liable. Bourla is also liable in connection with his unlawful failure to put a stop to this malicious project.
124. In paragraphs 107–109 of Bourla's Statement of Defence, he addresses the question of whether 'Comirnaty' is a product based on gene therapy and responds to the arguments on this matter set out in the writ of summons. In doing so, Bourla relies on definitions from EU legislation. In this Statement of Rejoinder, Minks et al. have taken their definitive position that this is not a 'vaccine' at all, but exclusively a biological weapon. In view of this, the application of the EU definitions concerning medicinal products may remain open, as the

use of a biological weapon against the Dutch population, including Minks et al., is by definition unlawful.

125. Minks et al. have ^{provided} conclusive evidence that this is a biological weapon²⁵ by demonstrating that Bourla's assertions regarding the rapid breakdown of mRNA in the body and the local action of his 'Comirnaty' in the Delta muscle of the arm are gross fabrications intended solely to maximise 'willingness to be vaccinated' with this biological weapon.
126. Finally, it is the case that Bourla's direct rival, Stéphane Bancel of ^{Moderna}²⁶, had already been informed about the alleged pandemic as early as 2019 (**Exhibit 118**). Apparently, this information regarding the 'Covid-19: The Great Reset' project was known in advance to the CEOs of companies involved in 'vaccine development'. This therefore also applies to Bourla.


VI. Response to the statement of defence by Van Cann and Jansen

127. In this response by Minks et al. to the statement of defence by Van Cann and Jansen, too, only those assertions will be addressed which have not yet been refuted or discussed in this reply (either in a more general sense or in relation to another defendant). The following points are made in this regard.
128. In paragraph 4 of their statement of defence, Van Cann and Jansen argue that the claimants' decision not to sue Van Cann and Jansen's employers, but to bring a claim against them in their private capacity, is based on a strategy devised by the Recht Oprecht Foundation, of which Minks et al. (and their solicitors) are allegedly part. In reality, however, the Recht Oprecht Foundation has absolutely no influence whatsoever on the proceedings or the content of the pleadings drawn up by the solicitors acting on behalf of Minks et al. Van Cann and Jansen, who claim to practise honest journalism, thereby demonstrate their contempt for the Truth. The reason for summoning Van Cann and Jansen in a private capacity is clear: they have personally acted unlawfully towards Minks et al. by, in the context of implementing the 'Covid-19: The Great Reset, as co-implementers of this project, projecting a preferred reality onto the general public, thereby misleading Minks et al. into having a Covid-19 jab.
129. The acts and omissions of Van Cann and Jansen resulted in this preferred reality being broadcast with great intensity via *De Telegraaf* and the NOS. By placing Minks et al. within this preferred reality in this manner (and by failing to provide a strong counter-narrative), the deception of Minks et al. went so far that they received Covid-19 injections. Had Van Cann and Jansen fulfilled their journalistic responsibilities, this would not have happened.

²⁵ See in particular paragraphs 50 to 58 inclusive of this reply.

²⁶ This name is a portmanteau of the words 'MODE' and 'RNA', and, like the meaning of the name Astra Ze Neca, this is by no means a coincidence.

130. Taking legal action against media legal entities in a case of such great social and historical significance as this serves no purpose whatsoever. It may be noted that, as a legal entity, De Telegraaf was banned for many years after the Second World War from publishing a newspaper due to its Nazi propaganda during the Second World War, and yet it still exists today. Nazi propaganda, too, is a preferential reality. Taking legal action against a media legal entity in a case such as this is therefore, as history teaches us, utterly pointless.
131. Attention has already been paid to the NATO-led information operations and PsyOps aimed at implementing the ‘Covid-19: The Great Reset’ project. In order to further clarify the role of the fully controlled media in this context – including Van Cann and Jansen as those ultimately responsible for journalism – Minks et al. will examine this in depth in this section.
132. In the preferred reality, NATO does not have a permanent PsyOp organisation. The truth, however, is that, for the implementation of the ‘Covid-19: The Great Reset’ project, such an organisation is indeed constantly present to keep everyone within the preferred reality. To this end, NATO and the USA (Pentagon) have set up the so-called CJPOTF (Combined Joint Psychological Operations Task Force) to increase the intensity of the preferred reality. The CJPOTF forms the network through which the PsyOp activities are carried out.
133. Below is an organisational chart with a table of contents listing all NATO parties tasked with keeping the Dutch population, including Minks and others, within a preferred reality for the implementation of the ‘Covid-19: The Great Reset’ project. The ultimate aim is to bring about a **New World Order**. The organisational chart shows that the ‘Product Development Centre’ (PDC) listed therein **must have access to all media platforms, such as radio, television, newspapers and the internet**.



134. PsyOps are carried out by specialised units under the command of the CJPOTF. Their implementation requires close coordination with Info Ops and other functions, such as military public affairs and Civil-Military Cooperation (CIMIC). International organisations such as the UN and non-governmental organisations (NGOs) contribute to the stabilisation and development of the PsyOp (preferred reality). Civil-military cooperation and interaction are essential for a PsyOp to succeed.
135. In the Netherlands, to support the organisation as set out in the organisational chart, there is the Joint Intelligence, Surveillance, Target Acquisition & Reconnaissance Command (JISTARC) and a Civil-Military Interaction Command (CMI Command), where approximately 500 people are employed on a permanent basis. Together with the support units in other NATO countries, this constitutes an organisation involving many thousands of military personnel who are exclusively dedicated to manipulating facts and events in such a way as to project a preferred reality onto the civilian population, including Minks and his associates.

136. Within the aforementioned CMI Command (CMIC) is the Psyops platoon²⁷, which focuses on psychological operations.
137. For PsyOps and Info Ops, complete control via NGOs and fully controlled (local) media is required in order to place and maintain the civilian population within a preferred reality. In the Netherlands, the Psyops platoon has access to the media and influential figures, including Van Cann and Jansen. The manner in which NATO enforces the necessary complete control over the media and influential figures is described in paragraph A-22 (page 83) of **NATO STANDARD AJP 3.19**. A copy of this is submitted as **Exhibit 134**.
138. In **NATO STANDARD AJP 3.19 (Exhibit 134)**, paragraphs 4.15 and 4.16 set out that CMIC leadership must actively participate in the media landscape in such a way that it effectively supports media producers, thereby shaping the media environment and the perceptions disseminated by the media. Marginal note 4.17 of the NATO STANDARD explains that the role of CMIC is to ensure that the civilian population accepts the broadcast ‘preferred reality’ as a ‘new normal’. This explains the media introduction of terms such as ‘vaccination willingness’ and ‘willingness to die’, which, as part of a PsyOp, serve precisely this purpose.
139. Another essential component of CMIC is the countering of information detrimental to the success of the ‘Covid-19: The Great Reset’ project – or, as Van Cann and Jansen term it, ‘**disinformation**’. This is combated using PsyOps and InfoOps in the form of so-called ‘fact-checking’ and ‘debunking’. Van Cann and Jansen bear ultimate responsibility for this within the media channels they oversee. As **Exhibit 135**, Minks et al. submit a screenshot of the NATO website relating to ‘Covid-19 disinformation’.
140. In military terms, fact-checkers constitute ‘a capability’ for combating disinformation. During the alleged Covid-19 pandemic, weekly reports from the ‘Information Domain Monitoring’ (MID) invariably referred to ‘actions taken’ when fact-checks were concerned. Even when the fact-checks themselves contained incorrect information. After all, the aim was to safeguard the Covid-19 narrative.
141. As part of the ‘Covid-19: The Great Reset’ project, Van Cann and Jansen ruthlessly followed the military instructions they received via the criminal organisational structure described here, with the result that the entire media landscape in the Netherlands is now controlled by NATO for the purposes of implementing the ‘Covid-19: The Great Reset’ project. Had Van Cann and Jansen personally refused to cooperate and had they fulfilled their journalistic duty, they would, in fact, have publicly exposed all of this. The fact that they did not do so is a serious charge against them.

²⁷ A platoon in the Dutch army is part of a company and, depending on its task, consists of around 20 to 40 soldiers led by an officer: usually a lieutenant.

142. Minks et al. provide explicit evidence of the existence of the organisational structure described here and of the fact that Van Cann and Jansen allowed themselves to be guided by it, thereby completely neglecting their journalistic duties and responsibilities, with the result that the Dutch population may have fallen victim to the preferred reality projected in part by Van Cann and Jansen. Minks et al. provide further evidence through the examination under oath of retired Major-General Van Kappen. Furthermore, as additional evidence of this, Minks et al. submit, as **Exhibit 136**, a screenshot of the CMIC website.

VI. Response to Gates' statement of defence

143. In this response by Minks et al. to Gates's statement of defence, too, only those assertions are addressed which have not yet been refuted or raised in this reply (either in a more general sense or in relation to another defendant). The following points are made in this regard.
144. Gates presents himself as a philanthropist in whom the world can place its trust because he is said to do good and provide accurate information about health risks relating to the disease Covid-19 and the Covid-19 injections developed to combat it. His statements in this regard make global headlines. He is one of the most famous people in ^{the world}.²⁸
145. Gates, too, pretends not to have understood that the claimants' claims relate to the material and non-material damage they have suffered because they were placed in a 'preferred reality' by the defendants, including Gates, and have suffered as a result of entirely unnecessary measures within that preferred reality. The creation of that preferred reality is precisely what Gates, as a co-implementer of the 'Covid-19: The Great Reset' project, is doing, for example, by deploying the Gates Foundation to combat 'viral infections' including 'corona' and, as a 'philanthropist', channelling enormous flows of money as investments to combat 'the Covid-19 disease'. The videos shown by Minks et al. (Exhibits 75 and 76 in the summons) illustrate how Gates himself projects this preferred reality onto the world's population.
146. In his statement of defence, Gates also goes to great lengths to uphold the preferred narrative, thereby revealing himself all the more as a co-implementer of the 'Covid-19: The Great Reset' project. Like the other defendants, Gates continues to maintain that the Covid-19 mRNA injections were safe and did not contain any toxic or hazardous substances such as graphene oxide. Furthermore, Gates claims that the administration of this biological weapon was carried out with the 'informed consent' of Minks et al., a claim which is expressly disputed and for which there is no evidence whatsoever.

²⁸ In this context, 'known' by no means implies 'aware'.

147. Gates further attempts to shield himself from personal liability by hiding behind the facades of legal entities, all of which are co-executors of the ‘Covid-19: The Great Reset’ project. Gates can be seriously criticised for his conduct, given that, as a co-implementer of that project, he has invested his fame and wealth as a ‘philanthropist’ in order, amongst other things, to increase the ‘willingness to be vaccinated’ amongst the world’s population, knowing full well that this was in reality tantamount to committing genocide through the use of a biological weapon. For the record, it should be noted that the ‘Covid-19: The Great Reset’ project is being implemented through various sectors of society which ultimately determine how society functions. Gates exerts his influence across all these areas.
148. His involvement, as a ‘philanthropist’, with substantial sums of money in the ‘Covid-19: The Great Reset’ project – which Gates refers to as ‘investments’ – and his collaboration with fellow implementers within the framework of that project is in itself unlawful; moreover, it is more than foreseeable that Minks and others will suffer harm as a result, or at least that the likelihood of harm will increase. In view of the genocide perpetrated as part of the project and the foreseeable global harm resulting from the ‘Covid measures’ implemented in the preferred reality, the foreseeable harm should have deterred Gates from participating in the group of co-implementers of the Covid-19: The Great Reset project. There is no need to further argue that the co-executors within the group have engaged in unlawful conduct, just as it is crystal clear that, given his social standing, knowledge and experience, Gates must be held accountable for his participation in all of this.
149. Minks et al. point out once again that Moderna’s CEO was already aware in 2019 of what was to come in the ‘preferred reality’ and, in response, increased the production of the toxic Covid-19 injections for the following year ten thousand-fold (!). It is important to note here that the patent submitted by Minks et al. as Exhibit 72 in the writ of summons does indeed relate to beta coronavirus mRNA injections and therefore – contrary to Gates’s assertion – has nothing to do with HIV. In his statement of defence, Gates acknowledges that, as early as 2011, he had been ‘investing’ in Pfizer and Moderna via this patent. Furthermore, the information submitted by Minks et al. as Exhibit 73 regarding the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation is relevant; this – again, contrary to Gates’s claims – clearly shows that an agreement was concluded with Moderna in 2016 which applied not only to mRNA injections against HIV but, above all, to ‘various infectious diseases’. In view of the aforementioned patent (Exhibit 72 to the summons), it is therefore clear that the primary focus was on the development of Covid-19 mRNA injections, in relation to which Gates also clearly had prior knowledge of the pandemic which, in the preferred reality, would be imposed on the world’s population by, amongst others, himself. It is a matter of common knowledge that Gates himself describes his investments in ‘vaccines’ as his best investments ever. Gates has channelled billions of dollars into the ‘Covid-19: The Great Reset’ project in order to establish the New World Order. The investments in what he calls ‘vaccines’, including the toxic Covid-19 mRNA injections, form part of this. Below is an overview of these cash flows channelled by Gates, whether or not through the legal entities (fronts) he utilises.

150. In order to present the financial interests or ‘investments’ in the co-implementers of the ‘Covid-19: The Great Reset’ project (front organisations) clearly to your court, an overview of these amounts is included below for illustrative purposes.



151. In the context of the sums paid by Gates to facilitate the promotion of the preferred reality by media companies, Gates contributed USD 319,000,000 under the ‘Committed grants’ façade of the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. A breakdown of this sum is submitted as **Exhibit**

137. Through his wealth, fame, connections and legal entities, Gates has the capacity to exert significant influence, including on the WHO. As evidence of that influence – which, incidentally, is a matter of common knowledge – Minks et al. submit, as **Exhibit 138**, information sourced from Fox News which reports on this matter based on a Twitter post by Gates himself.

152. In view of the foregoing, it is clear that whilst Gates (co-)organised the global pandemic drills described in the summons and made media appearances reaching billions of people worldwide, he had a vested interest in ensuring that the Covid-19 pandemic, as planned in the ‘preferred reality’, would materialise, leading – as rehearsed – to far-reaching ‘Covid-19 measures’.

153. Gates' influence on governments' 'coronavirus policy' is characterised by the fact that, under the guise of his legal entities, he intervenes directly and personally in the roll-out of the Covid-19: The Great Reset project. An example of this is the direct contact Gates has with the then Prime Minister of New Zealand, Jacinda Ardern, who was trained and installed by the WEF. Gates rewarded Ardern with a sum of USD 30,000,000 for her efforts to maximise 'vaccination willingness' in New Zealand by intensively projecting the preferred reality there. Robin de Boer of Nine for News published a highly informative article on this subject, which is submitted as **Exhibit 139**. That article also reveals Gates' direct involvement in Germany through his 'Gates Foundation Paper', which the German RKI was required to implement. Furthermore, Exhibit 138 comprises a Forbes article dated 4 June 2022, which reveals a payment of USD 30,000,000 to Ardern, as well as evidence that Ardern was trained by the WEF.
154. Further serious evidence of Gates' direct influence is his financial support for the UK's Medicines & Healthcare products Regulatory Agency (MHRA). The MHRA played a highly reprehensible role in censoring extremely alarming data that reached it at the start of the Covid-19 vaccination campaign. This went so far that, in January 2021, the MHRA even explicitly requested the Secretary of State for Health, via the EMA, to suppress reporting on the alarming data across Europe ('to help kill the story'). This evidence consists of WhatsApp messages released from early January 2021, the start of the genocide brought about by the Covid-19 vaccination campaign. The MHRA also played a highly reprehensible role in keeping under wraps the report from March 2024, submitted as **Exhibit 123**, which revealed the significantly increased risks of the aforementioned AESIs. This same MHRA is funded by Gates. When asked about the flow of funds originating from Gates, the MHRA refused to disclose information on this matter, apparently due to pressure exerted. The fact that Gates continues with all this and, in his statement of defence, denies his very significant influence and close ties with national authorities and government ministers speaks volumes. As **Exhibit 140**, Minks et al. submit information sourced from the internet concerning WhatsApps, the report withheld by the MHRA, Gates' financial involvement and the MHRA's refusal to provide transparency regarding the funding flows originating from Gates.
155. In order to deliver a final blow in this reply to the argument put forward by all the defendants that the Covid-19 injections do not contain any hazardous substances, Minks et al. submit, as **Exhibit 141**, a peer-reviewed study from the **International Journal of Vaccine Theory, Practice and Research**, published on 11 October 2024. This study reveals that the experimental Covid-19 injections contain at least 55 elements that cannot be chemically identified and that all Covid-19 injections examined contain the hazardous heavy metal chromium. Furthermore, this study demonstrates that arsenic, nickel, cobalt, copper, tin, cadmium, lead, manganese and mercury are found in the Covid-19 mRNA injections.

VII Response to Kant's statement of defence

156. In paragraph 238 of the writ of summons, Minks et al. offer only one statement regarding Kant's remarks: Kant is lying. Having read Kant's statement of defence, this statement requires further clarification: Kant is lying through her teeth!
157. To ensure a proper understanding of the arguments put forward by Minks et al., they first of all expressly point out once again that the term 'side effects', as used by the defendants, including Kant, is derived from the 'preferential reality'. The Truth, however, is that the Covid-19 injections are a biological weapon and that what are referred to in the 'preferential reality' as 'side effects' actually constitute the damage intended by this biological weapon (a primary effect). Any subsequent reference to 'side effects' does not, therefore, imply that Minks et al. are aligning themselves with the defendants' preferred reality regarding 'vaccines' and their 'side effects'.
158. Kant's argument essentially boils down to the fact that, when registering reports, Lareb applied an internal reporting procedure in such a way that no 'signals' became apparent that would have necessitated any intervention. Given the number of reported deaths and batch-related serious adverse reactions, this internal procedure amounts to nothing other than the 'cover-up' alleged by Minks et al. in the writ of summons. Kant was well aware of the numerous reports of serious adverse reactions and the significant and striking differences between the batches. It is noteworthy in this regard that Kant claims to have known that batch EM0477 was a dreadful 'killer batch' and yet continues to hide behind the internal systems and procedures that she herself set up, from 2013 onwards, together with the co-implementers of the 'Covid-19: The Great Reset' project. After all, Kant states in paragraph 42 of her submission:

'No conclusions can be drawn from the number of reports relating to a specific batch number'

159. On 3 December 2020, an internal memo was drawn up by the RIVM, specifically the Centre for Epidemiology and Surveillance of Infectious Diseases (EPI) under the leadership of its head, Dr Susan van den Hof, in collaboration with Kant. In the intended scenario, this memo was intended to impress upon staff responsible for recording adverse reactions the necessity of recording batch numbers. A large part of the memo therefore deals with the importance of recording batch numbers, which is, in principle, entirely justified, as effective monitoring is not possible without batch numbers. Minks et al. submit three pages of this memo – obtained via a whistleblower – as **Exhibit 142**.
160. In reality, however, this memo had a sinister purpose, namely to project a preferred reality onto the staff tasked with recording 'adverse reactions' in such a way that those staff would be led to believe that it is normal for a 'vaccine' to exhibit '*batch-specific characteristics*' and '*serious adverse reactions*'. The idea that there could be such a thing as a 'specific characteristic

of a batch' is introduced in this memo to lead the reader, within the preferred reality, to believe that it is normal for not all batches of a medical product to be (or have to be) the same. The memo is thus a textbook example of the neuro-linguistic programming of the reader, for which this memo was written by Kant.

161. This note states that recording batch numbers is important for decision-making, giving the following example:


*'warning people who have received a particular vaccine or **a particular batch of a vaccine** due to (inter)national safety signals...'*

162. The Lareb staff who were informed by this memo and processed the reports – and, of course, recorded the batch numbers for all reports – have therefore, as a result of this memo, absorbed the false information that it is normal for there to be batches with specific characteristics and that, should something serious be found to be wrong with a batch, people would be warned in that context. The truth, however, is that all batches must be identical, and if they are not, action must be taken. The truth is also that **no one** is warned about serious side effects relating to a specific batch of a Covid-19 vaccine that has been administered to them.
163. The memo was therefore necessary to maintain the illusion amongst Lareb staff that, despite 'signals', there were no batch-specific problems for which victims of extremely toxic batches of Covid-19 injections would need to be warned.
164. A careful reading of this memo also reveals that, on 3 December 2020, Kant and Van den Hof were already aware that, in the Covid-19 vaccination campaign due to start the following month, various batches with 'specific properties' and 'serious side effects' would be distributed amongst the Dutch population, including Minks et al. It follows that Kant and Van den Hof did exactly what they were appointed to do in the 'Covid-19: The Great Reset' project, namely to mislead the public in order to facilitate the large-scale Covid-19 vaccination campaign. It was precisely for this reason that Kant orchestrated a cover-up. This cover-up is crucial to maintaining 'vaccination uptake' at a high level. In this way, Kant and Van den Hof have played a crucial role in the genocide being carried out with the aid of a biological weapon. All bodies similar to Lareb and EPI have applied the same sinister cover-up scheme worldwide.
165. The truth is that shortly after the start of the Covid-19 vaccination campaign in the Netherlands, Lareb was inundated with a huge number of reports of serious side effects and deaths that had occurred shortly after a Covid-19 vaccination had been administered. Kant had organised her organisation in such a way that there was insufficient capacity to process this flood of reports correctly. Despite this lack of capacity, and in view of the above, it was therefore already perfectly clear to Kant from the outset that the biological weapon would destroy the health and lives of many people. Minks et al. have included a graph below showing the

the actual number of deaths reported in the period from 10 January 2021 to 25 March 2021. It should be borne in mind that the actual number of deaths (‘adverse reactions’) is many times higher. This graph shows that the deployment of the bioweapon effectively marked the start of the destruction of human lives.

Vaccinaties en doden na vaccinatie per dag jan-mrt 2021

Gebaseerd op cijfers portal en open.minvws.nl



166. This overview clearly shows that as more Covid-19 injections were administered, the number of deaths rose. The trend line indicates that this increase in deaths occurred among people who had received a Covid-19 injection shortly beforehand. Prior to the vaccination campaign, there was no increase in deaths. Batch EM0477 alone accounted for no fewer than 33 reported deaths in the Netherlands during the period from 25 January 2021 to 5 February 2021. To this end, Minks et al. present the table below, drawn from the VAERS data.



Search Results

From the 11/4/2022 release of VAERS data (an older release, current is 11/29/2024):

Found 33 cases where Vaccine targets COVID-19 (COVID19 or COVID19-2) and Lot Number contains 'EM0477' and Patient Died and CDC Split Type contains 'NLPFIZER' and Vaccination Date on/before '2021-03-31'

Government Disclaimer on use of this data

Table

Year,Month,Day of Vaccination	Count	Percent
2021-01-25	1	3.03%
2021-01-26	1	3.03%
2021-01-27	6	18.18%
2021-01-28	7	21.21%
2021-01-29	3	9.09%
2021-01-30	2	6.06%
2021-02-02	4	12.12%
2021-02-03	1	3.03%
2021-02-04	7	21.21%
2021-02-05	1	3.03%
TOTAL	33	100%

167. With regard to the deaths linked to batch EM0477, it should also be borne in mind that the actual number of deaths is much higher than the reported figure. Wherever this 'batch with specific characteristics' – as referred to by Kant in the memo – was administered in Europe, it turned into a bloodbath with many deaths. In France, 105 deaths were reported; in Germany, 66; in Spain, 34; in Belgium, 24; in Norway, 21; in Denmark, 16; in Ireland, 6; in Malta, 6; in Switzerland, 4; and in Estonia, ³²⁹. The deaths reported in the Netherlands in connection with this 'batch with specific characteristics' involved people aged 65 and over, 90 per cent of whom died in January and February 2021.
168. 'Killer batches' such as EM0477, referred to by Kant as 'a batch with specific characteristics', account for the vast majority of deaths occurring shortly after a Covid-19 vaccination. Research from Denmark has shown that just four per cent of the Pfizer vaccines used in Denmark were responsible for 71 per cent of all reported adverse reactions. That four per cent comprised nine specific batch numbers, which had been used early in the vaccination campaign. They were also found to be linked to 47 per cent of all reported deaths (579) in the Scandinavian country. Kant's claim that no conclusions can be drawn from the number of reports relating to a specific batch number is a blatant lie.
169. The fact that Kant is lying through her teeth is also evident from an internal email dated 3 May 2021 concerning feedback from the safety monitoring consultation between the CBG, Lareb, RIVM and VWS held on 29 April 2021. This email is submitted by Minks et al. as **Exhibit 143**. It includes, amongst other things:

²⁹ Source: European database (EudraVigilance)

‘...Lareb reports that they received a large number of reports of (deep vein) thrombosis within a very short period of time; as a result, they decided to carry out further investigations, which they presented on Thursday during a separate meeting. The CBG emphasises the importance of a thorough substantiation of findings. Only after the causality has been assessed can they submit anything to the EU/AZ; observational research alone is insufficient for this...’

170. The cover-up mechanism therefore works in such a way that, under the system set up by Kant, a report is completely pointless as long as its causality has not been assessed. It is clear that Lareb is either incapable of doing so or entirely inadequate for the task. Minks et al. will, for further clarification – insofar as they are able to do so at this stage of the proceedings – get to the bottom of Kant’s cover-up. In this regard, the following applies.

171. Minks et al. have already taken the position that all the documents relied upon by the defendants are derived from ‘preferential reality’ and have no evidential value whatsoever in support of the defendants’ claims. That position explicitly applies to Kant as well. The defendants, in particular Kant, speak endlessly of ‘scientific consensus’ in their statement of defence. The truth, however, is that what the defendants call ‘scientific consensus’ is nothing more than the bag of tricks of malicious illusionists, or in other words, ‘preferential reality’. Even the documents on which Kant relies are, to those willing to see and hear, nothing other than that. To show your court just how blatantly Kant is lying, a number of assertions from his statement of defence are quoted below and accompanied by a commentary based on reason and true facts.

172. Paragraph 27 of Kant’s statement of defence states the following:

‘It is true that Lareb would in fact be able to produce overviews of recorded adverse reactions by batch number. However, Lareb has not done so to date because this is not useful for safety monitoring. Such overviews are, in fact, not a suitable means of detecting any batch-related problems. To detect potential batch-related issues, Lareb does, however, carry out so-called ‘batch analyses’. During the COVID-19 pandemic, this took place once every two weeks. Using an automated analysis tool, the spectrum of reported adverse reactions per batch number is compared with the spectrum of the other batches. If certain adverse reactions occur more frequently with a specific batch, these reports are examined in more detail. However, this does not result in a list, but in a signal. This signal indicates that a particular adverse reaction occurs more frequently with a particular batch.’

173. This quotation reflects a fallacious line of reasoning. After all, carrying out an effective ‘batch analysis’ involves (among other things) compiling summaries of recorded ‘adverse reactions’ by batch number. These summaries clearly show the difference in the ‘adverse reactions’ between the individual batches. The ‘closer look’ at the incomplete batch analyses referred to by Kant amounts, when you get right down to it, to nothing more than ‘doing nothing’ about the already flawed batch analysis and constitutes a cover-up. A careful reading of this quotation therefore leads to Kant’s unconditional acknowledgement of the claimants’ assertion that a cover-up has taken place.

174. Paragraph 30 of Kant's statement of defence states the following:

With regard to Lareb, the Minister considered as follows:

Lareb has indicated that it does not have the requested documents, as such documents do not align with the way Lareb operates. Lareb carries out a fortnightly batch analysis. This batch analysis forms part of the regular safety monitoring of vaccines. The batch analysis does not produce a list, as you requested, but merely flags any occurrences that are more frequent in a particular batch. The article 'Optimising Safety Surveillance for COVID-19 Vaccines at the National Pharmacovigilance Centre Lareb: One Year of COVID-19 Vaccine Experience', which is available online, describes how safety monitoring specifically for COVID-19 vaccines is carried out. Furthermore, the results of the batch analyses are published on the Lareb website if an analysis yields results worthy of mention.'

175. The above quotation from Kant's conclusion serves to mask her cover-up. At first glance, this quotation gives the false impression that 'vaccine safety surveillance' is well safeguarded because a procedure described for this purpose exists. That procedure would then actually have to be about 'vaccine safety surveillance'. The truth, however, is that this procedure does the exact opposite and constitutes irrefutable evidence of Kant's cover-up. To demonstrate this, Minks et al. submit, as **Exhibit 144**, the online document 'Optimising Safety Surveillance for COVID-19 Vaccines at the National Pharmacovigilance Centre Lareb: One Year of COVID-19 Vaccine Experience', which is derived from the 'preferred reality'. The following points should be noted in this regard.

176. The first thing that stands out about this document (**Exhibit 144**) is that Kant himself is one of the authors. For this reason alone, this document has a high degree of 'We at WC-eend recommend WC-eend' bias. This document, which was published in the 'preferential reality' under an exclusive licence from 'Springer Nature Switzerland AG³⁰' as a 'research article', lists the following co-authors: Ingrid Oosterhuis, Joep Scholl and Florence van Hunsel (all affiliated with Lareb), as well as Eugène van Puijenbroek, who, in addition to Lareb, is also affiliated with PharmacoTherapy, Epidemiology and Economics, the University of Groningen and the Groningen Research Institute of Pharmacy. In short: the butcher is judging his own meat.

177. A closer reading of this document exposes the pitfall that the authors have dug for themselves and all their co-defendants. On this point, the following applies. In this English-language document—which is difficult or impossible to read for the Dutch population, including Minks et al.—the false Covid-19 narrative is repeated. It then explains the fortnightly 'batch analysis', which appears to be nothing more than a fully software-automated process. The right-hand column on page 68 of this document contains the following statement on this matter:

Standardised Morbidity Rates (SMR) were used to compare the number of spontaneously reported cases of the association of interest (Observed) in the COVID-19 vaccinated population with the Expected number based on Dutch background incidence rates within a risk window following immunisation, stratified by vaccine, dose, sex and age.

³⁰ In the preferred reality, a major publisher of 'academic literature'

178. To properly understand Kant's cover-up, this quotation first requires some clarification regarding the concept of '**morbidity**'. Morbidity is the number of people with a disease in relation to the number of individuals in the population in question within a specific time period; it is also known as the disease rate. For every disease in the Netherlands, there is a standardised morbidity ratio that compares the incidence of a particular disease among the Dutch population over a specific time period with the total population. As an example, the morbidity rate for diabetes in the Netherlands in 2024 was approximately 6 per cent. This means that 6 out of every 100 Dutch people had diabetes in 2024.
179. The automated Lareb 'batch analysis' process set up by Kant is therefore based on a comparison of the standardised morbidity ratios in the Netherlands with the reporting rate per morbidity for the Covid-19 vaccinations. This is – **deliberately and maliciously – comparing apples with pears**, because the under-reporting of adverse reactions is not taken into account in this comparison (!). After all, 'adverse reactions' are not reported until there is a suspicion of a link to 'the vaccination', but people living in the 'preferred reality' rarely harbour such a suspicion. In the 'preferred reality', there are, after all, no or hardly any other 'adverse reactions' to Covid-19 injections apart from fever and pain at the injection site. All other 'side effects' are 'very rare' in the preferred reality. Under-reporting plays a much smaller role in a morbidity ratio. After all, for most people in the Netherlands with a disease (such as diabetes), that disease has been diagnosed and recorded, so there is far less under-reporting of diseases than of 'side effects'. **For this reason alone, it is clear why the batch analysis carried out by Kant's Lareb is a farce.**
180. The truth is that this farce is even more malicious than this fact suggests. For what exactly did this batch analysis examine? Which '*association of interest*' was it referring to? The answer to this can be found a few lines further on:
- 'The batch analysis was performed for fever and for injection-site infection'*
181. It is therefore a fact that the already corrupt batch analysis by Kant's Lareb – in line with the false Covid-19 narrative – focused exclusively on reports of fever and pain at the injection site (!). A batch analysis should, of course, be carried out for all reported side effects. Moreover, fever and injection-site pain are reactions that regularly occur with all so-called 'immunisations' in the preferred reality.
182. The truth, therefore, is that the '*safety monitoring specifically for COVID-19 vaccines*' is, in reality, **Kant's cover-up**. This cover-up plays a crucial role in maximising 'vaccination willingness' and the deception required to continue attacking the Dutch population – including Minks and his associates – with a biological weapon.
183. In view of this cover-up by Kant, which must be regarded as proven, it should come as no surprise that the source data and results of Kant's 'batch analyses', including the 'heatmaps' mentioned in the document, were not made available alongside this document. The reason for this is clear: **it is a cover-up.**

184. Minks et al. have stated that Lareb was inundated with reports of ‘adverse reactions’. To enable your court to form a picture of the extremely high number of reports of ‘adverse reactions’ to the toxic Covid-19 injections, an explanation follows below.
185. In the Dutch Journal of Medical Microbiology 2019, volume 27, no. 3, a ‘scientific article’ entitled *‘Different perspectives on influenza vaccination among healthcare professionals’* states in the first column of page 139 that, for the period 2010–2013, the reporting rate for adverse reactions to influenza vaccinations at Lareb was approximately 0.0059 per cent. **That equates to 5.9 reports per 100,000 doses.** Minks et al. submit this ‘scientific article’ as **Exhibit 145.**
186. In the annual report of Kants’s Lareb, entitled *‘Reports of adverse reactions following influenza vaccinations, influenza season, report on the 2019–2020 influenza season’*, page 1 states that *over* three million Dutch people are vaccinated against influenza each year, and page 5 states that 491 reports of adverse reactions were submitted to Kants’s Lareb during the 2018–2019 influenza season. This translates to a reporting rate of (*less than*) 0.016 per cent. **That is therefore (less than) 16.4 reports per 100,000 doses.** Minks et al. present this annual report as **Exhibit 146.**
187. The document written by Kant cited above, *‘Optimising Safety Surveillance for COVID-19 Vaccines at the National Pharmacovigilance Centre Lareb: One Year of COVID-19 Vaccine Experience’*, states that Lareb received 184,411 individual reports relating to ‘COVID-19 vaccinations’. This translates to a reporting rate of 0.67 per cent for the year 2021. **That is therefore 670 reports per 100,000 doses.** This **relatively extremely high number of reports** shows that Kant could not care less how many reports – the key indicator par excellence – were submitted. There were far more of these than one would expect from a ‘safe vaccine’ that *had been ‘thoroughly tested without cutting any corners’* and which, in the preferred reality, was touted as a ‘miracle’. No number of ‘adverse reaction’ reports would have been reason enough for Kant to issue a warning to the Dutch population, including Minks and his associates. In doing so, Kant acted entirely in accordance with her remit in the project ‘Covid-19: The Great Reset’.
188. The truth is that if Lareb were to wish to protect people from dangerous medical products, it would not ignore the scale and severity of the reports themselves as an indicator. By doing so, and by failing to issue warnings to the Dutch population – including Minks and others – who brought the scale and severity of the reports to light, the cover-up remained airtight.
189. It should also be noted that Exhibit 4, submitted by Kant, constitutes further evidence of the cover-up, as it too contains nothing warning the Dutch public, including Minks et al., of the life-threatening risks of the Covid-19 injections, which are in fact a biological weapon.

VIII. Concluding remarks regarding the dispute (in respect of all defendants)

190. As set out in this submission, the proceedings taking place in court between the parties cannot be viewed in isolation from the underlying spiritual struggle. The word ‘proceedings’ derives from the Latin word ‘procedere’, which means ‘to proceed’. This means that in these legal proceedings, your court’s judgement can only be delivered definitively once the proceedings have come to an end. The same applies to the underlying spiritual struggle, on the understanding that the Last Judgement concerning the parties will not be delivered by your court, but by Almighty God, for *each according to their deeds*. This struggle, too, continues, and the outcome is not yet certain. The defendants can influence this Last Judgement through their deeds. Are they continuing to build the Tower of Babel, or are they tearing it down?

191. The Last Judgement will be passed in accordance with the word of Almighty God.

*And I saw a great white throne, and Him who sat upon it. Before
His face, the earth and the heavens fled away, so that no place
could be found for them.*

*And I saw the dead, great and small, standing before God. And the
books were opened, and another book was opened, namely the Book
of Life.*

*And the dead were judged according to what was written in the books,
according to their deeds. And the sea gave up the dead who were in it.
Death and Hades also gave up the dead who were in them, and they
were judged, each according to their deeds.*

*And Death and Hades were cast into the lake of fire. This is the
second death. And if anyone’s name was not found written in the
Book of Life, he was cast into the lake of fire.*

(Revelation 20:11–15 HSV)

IX. Offer of evidence and allocation of the burden of proof

In so far as the burden of proof rests with Minks et al. pursuant to Article 150 of the Code of Civil Procedure, Minks et al. offer evidence in support of all their claims by all lawful means. All defendants may be heard as witnesses; they are all co-implementers of the ‘Covid-19: The Great Reset’ project, are fully aware of all aspects of this project, and can testify from their own observations as to how they imposed a preferred reality on the Dutch people, including Minks

et al., and have caused harm to the Dutch population, including Minks et al., through the Covid-19 measures they implemented and/or propagated. Furthermore, Minks et al. refer to the specific offers of evidence as set out in this submission.

In particular, with regard to the assertion by Minks et al. that the spike protein expressed by the Covid-19 mRNA injections is found everywhere, continuously and permanently in the bodies of people who have received Covid-19 mRNA injections, Minks et al. offer to have Doctor (med.) Ute Krüger and Professor Doctor (med.) Walter Lang to be heard as witnesses under oath by your court.

With regard to the assertion by Minks et al. that the Covid-19 injections are biological weapons being used to commit genocide as part of the Great Reset in order to bring about a New World Order, Minks et al. refer once again to the offer of evidence made in Chapter III of this submission to have Ms Catherine Austin Fitts, Dr Mike Yeadon, Ms Alexandra Latypova (MBA), Ms Katherine Watt and Dr Joseph Sansone (BA) to be heard under oath by your court.

As regards the allocation of the burden of proof, the defendants bear the burden of proving the facts and assertions derived from their own preferred reality, including the existence of a medical pandemic and the existence of the non-existent SARS-CoV-2 virus.

IN CONCLUSION

Deed of application for the amendment of the

claim. Let us persevere!



Arno van Kessel



Peter Stassen