



This case is being brought by [REDACTED] G [REDACTED] advocatuur,
with offices at 47 [REDACTED], and by Mr P.W.H. Stassen, of the law firm
[REDACTED]

District Court of the Northern Netherlands, Leeuwarden Division

Hearing date : Wednesday 11 December 2024 at 10.00

Case number : C/17/190788

**SUBMISSION OF COPIES OF VACCINATION CERTIFICATES
PURSUANT TO SECTION 85(1) OF THE CODE OF CIVIL
PROCEDURE
and
DEED OF AMENDMENT TO THE CLAIM PURSUANT TO ARTICLE
130 OF THE CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE
and
APPLICATION FOR A PRELIMINARY HEARING PURSUANT TO
ARTICLE 87(2)(d) of the Code of Civil Procedure**

concerning:

Claimants:

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

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

against:

Defendants:

(public officials)

1. Mr EVERHARDUS ITE HOFSTRA, re [REDACTED]
2. Mr JAAP TAMINO VAN DISSEL, res [REDACTED]
3. Ms MARIA PETRONELLA GERARDA KOOPMANS, res [REDACTED]
ter [REDACTED]



4. Mr **MARK RUTTE**, residing in Brussels, Belgium;

5. Ms SIGRID AGNES MARIA KAAG, res [REDACTED];
 6. Mr HUGO MATTHEÛS DE JONGE, residin [REDACTED];
 7. Mr ERNST JOHAN KUIPERS, residing in Singapore / Malaysia;
 8. Mr DIEDERIK ANTONIUS MARIA PAULUS JOHANNES GOMMERS, residing i [REDACTED];
 9. Mr WOPKE BASTIAAN HOEKSTRA, residing i [REDACTED] de;
 10. CORNELIA VAN NIEUWENHUIZEN, residing at a confidential address;
- Solicitors: Mr R.W. Veldhuis and Mr M.E.A. Möhring

(pharmaceutical industry)

11. Mr ALBERT BOURLA, residing in New York, United States of America;
- Lawyer: Mr D. Roessingh

(mass media)

12. Ms GISELLE JACQUELINE MARIE-THÉRÈSE VAN CANN, residing [REDACTED] n;
 13. Mr PAUL JANSEN, of no known address or place of residence;
- Lawyer: Mr L. Broers

(non-governmental organisation (NGO, WEF))

14. Mr FEIKE SIJBESMA, residin [REDACTED].
 15. Mr WILLIAM HENRY BILL GATES III, residing in Washington, United States of America.
- Lawyer: W.H. Heemskerk, LL.M.

(quasi-governmental body)

16. Ms AGNES CATHARINA VAN DER VOORT-KANT, of no known address;
- Lawyer: Mr A.H. Ekker

(government)

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

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

I. Submission of vaccination certificates pursuant to Article 85(1) of the Code of Civil Procedure.

In their writ of summons, the claimants rely on the Covid-19 mRNA injections administered to them as a result of large-scale deception by the defendants. In doing so, they have sufficiently established that the Covid-19 injections were in fact administered to them – by reference to the diagnoses drawn up by a medical specialist (**Exhibit 91** to the writ of summons). Article 85(1) of the Code of Civil Procedure stipulates that, where reference is made to any document, a copy thereof must also be attached to the case file, unless the opposing party declares that it does not require a copy.

In the interests of proper procedural order, the claimants hereby submit their vaccination certificates pursuant to Article 85(1) of the Code of Civil Procedure, in addition to **Exhibit 91** of the writ of summons. This information relating to the claimants must be treated as confidential in these proceedings on the merits, in accordance with the General Data Protection Regulation. The claimants also note that, upon checking their Covid-19 mRNA vaccination certificates via ‘Mijn RIVM’, it has become apparent that the RIVM has deleted all the claimants’ Covid-19 mRNA vaccination data. The same may well apply to the Covid-19 mRNA vaccination data from 2021/2022 for the entire Dutch population!?

II. Increase in claim / extension of grounds pursuant to Article 130 of the Code of Civil Procedure.

1. Grounds:

In their statement of claim set out in the summons, the claimants seek, amongst other things, a declaration that the defendants, as a group and individually, acted unlawfully towards the claimants by deliberately and unlawfully misleading them and thereby inducing them to receive Covid-19 injections, of which the defendants knew, or at least ought to have known, were not safe and effective.

The writ of summons was served on the defendants on 14 July 2023. The factual basis of the claimants’ claim is formed by the allegations and evidence set out in the writ of summons, which logically cannot extend beyond the facts as they occurred up to 14 July 2023 and were known to the claimants. By means of this document, the claimants wish to expand the factual basis of their claims, by way of an amendment to the claim, to include events, facts and evidence that have occurred since the issue of the writ of summons and of which the claimants have become aware. The claimants also wish to reflect this in an amended statement of claim.

The defendants have a legally recognised interest in the aforementioned amendment to the claim. This interest lies, first and foremost, in the fact that the defendants, even after taking note of the allegations and evidence set out in the writ of summons, have continued to support the false narrative as it was put forward at the time of the alleged Covid-19 pandemic, if only by failing to refute it. By merely submitting their statements of defence, in which the defendants consistently upheld the false narrative, the defendants acted in a further misleading and unlawful manner. Their position in society, their knowledge of the many publicly known **new** and scientifically substantiated facts, and their knowledge of the writ of summons mean that this further misleading conduct is (also) unlawful towards the claimants.

Secondly, the claimants have a legally recognised interest in the amendment of the claim, because since the service of the writ of summons, various relevant events have taken place and facts and evidence have come to light on the basis of which it can be legally proven that the (international)



project ‘Covid-19: The Great Reset (in the sense set out by the claimants in the writ of summons), in which the defendants play a role, exists and is being continued unabated by the defendants in a ‘militarily’ coordinated context.

In particular, the claimants hereby refer to the public ministerial admission, of which the defendants are aware, that the Dutch Cabinet and, by extension, the Dutch State are in fact exclusively led by the NCTV (National Coordinator for Security and Counter-Terrorism), a security service established in 2012 without any legal basis. Similar public admissions have since also been made in the United Kingdom, Germany and the United States of America. For the claimants, this further deception by the defendants – whether active or passive – following the service of the summons entails highly damaging consequences in the form of psychological harm. Although this continued deception by the defendants means that the claimants can no longer be coerced into receiving new Covid-19 injections, such as those brought to market after the summons was served (including mRNA boosters and flu jabs), the claimants' living environment (primarily the Dutch people) is thereby further misled and harmed. The latter matter is of the utmost concern to the claimants and has a profound impact on their psychological well-being.

Many people within the claimants' community are falling ill and/or dying as a result of the continued deception by the defendants and the Covid-19 injections that the defendants continue to promote as part of their project. The claimants' community is being kept (further) in a **'preferred reality' (= a big lie)** by the defendants in their role as co-implementers of the Covid-19: The Great Reset project.

In that preferred reality, Covid-19 injections are still considered 'safe and effective', whereas in reality they constitute a biological weapon whose use leads to genocide. It goes without saying that living amongst people in a **'preferred reality'** – created and maintained in part by the defendants – who have been misled and harmed by this false narrative, is in itself detrimental to the plaintiffs' mental well-being.

Consequently, the tort committed by the defendants, whether collectively or individually, against the claimants **continues unabated even after the service of the summons**. Despite their knowledge of the scientifically substantiated relevant facts regarding the life-threatening side effects of the Covid-19 mRNA injections, the defendants continue to express their support for the life-threatening Covid-19 mRNA injections, which are still being distributed to the Dutch public via the GGD and the RIVM. Furthermore, despite their knowledge of the relevant facts and evidence (which came to light after the summons was served), the defendants have not spoken out **against** the life-threatening COVID-19 mRNA injections. As a result, the claimants are suffering **ongoing** and particularly severe psychological harm as a consequence of the unlawful act **continuously** committed against them by the defendants.

2. Amendment to the claim

The relief sought in paragraph 1 of the writ of summons is to be replaced as follows:

(1) to declare that the defendants, as a group and each individually, have continued to act unlawfully towards the claimants up to the date of the final decision handed down by your court in this case (including, inter alia, unlawful omission) 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, which the defendants knew, or at least ought to have known, were not safe and effective, or at least that the information disseminated by the defendants in the context of the Covid-19 project: The Great Reset,

misleading narrative propagated by the defendants as part of the ‘Covid-19: The Great Reset’ project and/or the Covid-19 injections introduced as part of this project are harmful to the health, fertility and psychological well-being of the plaintiffs 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 an order for costs to be made by your court, enforceable immediately.

III. Submission of supplementary evidence pursuant to Article 21 of the Code of Civil Procedure in conjunction with Article 152(1) of the Code of Civil Procedure.

As a result of numerous new and successive relevant facts relating to the legal consequences invoked by the claimants, from the date of the writ of summons dated 14 July 2023 to the present, the claimants request your court, pursuant to Article 150 of the Code of Civil Procedure to adduce evidence of these new and supplementary relevant facts by submitting new evidence and calling several national and international expert witnesses to give evidence under oath.

Without wishing to be exhaustive at this stage of the proceedings, it should be noted at this point that the evidence to be adduced in this regard relates, amongst other things, to scientific works and statements aimed at establishing the truth, including those by Professor Dr Francis Boyle, which show that the Covid-19 injections qualify as biological weapons in the legal sense. Further evidence in support of the claimants’ assertion that there has been deliberate deception in the aforementioned sense can be found in the statement by Dr Michael Yeadon, former chief scientist and director of Pfizer’s allergy and respiratory research division, which shows that the Covid-19 injections were designed and manufactured ‘by design’ with the aim of causing serious harm to people’s health and fertility. Further important evidence from the Netherlands that must not be overlooked can be found in the statements made by Minister Agema on 23 October 2024, in which she declared that, upon her appointment as minister, she had subordinated herself in her role as Minister of Public Health to directives issued by a supranational military organisation (NATO) and that, **under the direction of the NCTV**, she must identify all the measures required within the framework of the ‘Covid-19: The Great Reset’ project and the so-called ‘pandemic preparedness’ measures established in this regard by the UN/WHO and the WEF. The claimants wish to introduce this and other evidence (including, amongst other things, statements to be given before your court by several expert witnesses) into the proceedings in order to further examine the defendants’ tortious act, which consists of carrying out their ongoing deceptive role in the ‘Covid-19: The Great Reset’, and to enable your court to carry out its most fundamental task, namely the establishment of the truth.

To clarify the defendants’ roles, the claimants have chosen to divide the defendants into groups. This grouping is reflected in the designation of the parties in this document.

Within the (international) ‘Covid-19: The Great Reset’ project, the various entities and/or departments have their own tasks and objectives to be achieved in creating a top-down, prescribed and well-coordinated **preferred reality**. All of this is in the strategic interest of what the World Economic Forum refers to as ‘stakeholders’ in the implementation of the ‘Covid-19: The Great Reset’ project.

In light of the many new scientific (peer-reviewed) facts that have come to light since 14 July 2023 to the present day – despite heavy censorship – the claimants have a significant interest, in the interests of establishing the truth, in submitting additional evidence in respect of each defendant and each group.

IV. Application for a preliminary hearing pursuant to Article 87(2)(d) and (e) of the Code of Civil Procedure.

3. Basic principle:

The court may, at the request of the parties or the claimants, or of its own motion, order an oral hearing in all cases and at any stage of the proceedings. During this oral hearing, the court may consult with the parties on how the proceedings are to proceed and may issue such directions or order such procedural steps as it deems appropriate, in so far as the court considers this to be in accordance with the requirements of proper procedural order.

The claimants request that the court schedule a coordination hearing at which they may consult with the court and the lawyers for all parties regarding:

- a. The conduct of the proceedings for each group of defendants;
- b. The submission of new and supplementary evidence in light of the rapidly unfolding developments concerning the factual basis of the claimants’ claims, to be provided by submitting new documents and hearing national and international expert witnesses under oath;
- c. The manner in which the right to be heard is to be observed in the interests of proper procedural order;
- d. Allowing independent media access to all public oral hearings and to all examinations of national and international expert witnesses;
- e. How the remainder of the proceedings will proceed.

So be it!

Solicitors

