

## De hele rechtszaak tegen het Project Covid 19 the Great Reset

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cggHITwYqsA>

### Transcript translated from Dutch to English by Google Translate

0:45

45 seconds

Okay, welcome everyone.

0:48

48 seconds

Up for discussion is the appeal lodged by three appellants. I didn't quite hear Bos.

1:00

1 minute

Three appellants lodged: Bos, Manobulu, and Staamer. Mr. Stassen is present for that. Welcome.

1:07

1 minute, 7 seconds

Um, against 17, uh, respondents. Um, that's what we appeared for.

1:14

1 minute, 14 seconds

Um, let's see. Mr. Veldhuis. Can you turn up the volume?

1:27

1 minute, 27 seconds

I'll talk more into the microphone. Yes.

1:32

1 minute, 32 seconds

Mr. Veldhuis present. Present. Mr. Möhring. Yes,

1:37

1 minute, 37 seconds

Sorry. Oh yes, there. Then Mr. Roessingh. Yes, there.

1:41

1 minute, 41 seconds

Present. And Mr. Bredenoord-Spoek also present. Yes.

1:46

1 minute, 46 seconds

Um, Lichtendahl and Mr. Mulder also present. Um, Mr. Ekker present.

1:54

1 minute, 54 seconds

And Mr. Veldhuis. Yes, again.

1:57

1 minute, 57 seconds

Oh yes, that one. Yes, no, of course. We already had that one. I think we have everyone then. Is that correct? No. My name is Heemskerk. Mr. Heemskerk.

2:06

2 minutes, 6 seconds

And who did you come with? Would you like to ask something? Everyone pays a small fee. No photos, no videos. Thank you. 2:16

2 minutes, 16 seconds

Yes, there's a livestream that works.

2:19

2 minutes, 19 seconds

Oh, sorry, I see... Yes, one more person added. Bekema. Oh yes, I see him standing here.

2:26

2 minutes, 26 seconds

Excuse me. Yes,

2:29

2 minutes, 29 seconds

Okay. On this side of the table, you see Mr. Kingma on my right, Mr. Kingma on your left. On the other side, Mrs. Hofmeijer. The speaker on duty is Mrs. Velers, and my name is Bos.

2:38

2 minutes, 38 seconds

We have a livestream today and a large audience. That means we have to use the microphones properly.

2:45

2 minutes, 45 seconds

As was just apparent. Those microphones are very sensitive, by the way. So I also warn the

2:53

2 minutes, 53 seconds

people who have a microphone in front of them that if you want to discuss something among yourselves, uh, everything can be heard quite well. So maybe you can limit that to

3:02

3 minutes, 2 seconds

uh, the suspensions. I see someone is standing there.

3:08

3 minutes, 8 seconds

Yes, I can't make it any clearer than this right now. The microphones are loud, and I'm talking into the microphone.

3:19

3 minutes, 19 seconds

I see the technology is running fast. Thank you.

3:24

3 minutes, 24 seconds

We'll do our best. Let's see. We have, uh, oh yes, and for the lawyers, uh, yes, these days it's good practice

3:33

3 minutes, 33 seconds

to remain seated during pleadings, but today it's even necessary to remain seated. Um, because there's a camera pointed at you, and the intention is that only the

3:41

3 minutes, 41 seconds

bar attendants are visible today, uh, and the appellant has indicated they have no objection. So you'll be on camera, but only the bar attendants are visible, and the moment you stand up,

3:50

3 minutes, 50 seconds

then the public would also be visible.

3:52

3 minutes, 52 seconds

So, the kind request to plead seated.

3:57

3 minutes, 57 seconds

Okay. Um, after the appellants' notice of appeal, we received four statements of defense. Um, I also received a letter dated December 7

4:05

4 minutes, 5 seconds

with a USB drive attached. And after that, two more exhibits were submitted on the appellants' side

4:13

4 minutes, 13 seconds

uh. Exhibits 6 and 7. That's the file we have before us today.

4:20

4 minutes, 20 seconds

Um, we have a schedule, a tight schedule for today, and uh, we're just barely on time. Um, so I wanted to

4:28

4 minutes, 28 seconds

start right away with the first argument on behalf of the appellants. So, uh, Mr. Stassen, uh, you'll have an hour to plead your case. Do you have a statement of arguments?

4:39

4 minutes, 39 seconds

I do, but if you'll permit me, I'd like to raise a point of order first. Yes.

4:44

4 minutes, 44 seconds

Your court has quite rightly instructed that the defendants must be present here in person today.

4:51

4 minutes, 51 seconds

And I really haven't seen a valid reason why they're not here today. Their large absences are not just a

4:59

4 minutes, 59 seconds

big middle finger to your court and my clients, but also, if I may be so bold, to the whole world.

5:08

5 minutes, 8 seconds

With their absence, the defendants are making a last-ditch attempt to silence the procedural debate that should be taking place here today.

5:18

5 minutes, 18 seconds

After all, it is precisely the context of the request I am making here today that should be the topic here today.

5:24

5 minutes, 24 seconds

And even if it merely concerns an assessment of the admissibility of the appeal, that is still the case. And

5:32

5 minutes, 32 seconds

I will address that in my plea

Please also come back to this. I find this really very serious. And I also point out to you that you

5:40

5 minutes, 40 seconds

do not have to accept that. This case is too important for that, too important to society. And you

5:47

5 minutes, 47 seconds

of course have the right under the Code of Legal Procedure, more specifically Article 22, to order defendants to further explain their arguments

5:56

5 minutes, 56 seconds

or to submit documents related to the case. And, as you will see from my pleadings,

6:03

6 minutes, 3 seconds

there is every reason to do so. And I think, given this enormous absence of defendants who are obliged to attend,

6:11

6 minutes, 11 seconds

have been invited, your court, uh, should not close the oral hearing today. Um, I think that

6:19

6 minutes, 19 seconds

uh, it's up to the court to use their discretionary powers here. Uh, and that

6:26

6 minutes, 26 seconds

serves only one interest, and that is the interest in the truth, right? And that is also the core interest of my client.

6:34

6 minutes, 34 seconds

That must be served. And so I wanted to point out that I consider it a very serious matter, a great

6:41

6 minutes, 41 seconds

disappointment that they simply don't appear and withdraw from the debate. The second point I want to make,

6:48

6 minutes, 48 seconds

but then I'm not going to...uh, I'm going to be very brief about that. Uh, you're applying the press guidelines. In the previous hearing in the court of first instance, I expressed

6:56

6 minutes, 56 seconds

fundamental objections to that. I'm just repeating that to you, and I'm not going to draw any conclusions from that.

7:06

7 minutes, 6 seconds

No, the first point, yes, do you draw any conclusions from that? Because, of course, the party is free to appear with or without a lawyer or in person.

7:15

7 minutes, 15 seconds

Well, the court's invitation was very clear, wasn't it? That was in person, wasn't it? Uh, and only, uh, and that's your invitation, and uh, that's what

7:24

7 minutes, 24 seconds

the parties, of course, simply listened to it out of respect for your court, and they didn't. Your opinion, your view, has been noted. Yes.

7:32

7 minutes, 32 seconds

Yes. Do you want to comment on that, Mr. Nee?

7:36

7 minutes, 36 seconds

Do you want us to do something with it now, or are you saying, well, I'll leave it at that for now? 7:39

7 minutes, 39 seconds

Fine. Well, okay. Then, uh, I'll stick with that observation. Your opinion has been noted, and the party is free to decide whether or not to appear with

7:47

7 minutes, 47 seconds

their lawyer. We're discussing a rather legal issue today, namely, can the prohibition on legal remedies be broken? Um, well

7:57

7 minutes, 57 seconds

and the decision on whether the party should appear with their lawyer is up to them at this point. Um, Mr. Stassen, do you now have my

8:05

8 minutes, 5 seconds

opportunity, uh, top-lead through. I'm going to keep you strictly on time. We're running five minutes behind, but that means you can also just walk 5 minutes off the clock

8:12

8 minutes, 12 seconds

. So, uh, 10 feet, I see you have a pleading. Would you like me to hand it over? 8:18

8 minutes, 18 seconds

What I forgot to mention is that the interpreters—there are three interpreters present who are attending the hearing via a video link elsewhere in this building.

8:26

8 minutes, 26 seconds

Um, and someone will be going to them with your pleadings in a moment,

8:32

8 minutes, 32 seconds

because that's practical for them. Um, they're in the back of the room, so they'll be here shortly to pick up a pleading. Very helpful.

8:39

8 minutes, 39 seconds

Thank you. Yes. Yes, thank you.

9:14

9 minutes, 14 seconds

Everyone, I also have copies for the room. I'm a bit afraid you'll penalize me with the time if I hand them out, but I think I'll manage.

8:39

8 minutes, 39 seconds

Thank you. Yes. Yes, thank you.

9:14

9 minutes, 14 seconds

Everyone, I also have copies for the room. I'm a bit afraid you'll penalize me with the time if I hand them out, but I think I'll manage. 9:23

9 minutes, 23 seconds

You, but maybe it can be passed on. That will save you some time. Very quickly.

9:30

9 minutes, 30 seconds

And if you at least hear the communication colleague who's coming towards you now, yes.

9:41

9 minutes, 41 seconds

Yes, you really have to speak into the microphone, I just learned. So, uh,

9:51

9 minutes, 51 seconds

am I clearly audible to you or to me? Certainly for us, not the whole audience yet.

9:58

9 minutes, 58 seconds

Can anything happen to prevent the audience from being there? I saw the tech people already running, so, uh, but at least everyone can read along with you now. So that, uh, that helps.

10:12

10 minutes, 12 seconds

Yes, I would appreciate it if people could hear. Two more. It's better for the audience this way.

10:21

10 minutes, 21 seconds

I haven't heard any major criticism yet. Go ahead. Thank you.

10:29

10 minutes, 29 seconds

Noble, distinguished board. Dear Chairman, interested parties.

10:35

10 minutes, 35 seconds

Today we are discussing a matter of global importance.

10:40

10 minutes, 40 seconds

That's a given because my clients' request focuses on the executors of the COVID-19 project.

10:48

10 minutes, 48 seconds

reset. In which project are the COVID-19 mRNA injections crucial?

10:55

10 minutes, 55 seconds

The sound has been repaired, I understand.

10:59

10 minutes, 59 seconds

You can only reach a balanced judgment in this case if you consider the facts and circumstances

11:07

11 minutes, 7 seconds

under which the request was made.

11:12

11 minutes, 12 seconds

So it's about the context of the request.

11:15

11 minutes, 15 seconds

A significant portion of the grounds for appeal against the decision in first instance concerns the judge's failure to consider the context.

11:23

11 minutes, 23 seconds

or at least completely insufficiently.

11:28

11 minutes, 28 seconds

In this plea, I will convince you that this alone violates fundamental standards of a fair trial.

11:38

11 minutes, 38 seconds

This is so serious that breaching the prohibition on legal remedies is essential.

11:45

11 minutes, 45 seconds

This is because otherwise my clients would not have access to a fair trial.

11:51

11 minutes, 51 seconds

The context of the case is therefore of paramount importance for assessing the admissibility of this appeal. 12:01

12 minutes, 1 second

To make you aware of the context of this case, I will first address the official COVID-19 narrative and compare it

12:09

12 minutes, 9 seconds

with a number of facts that are generally known.

12:16

12 minutes, 16 seconds

I would like to note that since the appeal was filed, a new fact has also emerged.

12:23

12 minutes, 23 seconds

These are such important new facts that the complaint that the context of the case was not taken into account

12:32

12 minutes, 32 seconds

can now be further substantiated with facts.

12:37

12 minutes, 37 seconds

Therefore, I am primarily of the opinion that the introduction of these new facts is not contrary to the two conclusions from Article 347 of the Code of Civil Procedure. 12:47

12 minutes, 47 seconds

And alternatively, I argue that the full application of the two-conclusion rule

12:55

12 minutes, 55 seconds

contradicts good procedural order because there is a new development.

13:05

13 minutes, 5 seconds

I don't know what it's about, but it's a bit less good.

13:15

13 minutes, 15 seconds

A speaker seems to be rapping. Okay,

13:20

13 minutes, 20 seconds

speak clearly into the microphone. As loud as possible.

13:27

13 minutes, 27 seconds

Let me take you to the defendants' official COVID-19 narrative. Because as I just explained, I'm going to compare it to a fact that are generally known. 13:39

13 minutes, 39 seconds

So let me remind you what the official narrative is, according to the executors of the COVID-19 project, and therefore also the defendants in these proceedings.

13:51

13 minutes, 51 seconds

We can easily find that narrative in Dutch legislation.

13:57

13 minutes, 57 seconds

It's important to note that this narrative of governments and international organizations, including

14:05

14 minutes, 5 seconds

the UN and NATO, is the same worldwide.

14:10

14 minutes, 10 seconds

The only explanation for this is that the COVID-19 project, the Great Reset, is a global project, i.e., a project of globalists.

14:23

14 minutes, 23 seconds

Back to that official narrative. According to the defendants in this case, it reads as follows. 14:29

14 minutes, 29 seconds

In December 2019, a new coronavirus emerged in the Wuhan, China.

14:37

14 minutes, 37 seconds

Initially designated as the novel coronavirus 2019 nCov and now formally

14:43

14 minutes, 43 seconds

named SARS-CoV-2, Severe Acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus.

14:50

14 minutes, 50 seconds

In the Netherlands, the developments surrounding the virus have been closely monitored. On January 28, 2020, the virus was, on the advice of the Outbreak Management Team (OMT), designated as belonging to group A, as referred to in

15:07

15 minutes, 7 seconds

the Public Health Act (WPG). And all provisions of the WPT that apply to infectious diseases belonging

15:16

15 minutes, 16 seconds

to group A have been declared applicable to the control of the virus epidemic. That is the official narrative.

15:27

15 minutes, 27 seconds

Placing the supposed virus in group A had far-reaching legal consequences.

15:36

15 minutes, 36 seconds

This firstly created a legal reporting obligation for this supposed new infectious disease.

15:44

15 minutes, 44 seconds

Secondly, this activated all the control powers under the WPG. And thirdly, the Minister of Medical Care

15:53

15 minutes, 53 seconds

became responsible for leading the control of this supposedly new disease.

16:00

16 minutes

In short, a medical surveillance state was established in which citizens' fundamental rights were eroded,

16:08

16 minutes, 8 seconds

which is still being defended by defendants today by invoking this official narrative.

16:18

16 minutes, 18 seconds

My clients argue that this official narrative and the way in which defendants, as a group, promoted, imposed, and enforced this narrative

16:25

16 minutes, 25 seconds

was unlawful.

16:31

16 minutes, 31 seconds

This unlawful conduct misled my clients, resulting in them receiving a COVID-19 injection. 16:41

16 minutes, 41 seconds

To this day, the defendants maintain that the use of these COVID-19 injections was a

16:48

16 minutes, 48 seconds

necessity and that these injections qualify as a safe and effective vaccine against the new disease COVID-19, according to the

16:56

16 minutes, 56 seconds

official narrative.

17:02

17 minutes, 2 seconds

That the defendants do not dispute this narrative and continue to defend it is crystal clear from the court documents I submitted in these proceedings.

17:13

17 minutes, 13 seconds

As a result of the COVID-19 injections, very little remains of my clients' health. I would have liked to be here

17:21

17 minutes, 21 seconds

with the three of them today. I really need to excuse one of my clients because of the illness, which is so severe that he can't be here.

17:32

17 minutes, 32 seconds

I consider it a miracle that I still have two of them by my side today.

17:38

17 minutes, 38 seconds

That's why my clients have a right and an interest in hearing the honest and

17:46

17 minutes, 46 seconds

independent experts they have presented, who should participate in a court proceeding with the opportunity for both sides to be heard.

17:57

17 minutes, 57 seconds

Only in this way can my clients assess their chances of success in any substantive proceedings they will initiate. 18:07

18 minutes, 7 seconds

The Leeuwarden court denied them that opportunity, and I will therefore explain to you why this violated fundamental

18:14

18 minutes, 14 seconds

standards that guarantee access to a fair trial.

18:23

18 minutes, 23 seconds

Those facts of common knowledge. How does the official narrative that the defendants, as executors of the COVID-19 project, defend the Great Reset

18:31

18 minutes, 31 seconds

relate to facts that are now common knowledge?

18:37

18 minutes, 37 seconds

I will mention, without limitation, a few that you should not have missed. But before I do so, I would like to make a very important comment. 18:49

18 minutes, 49 seconds

If I mention facts of common knowledge, I'm also partly referring to facts that are the result of a

18:58

18 minutes, 58 seconds

controlled, preferred, and therefore false reality by the defendants.

19:05

19 minutes, 5 seconds

So, it's partly about lies that the executors of the Covid-19 project, the Great Reset, have made part

19:14

19 minutes, 14 seconds

of a new normal. I will return to this later in my explanation. I'm now talking about those facts that

19:23

19 minutes, 23 seconds

are now common knowledge because they have been admitted by official bodies

19:31

19 minutes, 31 seconds

and have been made public or are known to a wide audience as if they were true facts. 19:40

19 minutes, 40 seconds

And this brings me to a list of facts that are now common knowledge.

19:49

19 minutes, 49 seconds

The malignant new disease COVID-19, caused by the coronavirus, was never more dangerous than a mild flu.

19:57

19 minutes, 57 seconds

This is also confirmed by Professor John Ioannides of Stanford University in California and now also by the WHO itself.

20:07

20 minutes, 7 seconds

The PCR test cannot detect infections, as has been repeatedly stated publicly by its inventor, Nobel Prize winner Karry.

20:16

20 minutes, 16 seconds

Mullis and also by former Pfizer vice president Dr. Mike Yeadon, the German university professor

20:23

20 minutes, 23 seconds

Dr. Klaus Steger, the American university professor J. Jay Couey, the Italian professor Gabriele Ségalla, and the

20:31

20 minutes, 31 seconds

Canadian physicians Dr. Mark Trozzi and Dr. Roger Hodkinson, all of whom confirmed that the alleged dangers of

20:40

20 minutes, 40 seconds

the coronavirus and the COVID-19 disease never existed, but that the population was panicked on political orders.

20:54

20 minutes, 54 seconds

The Verwaltungsgericht Osnabrück Germany issued a very important ruling on September 3, 2024.

21:06

21 minutes, 6 seconds

This ruling has been published, and I have included the Eckleumner in this pleading as a matter of urgency.

21:13

21 minutes, 13 seconds

This ruling was made by judges who

Just like you, judges in Europe are, and you cannot ignore what they established as facts in that case.

21:25

21 minutes, 25 seconds

In short, that case concerned the legal requirement to have a COVID-19 injection or to have proof of recovery from

21:34

21 minutes, 34 seconds

COVID-19 in order to be allowed to work in a hospital and in certain contact-based professions.

21:43

21 minutes, 43 seconds

The German Constitutional Court had tested this regulation against the German Constitution and deemed it permissible.

21:52

21 minutes, 52 seconds

For that reason, the case brought before the Administrative Court on this matter was in principle inadmissible.

22:02

22 minutes, 2 seconds

However, the Administrative Court declared itself admissible in that case based on new facts and new perspectives. 22:12

22 minutes, 12 seconds

These new facts and circumstances primarily concerned the partially blacked-out protocols of the RKI Krisenstabs which had been released in the interim.

22:20

22 minutes, 20 seconds

What we call the Outbreak Management Team (OMT) here.

22:27

22 minutes, 27 seconds

The prosecution examined these protocols and concluded that the COVID-19 injections did not provide effective protection against infection for the weaker members of society.

22:34

22 minutes, 34 seconds

and that,

22:41

22 minutes, 41 seconds

therefore, it was established in 2022 alone that this false narrative of an effective vaccine and the legal obligations for certain professionals based on it in Germany violated the fundamental rights of citizens. That has been established. 23:00

23 minutes

But perhaps even more importantly, the court also established the far-reaching political influence exerted on the RKI-Krisenstabs during the crisis.

23:12

23 minutes, 12 seconds

In short, according to the court, these are criminal measures. The defendants in

23:20

23 minutes, 20 seconds

this case, including members of the Outbreak Management Team (OMT), knew this.

23:25

23 minutes, 25 seconds

And against that background, it is established that the defendants knew, at least after 2022, that there was no

23:33

23 minutes, 33 seconds

an effective vaccine and that it was in fact about political orders.

23:40

23 minutes, 40 seconds

Yet they continue to lie and deceive about this. This makes it clear that they are working together to commit a criminal act. 23:50

23 minutes, 50 seconds

I am pointing this out to you because, although it was published, it is not being heard due to the deliberate

23:58

23 minutes, 58 seconds

failure by the executors of the COVID-19 project which

24:03

24 minutes, 3 seconds

control the political media and the scientific landscape.

24:09

24 minutes, 9 seconds

This statement is also not being heard in the fake parliamentary inquiry committee on the coronavirus established in the Netherlands, which also does not want

24:18

24 minutes, 18 seconds

to know about the procedures carried by my clients and the published findings of the experts my clients have presented.

24:30

24 minutes, 30 seconds

Apparently, the speaker has failed again.

24:42

24 minutes, 42 seconds

Keep your hands off the equipment.

24:44

24 minutes, 44 seconds

Um, yeah, we're looking. Um, apparently it cuts out every now and then. I can't do anything about that from this angle at the moment.

24:53

24 minutes, 53 seconds

Yeah, they didn't want that.

25:04

25 minutes, 4 seconds

I hear it. I hear it. I'm just checking. Can we do something about this? Um, look to the back right of the room. There's a nod.

25:29

25 minutes, 29 seconds

Is that it?

25:47

25 minutes, 47 seconds

Yeah, right. Um, so there's a possibility in the room

25:55

25 minutes, 55 seconds

next door, uh, uh, then the sound will probably be better. I don't know if the people in the front row would also experience the problem, but perhaps the

26:02

26 minutes, 2 seconds

people in the back row would then be able to listen better in the room next door.

26:27

26 minutes, 27 seconds

Great.

26:31

26 minutes, 31 seconds

If you want to hear well, here's

26:42

26 minutes, 42 seconds

and it works, this one can stay here without

26:48

26 minutes, 48 seconds

amplification. And if it happens, the clicking is gone now. Um

26:56

26 minutes, 56 seconds

What do you want? Would you like, uh, let's see how it goes now without the clicking.

27:01

27 minutes, 1 second

And if you say, well, then I'd rather go to the room next door. Then calmly stand up and walk to the room next door.

27:12

27 minutes, 12 seconds

Do I have a more clear voice than Mr. Stassen, or not? Uh, don't worry.

27:18

27 minutes, 18 seconds

Mr. Stassen, uh, if you could just, well, at least they should be quiet already. That's always best for the hearing of the

27:26

27 minutes, 26 seconds

people sitting in the front. Uh, Mr. Stassen, please continue calmly, and as I said, feel free to do it in the back despite the lack of

27:34

27 minutes, 34 seconds

conds

Can't hear the tapping now? Calmly stand up, walk to the room next door, and you'll have a good sound.

27:42

27 minutes, 42 seconds

No, go ahead. Please continue, Mr. Stassen.

27:49

27 minutes, 49 seconds

The so-called coronavirus measures were economically destructive. Especially the

27:55

27 minutes, 55 seconds

lockdowns, and they lead to the deaths of millions of people and to serious side effects.

28:02

28 minutes, 2 seconds

In my footnote in this plea, I already indicate that these are actually main effects.

28:10

28 minutes, 10 seconds

According to the findings of Professor Denis Rancourt and pathologist and PCR test manufacturer Dr. Roger Hodgkinson from

28:18

28 minutes, 18 seconds

Canada, this amounts to at least 20 million deaths worldwide and 2.4 billion serious side effects. 28:29

28 minutes, 29 seconds

The European Agency responsible for authorizing vaccines, EMA, has confirmed the following in a letter dated October 18, 2023, in response to questions from former Member of the European Parliament.

28:38

28 minutes, 38 seconds

Marcel de Graaff:

28:47

28 minutes, 47 seconds

You state that, based on the authorized indications, the vaccines may only be administered to persons seeking personal protection and that they are not authorized for the purpose of

29:01

29 minutes, 1 second

reducing transmission or infection rates - controlling transmission -. 29:08

29 minutes, 8 seconds

You also state that the authorized indication does not correspond to applications promoted by

29:15

29 minutes, 15 seconds

pharmaceutical companies, politicians, and healthcare professionals.

29:21

29 minutes, 21 seconds

And then it says: "You are indeed right when you point out that the COVID-19 vaccines are not authorized for

29:30

29 minutes, 30 seconds

preventing transmission from one person to another.

29:35

29 minutes, 35 seconds

The indications are exclusively for the protection of vaccinated individuals.

29:42

29 minutes, 42 seconds

The EMA continues: The product information for COVID-19 vaccines clearly states that the vaccines are intended for active immunization to prevent COVID-19.

29:54

29 minutes, 54 seconds

Furthermore, the EMA's assessment reports on the authorization of the vaccines mention the lack of

30:02

30 minutes, 2 seconds

data on transmissibility. Thus EMA.

30:08

30 minutes, 8 seconds

This means that, according to the EMA, administering a COVID-19 injection could only take place based on informed-consent in a

30:16

30 minutes, 16 seconds

doctor-patient relationship.

30:20

30 minutes, 20 seconds

Everything we have seen and can see and hear in the new normal about a vaccine that, according to the former minister,

30:26

30 minutes, 26 seconds

was tested extensively, cannot in any way be traced back to the marketing authorization granted by the EMA.

30:36

30 minutes, 36 seconds

By repeatedly explicitly, implicitly

30:44

30 minutes, 44 seconds

and subliminally confirming the safety and effectiveness of the COVID-19 injections over an extended period of time, the defendants acted using the brainwashing method developed

30:51

30 minutes, 51 seconds

by the former German Minister of Propaganda Goebbels.

30:57

30 minutes, 57 seconds

It is now common knowledge that the official COVID-19 narrative is incorrect and that

31:05

31 minutes, 5 seconds

all campaigns with "you're doing it for someone else" were based on something other than deception.

31:12

31 minutes, 12 seconds

Yet, the defendants maintain this. Their legal documents are completely clear on this point, and so it is also completely

31:19

31 minutes, 19 seconds

clear that we are dealing with professional liars here. And now the novelty I was talking about.

31:27

31 minutes, 27 seconds

You've probably heard of the traffic jams.

31:31

31 minutes, 31 seconds

There's no escaping it. Without any speculation or uncertainty about the content of those files, the following is certain.

31:41

31 minutes, 41 seconds

There is a globally organized malicious Elite. At the top of this

31:49

31 minutes, 49 seconds

elite are at least some of the families who own the central banks worldwide, which

31:57

31 minutes, 57 seconds

have hijacked the right to create money out of thin air.

32:02

32 minutes, 2 seconds

They are the ones who lend this money to governments at interest and enrich themselves at the expense of the taxpayer.

32:12

32 minutes, 12 seconds

Mr. Epstein plays an important role in this network. He is the bankers' agent and also

32:21

32 minutes, 21 seconds

a very important person at the Trilateral Commission, which has also been created by the Rockefellers, a banking family.

32:31

32 minutes, 31 seconds

Mr. Epstein is a self-proclaimed transhumanist.

32:35

32 minutes, 35 seconds

Someone who has no respect for the divine creation of man, unless they belong to the wealthy nobility.

32:42

At the behest of his superiors, Epstein is shaping the transhuman agenda, which is largely driven by the desire to largely eradicate the

32:52

32 minutes, 52 seconds

world population.

32:56

32 minutes, 56 seconds

This transhuman agenda is a key component of the Great Reset agenda, of which the defendants are executors.

33:05

33 minutes, 5 seconds

As early as 2011, Mr. Epstein, at Gates's behest, advocated a

33:14

33 minutes, 14 seconds

financial model to profit from vaccines at the largest American bank, JP Morgan Chase. 33:20

33 minutes, 20 seconds

You should know that a few years earlier, the WHO had changed the definition of a pandemic so that on June 11, 2009, it could declare the

33:29

33 minutes, 29 seconds

fake swine flu pandemic, also known as the Mexican flu, eradicate it. Yes, you

33:37

33 minutes, 37 seconds

should also know that the WHO was founded after World War II and, since the lack of real

33:46

33 minutes, 46 seconds

pandemics, has been increasingly funded by private parties. Private parties don't just donate money,

33:55

33 minutes, 55 seconds

but do so to make money.

33:59

33 minutes, 59 seconds

Gates, with his Gates Foundation, excels above all others as the WHO's largest private funder.

34:08

34 minutes, 8 seconds

Neither at the bank, nor at Gates, are Epstein's well-known conviction for sex for the sexual abuse

34:16

34 minutes, 16 seconds

of a minor encountering any objection to allowing Epstein's mediating role.

34:23

34 minutes, 23 seconds

This entire financial model, with a donor advised fund, offshore structures, and a bank's hedge fund to invisibly pocket profits

34:31

34 minutes, 31 seconds

, was set up well before the rollout of the planned and fake COVID-19 crisis.

34:42

34 minutes, 42 seconds

Of course, no doctor was involved in this, because the bankers, Gates, and all the other participants were not concerned with health at all. 34:54

34 minutes, 54 seconds

The World Bank Group, for which our Queen is a top advocate in the area of financial health,

35:01

35 minutes, 1 second

inclusion and economic development, also played an important role.

35:07

35 minutes, 7 seconds

The trigger mechanism in the complicated and shady financial construct was the number of PCR

35:17

35 minutes, 17 seconds

deaths, which now makes you understand why the defendants, as executors

35:25

35 minutes, 25 seconds

of the COVID-19 project, pushed through the PCR test.

35:32

35 minutes, 32 seconds

The planned COVID-19 crisis, including sufficient PCR deaths, was a prerequisite for making the planned financial

35:41

35 minutes, 41 seconds

gain possible and therefore did not come about by chance. 35:47

35 minutes, 47 seconds

The Epstein files prove that the superiors of Epstein, the institutions that are supposed to enforce law and order,

35:55

35 minutes, 55 seconds

have global power. Whichever way you look at it, Gates is part of this network and plays

36:03

36 minutes, 3 seconds

a crucial role when it comes to making money from so-called vaccines.

36:11

36 minutes, 11 seconds

This aligns seamlessly with Gates's own statement in a 2010 TED Talk that with new vaccines, healthcare

36:19

36 minutes, 19 seconds

and reproductive health services—read: abortion and sterilization—a reduction in the world population of 10 to 15 % can be achieved. 36:31

36 minutes, 31 seconds

It's shocking, but equally understandable, that none of the defendants in this case have any criticism of Gates. Apparently

36:40

36 minutes, 40 seconds

they are all vulnerable and cannot afford criticism.

36:47

36 minutes, 47 seconds

Now, these Epstein files—approximately 3.5 million of the more than 5 million pages with many black lines—have been released.

36:56

36 minutes, 56 seconds

And these files testify to the involvement of bankers, secret services, media, Hollywood figures,

37:04

37 minutes, 4 seconds

government officials, universities, and also many so-called scientists who are all corruptly connected to this

37:13

37 minutes, 13 seconds

network and are at the service of this transhuman, let's just say satanic, mind-bending system. 37:22

37 minutes, 22 seconds

A side note. The state, in its statement of defense in the main proceedings, indeed a completely separate

37:30

37 minutes, 30 seconds

procedure with other plaintiffs. However, it writes the following:

37:35

37 minutes, 35 seconds

"The state wishes to emphasize that the consequences of the theories formulated in the summons are not innocent.

37:45

37 minutes, 45 seconds

The narrative used with these theories of an evil elite targeting the population could

37:52

37 minutes, 52 seconds

ultimately have an undermining effect on

about the democratic rule of law.

37:56

37 minutes, 56 seconds

It already provides a group of people with legitimacy for online hate speech, death threats, and worse.

38:05

38 minutes, 5 seconds

It is now common knowledge that the Dutch state is lying.

38:12

38 minutes, 12 seconds

After all, the democratic rule of law is being undermined by a malicious elite that is targeting the population.

38:19

38 minutes, 19 seconds

The Epstein files prove that. And for defenders, denying the existence of such a malicious elite is

38:27

38 minutes, 27 seconds

undermining the very functioning of a democratic rule of law. 38:32

38 minutes, 32 seconds

These kinds of blatant lies from defendants are completely in violation of the duty to tell the truth under Article 21

38:39

38 minutes, 39 seconds

of the proceedings and have completely misled the court of first instance. There is no doubt whatsoever that fundamental norms were violated.

38:47

38 minutes, 47 seconds

This leaves no doubt whatsoever that fundamental norms were violated.

38:52

38 minutes, 52 seconds

Back to the Epstein files. A few critical observations are appropriate here.

39:00

39 minutes

1. The members of this now partially revealed elite network are not prosecuted.

39:06

39 minutes, 6 seconds

Two: the members of this elite network are adhering to the mafia code of silence and deny everything of material

39:13

39 minutes, 13 seconds

significance. Three. Citizens are far from receiving all the information regarding the elite network.

39:22

39 minutes, 22 seconds

Four. The information released at the individual level about the members of this network is always too meager to draw any truly bitter legal conclusions regarding that

39:31

39 minutes, 31 seconds

individual person when it comes to what's called Pizzagate. If you don't know what that is,

39:40

39 minutes, 40 seconds

you should look it up, because you should know.

39:44

39 minutes, 44 seconds

These Epstein files will therefore have a major psychological impact on the world's population.

39:50

39 minutes, 50 seconds

It will be a great disappointment to them that little to no action is taken against this elite and their accomplices. 39:59

39 minutes, 59 seconds

Six. This action is already leading to further demoralization,

40:04

40 minutes, 4 seconds

which, on closer inspection, must also be the intention of this evil elite.

40:10

40 minutes, 10 seconds

Otherwise, the full package of information would have been released, and hundreds, if not thousands, of arrests would have already been made.

40:19

40 minutes, 19 seconds

Seven. This planned demoralization of the world's population is already accompanied by a further erosion of trust in institutions. It cannot be otherwise.

40:32

40 minutes, 32 seconds

Eight. This is already diminishing many people's resistance to the idea of democratically legitimizing the replacement of

40:40

40 minutes, 40 seconds

existing institutions with new ones. 40:45

40 minutes, 45 seconds

And this brings me to the point of what the Epstein files really are. It's a

40:52

40 minutes, 52 seconds

psychological operation to further facilitate the Great Reset.

40:58

40 minutes, 58 seconds

The argument is that if the judge in first instance had been aware of these facts and circumstances, they would have recognized the importance of the honest experts

41:06

41 minutes, 6 seconds

whom my clients presented and would have granted that request. You, as judges, cannot ignore this reality.

41:19

41 minutes, 19 seconds

I already noted that not everything that is considered common knowledge is actually true. 41:28

41 minutes, 28 seconds

The truth must be investigated, and it is your primary duty as judges to establish the true facts and circumstances in order to reach a balanced judgment.

41:41

41 minutes, 41 seconds

This is no different in your assessment of the admissibility of this appeal. And it is my duty to provide you with the facts for this purpose.

41:51

41 minutes, 51 seconds

The Roman law adage "Da mihi factum, dabo tibi ius", give me the facts and I will give you the law," also applies

42:00

42 minutes

to assessing the admissibility of this appeal.

42:05

42 minutes, 5 seconds

This implies that in a legal case it is up to the parties to state and prove the facts and thus to define the dispute

42:13

42 minutes, 13 seconds

about which the judge is to judge. You must therefore consider the facts I present to you in your judgment.

42:24

42 minutes, 24 seconds

The context of the request should have dawned on you by now.

42:33

42 minutes, 33 seconds

Now I come to the in-depth explanation necessary to let you know the true facts, which is essential for a fair trial.

42:44

42 minutes, 44 seconds

The true facts are essentially nothing more than my having loudly and clearly presented in the first instance

42minutes, 51 seconds

We are witnessing the largest genocide of the world's population ever.

42:59

42 minutes, 59 seconds

This is a key component of the COVID-19 agenda, which the defendants are executing.

43:07

43 minutes, 7 seconds

To delve deeper, you need the findings of genuine experts who are separate from

43:15

43 minutes, 15 seconds

those implementing the COVID-19 Great Reset agenda.

43:21

43 minutes, 21 seconds

All suggestions from the defendants regarding the identity of the experts my clients are putting forward should, for

43:28

43 minutes, 28 seconds

be immediately discarded.

43:32

43 minutes, 32 seconds

Given the context of this case, there is no other way.

43:40

43 minutes, 40 seconds

In this case and in this context, you cannot ignore the findings of the experts presented by my clients.

43:47

43 minutes, 47 seconds

Their motive is clearly not money, not fame, not power, but love of the truth.

43:58

43 minutes, 58 seconds

Truth is the driving force and the research field of the true scientist.

44:04

44 minutes, 4 seconds

A number of them have come to this courtroom today at their own expense to make that drive. And you would be wise to ask them questions if anything about the video messages and reports they sent you is unclear.

44:11

44 minutes, 11 seconds

44:23

44 minutes, 23 seconds

Of course, I assume you've read those reports and watched the videos, but I'd like

44:30

44 minutes, 30 seconds

to explain some important elements to you.

44:37

44 minutes, 37 seconds

I'll start with Joseph Senon's statement.

44:42

44 minutes, 42 seconds

It's based on the affidavit of what late Professor Dr.

44:46

44 minutes, 46 seconds

Francis Boyle has established and concluded.

44:52

44 minutes, 52 seconds

Professor Boyle is the leading authority on bioweapons legislation.

44:59

44 minutes, 59 seconds

He is the author of it.

45:02

45 minutes, 2 seconds

So he knows what that legally means.

45:05

45 minutes, 5 seconds

He knew better than anyone that the COVID-19 mRNA injection is a bioweapon.

45:13

45 minutes, 13 seconds

He made that clear to the world, after which he died, despite being in good health, shortly after

45:22

45 minutes, 22 seconds

declaring himself willing to testify about this before the court in Leeuwarden under oath.

45:31

45 minutes, 31 seconds

The core of Professor Boy's argument is that the COVID-19 mRNA injections contain derivatives of

45:39

45 minutes, 39 seconds

illegal military gain of function research.

45:43

45 minutes, 43 seconds

This means that the COVID-19 injections qualify by definition as a military biological

45:50

45 minutes, 50 seconds

weapon system. A bioweapon thus. This bioweapon consists of two

45:59

45 minutes, 59 seconds

integrated components: the pathogenic payload and the delivery mechanism.

46:08

46 minutes, 8 seconds

The pathogenic payload is undoubtedly the product of illegal gain-of-function research.

46:16

46 minutes, 16 seconds

Boyle refers to an article in the scientific journal Nature Medicine, the link of which I have included in this plea.

46:25

46 minutes, 25 seconds

If you open that link, you will immediately read the warning that true scientists believe that an animal is the

46:34

46 minutes, 34 seconds

most likely source of the coronavirus. You know immediately now that what is called in "the new normal"

46:42

46 minutes, 42 seconds

true scientists are not scientists, but religious fanatics.

46:49

46 minutes, 49 seconds

These are the scientists that the defendants are hiding behind.

46:54

46 minutes, 54 seconds

The article in Nature Medicine about which boill reports was published in 2015

47:02

47 minutes, 2 seconds

and the title, translated, is: A cluster of circulating coronaviruses in bats similar to SARS

47:10

47 minutes, 10 seconds

shows potential for infection in humans.

47:15

47 minutes, 15 seconds

I present to you what the summary of this research included in the article teaches us. 47:23

47 minutes, 23 seconds

It says, based on these findings, we have synthetically developed an infectious

47:30

47 minutes, 30 seconds

full SHC014- recombinant virus and demonstrated robust viral replication both in vitro and in vivo.

47:43

47 minutes, 43 seconds

So, it says, we researchers have created a SARS-CoV-2 coronavirus with a spike protein optimized for human infection.

47:55

47 minutes, 55 seconds

I can't think of a better example of illegal gain-of-function research.

48:01

48 minutes, 1 second

And who wrote that 2015 article?

48:05

48 minutes, 5 seconds

These include researchers affiliated with UNC Chapel Hill and the Wuhan Institute of Virology.

Wuhan. Yes,

48:13

48 minutes, 13 seconds

Wuhan? Yes Wuhan! You know, where, according to the official narrative, people just dropped dead in the streets when COVID-19

48:22

48 minutes, 22 seconds

broke out because a bat had mutated there.

48:26

48 minutes, 26 seconds

The spike, the pathogenic load of the bioweapon, is the result of this research.

48:33

48 minutes, 33 seconds

So it's not a natural spike, but an illegally developed, synthetic pathogen. That is

48:41

48 minutes, 41 seconds

optimized for human infection. 48:47

48 minutes, 47 seconds

The spike protein mRNA, which instructs human cells to produce this pathogenic spike protein, is

48:55

48 minutes, 55 seconds

one of the two crucial building blocks of the COVID-19 bioweapon.

49:02

49 minutes, 2 seconds

Now the delivery system, the NLPs, you know, the nanolipid particles that encapsulate the mRNA payload and deliver it to the interior

49:10

49 minutes, 10 seconds

of the cells. The propaganda term for this is fat globules.

49:16

49 minutes, 16 seconds

As if we're talking about something as innocent as a pack of butter. What did Boyle explain about that?

49:24

49 minutes, 24 seconds

Boyle explained that it's actually a nanotechnology-enhanced delivery platform. 49:33

49 minutes, 33 seconds

This technology, as Boyle explained, was paid for, developed,

49:39

49 minutes, 39 seconds

funded, and conceived by the Pentagon and its research institute, Darpa. This technology platform,

49:48

49 minutes, 48 seconds

nanotechnology platform, was not a side issue.

49:52

49 minutes, 52 seconds

Dr. Boyle points out that the virus itself was aerosolized and processed with nanotechnology from the very beginning.

49:59

49 minutes, 59 seconds

This indicates a long-term program aimed at applying advanced delivery systems.

50:07

50 minutes, 7 seconds

And this technology was used in the COVID-19 injections.

50:14

50 minutes, 14 seconds

Boyle determined that the NLP delivery system in the injections is the result of a specific military-sponsored

50:22

50 minutes, 22 seconds

nanotechnological biological weapons program.

50:28

50 minutes, 28 seconds

You can read more about the legal implications of this in Sansone's explanation.

50:35

50 minutes, 35 seconds

Here, it is also substantiated that Gates and Boerla qualify as suspects of crimes

50:42

50 minutes, 42 seconds

against humanity, as defined in the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court.

50:51

50 minutes, 51 seconds

I will also explain Sasha Latypova's statement. Sasha Latypova has a very impressive resume that demonstrates that

50:59

50 minutes, 59 seconds

she is uniquely familiar with the procedures and formal requirements of drug development.

51:08

51 minutes, 8 seconds

That resume is part of the court documents in this case.

51:13

51 minutes, 13 seconds

Latypova teaches you that the technology used in COVID-19 mRNA injections is officially recognized as a dual-use technology.

51:23

51 minutes, 23 seconds

This involves technology that can be used for medical applications, but is also highly suitable for creating a bioweapon. 51:34

51 minutes, 34 seconds

She teaches you that as early as 1997, US defense advisors, the Jason Group, qualified gene therapy platforms based on

51:44

51 minutes, 44 seconds

mRNA and NLPs as technology that could be deployed as a bioweapon.

51:52

51 minutes, 52 seconds

Latypova explains that even fragmented RNA disrupts the host's gene expression, even without coding for specific proteins.

52:04

52 minutes, 4 seconds

The officially permitted amount of DNA scrap in COVID-19 mRNA injections is therefore particularly worrisome.

52:17

52 minutes, 17 seconds

Latypova also teaches us that COVID-19 was not a public health incident, but a covert global military operation. 52:33

52 minutes, 33 seconds

A national emergency was declared in the United States on February 4, 2020.

52:39

52 minutes, 39 seconds

under the Public Readiness and Emergency Preparedness Act, the Prep Act.

52:46

52 minutes, 46 seconds

The Prep Act provides for a national emergency for a military, chemical, biological, radiological, or nuclear emergency.

52:55

52 minutes, 55 seconds

This national emergency was declared in the US on February 4, 2020, and will remain in effect

53:02

53 minutes, 2 seconds

at least until December 31, 2022.

53:10

53 minutes, 10 seconds

Similar emergency laws were enacted in the European Union. EU persons and other government agencies

53:18

53 minutes, 18 seconds

concluded predatory COVID-19 injection contracts with Pfizer and other manufacturers. And

53:26

53 minutes, 26 seconds

thus circumventing all consumer safety regulations and import and export laws.

53:36

53 minutes, 36 seconds

Key relevant statements and timeline

Regarding the course of events in the European Union and

53:43

53 minutes, 43 seconds

the Netherlands, these are described in detail in Latypova's documents.

53:48

53 minutes, 48 seconds

And I submitted those documents as an appendix to the appeal.

53:53

53 minutes, 53 seconds

All COVID-19 mRNA injections that were promoted as safe and effective vaccines were ordered and financed

54:02

54 minutes, 2 seconds

by the US Department of Defense as prototypes and demonstrations of large-scale production.

54:10

54 minutes, 10 seconds

The US Department of Defense and NATO oversaw the development, production, and global

54:17

54 minutes, 17 seconds

distribution of all so-called COVID-19 means of control.

54:24

54 minutes, 24 seconds

The COVID-19 injections came onto the market in December 2020 as emergency use authorization countermeasures.

54:34

54 minutes, 34 seconds

Countermeasures that are permitted in an emergency.

54:40

54 minutes, 40 seconds

These regulations have nothing to do with the usual regulations for pharmaceutical products.

54:48

54 minutes, 48 seconds

When a product is designated as a countermeasure, all laws and regulations regarding consumer safety,

54:57

54 minutes, 57 seconds

including manufacturer liability, are void.

55:01

55 minutes, 1 second

This category of products may only be distributed in the event of a declared biochemical, nuclear, or terrorist emergency. 55:13

55 minutes, 13 seconds

The emergency use authorization procedure for countermeasures may only be used in the United States

55:21

55 minutes, 21 seconds

if the U.S. Secretary of Health and Human Services.

55:26

55 minutes, 26 seconds

declares an emergency based on advice from the Food and Drug Administration, whose counterpart in Europe is the EMA.

55:37

55 minutes, 37 seconds

Section 564 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, FD&C Act, exempts countermeasures from

55:46

55 minutes, 46 seconds

pharmaceutical regulations and informed consent requirements. This will last as long as the state of emergency is in effect, which

55:54

55 minutes, 54 seconds

means in the United States at least until December 31, 2022.

56:01

56 minutes, 1 second

But you see, exactly the same thing is happening here in the Netherlands. On the day my appeal is filed, a new COVID-19

56:10

56 minutes, 10 seconds

injection campaign started, for which people were called en masse.

56:16

56 minutes, 16 seconds

Under this legal emergency status, compliance with pharmaceutical legislation is voluntary and unenforceable.

56:25

56 minutes, 25 seconds

This effectively creates a lawless situation. 56:30

56 minutes, 30 seconds

Latypova hereby reminds you that misleading representations about the safety, efficacy, or content of products with an emergency use authorization

56:39

56 minutes, 39 seconds

are permitted under US federal law.

56:46

56 minutes, 46 seconds

Similar exceptions to the law have been invoked in EU member states.

56:54

56 minutes, 54 seconds

Please refer to the EU Regulation on Emergency Use 2016-369.

57:00

57 minutes

There, the European Commission allows the complete suspension of current good manufacturing practice,

57:04

57 minutes, 4 seconds

the cGMP, standards during a declared emergency.

57:12

57 minutes, 12 seconds

This suspension actually takes place in Europe through supply agreements with pharmaceutical companies. Pharmaceutical

57:21

57 minutes, 21 seconds

companies, including Pfizer, are fully indemnified against injuries and deaths resulting from an unsafe

57:29

57 minutes, 29 seconds

product. Except in the case of very narrowly defined intentional misconduct.

57:37

57 minutes, 37 seconds

The European supply contracts are not coincidentally comparable to the provisions on this point in the American Prep Act.

57:47

57 minutes, 47 seconds

the global recognition agreement, or the mutual recognition agreement, I should say, between

57:55

57 minutes, 55 seconds

the EMA and the FDA, which has been in effect since July 2019, and allows qualified persons in the EU

58:04

58 minutes, 4 seconds

to blindly accept American batch data.

58:10

58 minutes, 10 seconds

Therefore, claims by EU health authorities

58:13

58 minutes, 13 seconds

or manufacturers cannot be considered reliable sources of information.

58:21

58 minutes, 21 seconds

Latypova also explains in her contribution that although the FDA granted a biologic licensing approval

58:30

58 minutes, 30 seconds

BLA to Pfizer's mRNA COVID-19 injection in August 2021, this violated US biologics licensing laws

58:38

58 minutes, 38 seconds

and international laws on clinical trials.

on humans.

58:46

58 minutes, 46 seconds

The COVID-19 mRNA injections that came onto the market through the non-research EUA emergency use authorization procedure

58:55

58 minutes, 55 seconds

cannot formally obtain a BLA license without first demonstrating that these injections fully meet the research standards for a BLA license.

59:08

59 minutes, 8 seconds

Yet, the legally impossible has happened, which demonstrates the extent of corruption among the highest and most powerful

59:16

59 minutes, 16 seconds

regulators. The license has indeed been granted. And a formal citizen request from Children's Health Defence

59:25

59 minutes, 25 seconds

A request from Children's Health Defense to revoke the BLA license and relabel Pfizer's product

59:33

59 minutes, 33 seconds

as emergency use authorization is currently being processed by the FDA. This is all very serious.

59:43

59 minutes, 43 seconds

Latypova concludes that the defendants misleadingly promoted the COVID-19 injections

59:49

59 minutes, 49 seconds

under a false drug label as safe prophylactic vaccines against COVID-19. 1:00:01

1 hour, 1 second

The emergency permit I was talking about, the emergency use authorization, and the associated legislation in the field

1:00:08

1 hour, 8 seconds

of public health served as a convincing cover, a legal theater, while the actual

1:00:16

1 hour, 16 seconds

operating regime, the legislation regarding chemical and biological warfare and the associated

1:00:24

1 hour, 24 seconds

emergency exemptions was and remains.

1:00:29

1 hour, 29 seconds

Latypova establishes that the Dutch government and agencies based their decisions on the regulatory information and

1:00:36

1 hour, 36 seconds

decisions of the FDA and were therefore aware of the ins and outs. The intentionality of their

1:00:44

1 hour, 44 seconds

unlawful conduct is thus established. 1:00:49

1 hour, 49 seconds

I will briefly comment on the statements of the other experts.

1:00:53

1 hour, 53 seconds

I cannot leave undiscussed the expert opinions of Katherine Watt, Mike, and Catherine Austin Fitts. Given my speaking time and the lengthy lead-up that

1:01:02

1 hour, 1 minute, 2 seconds

I have taken to penetrate your consciousness, I am compelled to explain their equally important statements even more concisely.

1:01:12

1 hour, 1 minute, 12 seconds

Katherine Watt teaches you that everyone who has received a vaccination, regardless of the type, has been poisoned. Injecting foreign substances found in all vaccines into the bloodstream

1:01:20

1 hour, 1 minute, 20 seconds

is by definition toxic, making people susceptible to allergies,

1:01:30

1 hour, 1 minute, 30 seconds

cancer, and autoimmune diseases.

1:01:33

1 hour, 1 minute, 33 seconds

She describes all the laws and regulations in this regard, and her conclusion makes it clear that we are being massively defrauded by the law and regulatory bodies in the field

1:01:41

1 hour, 1 minute, 41 seconds

of medicines, and in particular by the pharmaceutical companies that produce and sell vaccines. 1:01:50

1 hour, 1 minute, 50 seconds

Mike Yeadon, a renowned scientist who held a senior position at Pfizer, is the most

1:01:57

1 hour, 1 minute, 57 seconds

qualified person in the world to read the design of a medical product. And he has seen the building blocks of

1:02:06

1 hour, 2 minutes, 6 seconds

the COVID-19 bioweapon for what they are.

1:02:11

1 hour, 2 minutes, 11 seconds

His explanation of the malicious design of the COVID-19 mRNA injections leaves nothing of clarity to be desired. 1:02:23

1 hour, 2 minutes, 23 seconds

Catherine Austin Fitts, a former high-ranking advisor to the Bush administration and insider in the banking system, has explained to you in no uncertain terms how the global economic and political playing field is dominated by a

1:02:31

1 hour, 2 minutes, 31 seconds

collaboration of criminals she refers to as Mr. Global. She places the COVID-19 injections within that reality. 1:02:49

1 hour, 2 minutes, 49 seconds

The statements of all clients' experts contribute to the evidence that the official narrative

1:02:56

1 hour, 2 minutes, 56 seconds

of the defendants is malicious and false and that the defendants in these proceedings, as a group, as executors of the

1:03:04

1 hour, 3 minutes, 4 seconds

COVID-19 project, the Great Reset, are deliberately acting unlawfully. I will conclude.

1:03:13

1 hour, 3 minutes, 13 seconds

Article 21 of the Code of Civil Procedure stipulates that the parties are obligated to present the facts relevant to the decision fully and truthfully. 1:03:24

1 hour, 3 minutes, 24 seconds

Everything you know now shows that the defendants in the first instance have misrepresented the truth.

1:03:32

1 hour, 3 minutes, 32 seconds

21 legal proceedings

and violated with no other purpose than to conceal the truth, so that the crimes against

1:03:40

1 hour, 3 minutes, 40 seconds

humanity can continue unhindered.

1:03:44

1 hour, 3 minutes, 44 seconds

The fundamental standard of a fair trial has been violated by them.

1:03:52

1 hour, 3 minutes, 52 seconds

This undoubtedly justifies a very extensive discussion of the admissibility of this appeal as, in my view,

1:04:00

1 hour, 4 minutes

a breach of the legal remedy ban. Thank you.

1:04:08

1 hour, 4 minutes, 8 seconds

Yes, thank you, Mr. Stassen. Um, good, uh, you stayed well within the time limit. Fine. Despite the annoying

1:04:17

1 hour, 4 minutes, 17 seconds

interruptions. I understand from the presence that it's still quite manageable in the back. Oh, I get a thumbs up. Great. Um

1:04:26

1 hour, 4 minutes, 26 seconds

Yes, we've scheduled a break now. I also think that's a good thing for a while. Um, it's scheduled until 1 o'clock. That was, uh, yes, now

1:04:34

1 hour, 4 minutes, 34 seconds

A little less than 45 minutes. That's enough. Scan the lawyers. Mr Stassen also sufficient?. Yes, then, uh, we'll see

1:04:41

1 hour, 4 minutes, 41 seconds

We'll meet back here shortly at, uh, at 1 o'clock, uh, for the first statement of the respondent, where they can also respond to the first statement of the appellants. See you soon. 1:05:06

1 hour, 5 minutes, 6 seconds

Oh,

1:05:09

1 hour, 5 minutes, 9 seconds

Welcome, uh, welcome back everyone. Yes, those are original ones, actually, but everyone has found a place again.

1:05:17

1 hour, 5 minutes, 17 seconds

Um, before going to the respondent's side, uh, I realized that

1:05:23

1 hour, 5 minutes, 23 seconds

Mr. Stassen, uh, somewhere in the beginning of your argument, I forgot to ask who sat next to you.

1:05:30

1 hour, 5 minutes, 30 seconds

And that's definitely Ms. Mannabulu. Correct.

1:05:33

1 hour, 5 minutes, 33 seconds

Um, I assume. Welcome. And then it's either Mr. Bos or Mr. Staamer. Sorry,

1:05:39

1 hour, 5 minutes, 39 seconds

Mr. Bos. Mr. Bos, welcome. Um, and no one else showed up on the respondent's side. Not even digitally, because I occasionally looked

1:05:47

1 hour, 5 minutes, 47 seconds

at the screen. I didn't see anyone calling in.

1:05:51

1 hour, 5 minutes, 51 seconds

There was a representative from Pfizer calling in. Although we... Yes, Mrs. Matteo

1:05:59

1 hour, 5 minutes, 59 seconds

Yes,

1:06:00

1 hour, 6 minutes

Okay. I see her in and out every now and then.

1:06:02

1 hour, 6 minutes, 2 seconds

Yes, she let us know by email that sometimes it's not possible to stay in the loop. Hm. Well, maybe I can comment on that.

1:06:11

1 hour, 6 minutes, 11 seconds

Look, Pfizer is not a party to this procedure, so I wouldn't know what a Pfizer representative should participate in this case.

1:06:18

1 hour, 6 minutes, 18 seconds

That person, uh, on behalf of Ms. Matteo, is someone on behalf of Mr. Bourla, or uh, yes.

1:06:25

1 hour, 6 minutes, 25 seconds

Okay. Okay, that's different. Yes, the speaker has the microphone open, so we're hearing the speaker now. Ms. Djamilla le pair,

1:06:33

1 hour, 6 minutes, 33 seconds

Can you, uh, yes. And now I see at the bottom of the screen

1:06:40

1 hour, 6 minutes, 40 seconds

Ms. Kant is present as one of the parties. Welcome. Yes,

1:06:45

1 hour, 6 minutes, 45 seconds

Good. Then we come to, uh, the respondent's first statement. Do you have a thought order among yourselves or

1:06:55

1 hour, 6 minutes, 55 seconds

shall we just start with, uh, the respondent 1 through, what is it, 11 and 16? So, Mr. Veldhuis.

1:07:03

1 hour, 7 minutes, 3 seconds

Yes. Mr. Möhring. Yes. Yes,

1:07:12

1 hour, 7 minutes, 12 seconds

Thank you. Yes, thank you.

1:07:15

1 hour, 7 minutes, 15 seconds

And do you also have a copy for the interpreters? I'll check if our colleague at the back of the room is available for that.

1:07:30

1 hour, 7 minutes, 30 seconds

Thank you.

1:07:34

1 hour, 7 minutes, 34 seconds

Yes, is there one copy left at the very back of the room? She's standing up now. Then she can... But that's... we need two copies. Was this one, or... are there two?

1:07:46

1 hour, 7 minutes, 46 seconds

Interpreters are in two different rooms. Then go ahead, Mrs. Möhring.

1:07:57

1 hour, 7 minutes, 57 seconds

Thank you.

1:07:59

1 hour, 7 minutes, 59 seconds

Your Honorable College. Mrs. clerk.

1:08:03

1 hour, 8 minutes, 3 seconds

The disease COVID-19 exists. There has been a pandemic, and the vaccines against COVID-19 are safe and effective.

1:08:15

1 hour, 8 minutes, 15 seconds

That's... Wait a minute, wait a minute. Um, just now with Mr. Stassen, it was also quiet in the room. I want that to be the case when the defendant's lawyers are speaking. So

1:08:24

1 hour, 8 minutes, 24 seconds

Um, if you would like to talk to each other, laugh, or make comments, you are welcome in the room next door, but not in this room.

1:08:33

1 hour, 8 minutes, 33 seconds

Yes.

1:08:36

1 hour, 8 minutes, 36 seconds

That is the global scientific consensus supported by many independent and impartial experts.

1:08:45

1 hour, 8 minutes, 45 seconds

It is clear that the applicants have a theory about COVID-19 that directly contradicts this.

1:08:52

1 hour, 8 minutes, 52 seconds

However, that is not what we are discussing today.

1:08:56

1 hour, 8 minutes, 56 seconds

Everything my esteemed opponent has just put forward is therefore also irrelevant today.

1:09:04

1 hour, 9 minutes, 4 seconds

These proceedings before the court concerned only the question of whether the applicants are permitted to submit questions to certain individuals through the court. 1:09:14

1 hour, 9 minutes, 14 seconds

As asked, are the COVID-19 vaccines a bioweapon used to commit genocide?

1:09:22

1 hour, 9 minutes, 22 seconds

These questions are already clear in advance as to how these individuals, chosen by the applicants themselves, will answer them.

1:09:32

1 hour, 9 minutes, 32 seconds

The court rightly rejected that request for several independent reasons.

1:09:39

1 hour, 9 minutes, 39 seconds

The court has determined, among other things, that the request is contrary to the legislature's intention.

1:09:44

1 hour, 9 minutes, 44 seconds

That hearing these individuals is not the appropriate means. That the applicants have no interest in their request. 1:09:51

1 hour, 9 minutes, 51 seconds

and that the request violates due process.

1:09:56

1 hour, 9 minutes, 56 seconds

And that judgment is not even the issue here today.

1:10:01

1 hour, 10 minutes, 1 second

Today, the only question is whether the applicants can appeal the court's ruling.

1:10:09

1 hour, 10 minutes, 9 seconds

And the answer to that question is no.

1:10:13

1 hour, 10 minutes, 13 seconds

Appeal against a decision like the district court's is prohibited by law. There is a prohibition on legal remedies.

1:10:22

1 hour, 10 minutes, 22 seconds

And that would have been different if the court had granted leave for this appeal. But the applicants did not request this, and leave was not granted.

1:10:36

1 hour, 10 minutes, 36 seconds

The only option the applicants then have to appeal is to invoke a ground for interruption.

1:10:44

1 hour, 10 minutes, 44 seconds

This requires that the proceedings before the court have violated such fundamental legal principles that a fair and

1:10:52

1 hour, 10 minutes, 52 seconds

impartial hearing of the case can no longer be said to have been conducted.

1:10:57

1 hour, 10 minutes, 57 seconds

A high threshold, therefore, which is completely unmet in this case. 1:11:03

1 hour, 11 minutes, 3 seconds

None of the applicants' arguments justify the conclusion that the court's handling of this case was not fair and impartial.

1:11:14

1 hour, 11 minutes, 14 seconds

The state has already explained this in its statement of defense and will not repeat it here.

1:11:20

1 hour, 11 minutes, 20 seconds

Then, outside the pleadings. Regarding the aforementioned new facts (Novum), it does not constitute grounds for interruption.

1:11:28

1 hour, 11 minutes, 28 seconds

Moreover, the applicants have not explained why the Novum would lead to the conclusion that the court violated a fundamental legal principle that would

1:11:37

1 hour, 11 minutes, 37 seconds

make it impossible to speak of a fair and impartial handling of the case. 1:11:45

1 hour, 11 minutes, 45 seconds

In the ruling, which was undoubtedly rendered within a reasonable time and after a public hearing, the

1:11:52

1 hour, 11 minutes, 52 seconds

court assessed the relevant positions of the parties based on the statutory assessment framework.

1:11:59

1 hour, 11 minutes, 59 seconds

And that resulted in the request being denied.

1:12:04

1 hour, 12 minutes, 4 seconds

And the applicants clearly disagree with this. But that, of course, does not constitute grounds for dismissal.

1:12:13

1 hour, 12 minutes, 13 seconds

The applicants' appeal must therefore be declared inadmissible. Or at the very least, the appeal must be dismissed. Thank you. 1:12:21

1 hour, 12 minutes, 21 seconds

Thank you, Ms. Möhring. Um, that was also your immediate response to the first round of Mr. Stassen. Okay.

1:12:28

1 hour, 12 minutes, 28 seconds

Then, uh, Ministers Roessingh or Bredenoord on behalf of Mr. Bourla.

1:12:35

1 hour, 12 minutes, 35 seconds

We have nothing to add to this, no additions. Okay. Um, then, Mr. Heemskerk or Mulder.

1:12:43

1 hour, 12 minutes, 43 seconds

We also have nothing to add to the fact that judgment of... Okay, because you don't have a microphone,

1:12:50

1 hour, 12 minutes, 50 seconds

I'll repeat it. You say you have nothing to add, and we refer to the The court's judgment.

1:12:57

1 hour, 12 minutes, 57 seconds

Um, Mr. Ekker. Oh yes, first. My client has nothing to add either. And then Mr. Bekema and Lichtendahl.

1:13:06

1 hour, 13 minutes, 6 seconds

Everyone also agrees with Mr. Möhring's argument.

1:13:11

1 hour, 13 minutes, 11 seconds

Okay. Um, well, in terms of scheduling the hearing, it's going pretty smoothly. We had

1:13:20

1 hour, 13 minutes, 20 seconds

an hour for this. Um, let's get to the court's questions. Um

1:13:27

1 hour, 13 minutes, 27 seconds

Yes, Mr. Stassen, perhaps the first point that Ms. Möhring also touched upon, uh, what she also touched upon in

1:13:34

1 hour, 13 minutes, 34 seconds

her, uh, in her pleadings. Um, is it true that no leave was requested to lodge appeals?

1:13:42

1 hour, 13 minutes, 42 seconds

I appreciate you asking that.

1:13:44

1 hour, 13 minutes, 44 seconds

And I'll explain why that's true and why that is the case.

1:13:49

1 hour, 13 minutes, 49 seconds

I started a case in the first instance of which the legislature says you can't lose unless there is

1:13:56

1 hour, 13 minutes, 56 seconds

abuse of the Law. Which is clearly not the case,

1:14:03

1 hour, 14 minutes, 3 seconds

a request to a judge to make receptive a case to appeal where legal remedies are prohibited

1:14:10

1 hour, 14 minutes, 10 seconds

is, of course, a huge declaration of weakness. Because why would you ask that? That's definitely a signal that you're expecting

1:14:18

1 hour, 14 minutes, 18 seconds

that you expect the judge will reject the request and therefore was no reason whatsoever. 1:14:23

1 hour, 14 minutes, 23 seconds

And I think that's also why, uh, my esteemed opposing counsel constantly insists, yes, you should have

1:14:30

1 hour, 14 minutes, 30 seconds

had asked that, or you could have asked. I don't have to ask. The law doesn't require me to ask either. The judge has discretionary power to decide whether or not to open that up for appeal.

1:14:41

1 hour, 14 minutes, 41 seconds

And of course, it wasn't my place to ask that. It was the opposing parties' place to ask that. Because they had the weak case. They had the

1:14:49

1 hour, 14 minutes, 49 seconds

weak case. So I think it's a bit of a rhetorical reversal to keep putting that on me. Why didn't you ask? It would have made much more sense if the state had asked for it.

1:14:59

1 hour, 14 minutes, 59 seconds

That's my answer.

1:15:02

1 hour, 15 minutes, 2 seconds

Okay. But it's true that you didn't ask with this, uh, reasoning behind it. Right.

1:15:09

1 hour, 15 minutes, 9 seconds

Okay. Um, yeah, go ahead.

1:15:14

1 hour, 15 minutes, 14 seconds

Requests can also be made after the decision to

1:15:27

1 hour, 15 minutes, 27 seconds

In principle, it can also be made after the decision to not do it.

1:15:32

1 hour, 15 minutes, 32 seconds

I can understand it. But yeah, let's see if this one works. Can you hear me now? 1:15:42

1 hour, 15 minutes, 42 seconds

Yes. Yes. Look,

1:15:44

1 hour, 15 minutes, 44 seconds

the question of persistence. Uh, these types of requests can, in principle, also be made after the decision. A uh, a

1:15:52

1 hour, 15 minutes, 52 seconds

request to open an interlocutory appeal, or an interlocutory appeal between quotation marks. Did you consider that at the time?

1:16:00

1 hour, 16 minutes

Um, I just read the law, of course, and the law is actually very clear. The judge can determine in the ruling whether there is the possibility to appeal, right? Yes.

1:16:08

1 hour, 16 minutes, 8 seconds

And in my opinion, the basic principle is that once a ruling has been rendered, it's over.

1:16:15

1 hour, 16 minutes, 15 seconds

Right. After the hearings, the case is in a state of trial, and then a ruling will be issued, and then we can't do it afterward, right? And no, but I interrupt you.

1:16:23

1 hour, 16 minutes, 23 seconds

just a moment. I interrupt you for a moment. Articles 31 and 32 of the Code of Civil Procedure, of course, deal with that. If there's a point that hasn't been decided on,

1:16:30

1 hour, 16 minutes, 30 seconds

while it was expected to be, or if a mistake was made, then that can still be raised after the ruling.

1:16:38

1 hour, 16 minutes, 38 seconds

Yes, that's right. There are all sorts of ways to correct errors or typographical errors, but I don't think those regulations apply.

1:16:45

1 hour, 16 minutes, 45 seconds

This judge simply made it clear in her verdict that no appeal is permitted.

1:16:50

1 hour, 16 minutes, 50 seconds

Okay. So you're assuming that's not an omission. And that's why you didn't ask.

1:16:55

1 hour, 16 minutes, 55 seconds

Right, that's what I'm assuming. Yes, that's perfectly clear. Yes.

1:17:00

1 hour, 17 minutes

Yes. Um, the other case, uh, which You're saying, well, yes, it's not at all the intention to join that, right? That was one of the

1:17:08

1 hour, 17 minutes, 8 seconds

considerations of the court, we've read. Um, yes, to the extent relevant. What is

1:17:16

1 hour, 17 minutes, 16 seconds

the current state of affairs there? Is there still a possibility of joining, or is that out of the question in your opinion? Can you tell us something about that? Well, it's

1:17:25

1 hour, 17 minutes, 25 seconds

so far out of the question because my clients do not wish to do anything with that procedure. They want their own procedure. The case, uh, is scheduled for October 22

1:17:33

1 hour, 17 minutes, 33 seconds

next for a joint hearing of the parties, where, uh, I, uh, am receiving signals from the court

1:17:42

1 hour, 17 minutes, 42 seconds

that they want to handle this very briefly, right? Um, which I also definitely will object to,

1:17:49

1 hour, 17 minutes, 49 seconds

uh, I will raise necessary objections. Um, so yes, it's not obvious to connect with that case. Um,

1:17:57

1 hour, 17 minutes, 57 seconds

So, what's the status? Yes, only then will the first oral hearing take place, and then the court will decide whether they consider themselves capable of appointing a

1:18:05

1 hour, 18 minutes, 5 seconds

final or interim decision, or, well, we'll see about that. Yes, of course. Yes. And so, what you're saying,

1:18:11

1 hour, 18 minutes, 11 seconds

is your clients' explicit wish not to be involved. Yes. Yes. Yes. Um, but also not yet your own procedure.

1:18:19

1 hour, 18 minutes, 19 seconds

What's holding you back? A lot of things. Look, we live, and that's also been part of my pleadings,

1:18:26

1 hour, 18 minutes, 26 seconds

in a preferred reality where, you know, what are called true scientists, which I told you are not

1:18:33

1 hour, 18 minutes, 33 seconds

scientists, those are religious fanatics, who are in charge. And, uh, I've described the network to you. I've shown you

1:18:42

1 hour, 18 minutes, 42 seconds

that there is an evil elite, and of course, I've extensively stated in the court documents that there is also a global project

1:18:51

1 hour, 18 minutes, 51 seconds

COVID-19, the Great Reset. And in that project, a completely preferred

1:18:57

1 hour, 18 minutes, 57 seconds

reality is created, a lie. And that's where we live. Unless you escape it, but most people live in it.

1:19:07

1 hour, 19 minutes, 7 seconds

In that lie, in that preferred reality.

1:19:12

1 hour, 19 minutes, 12 seconds

A term that, by the way, didn't come from me, but from an ex-major, you know,

1:19:15

1 hour, 19 minutes, 15 seconds

Major General van Kappen, right? He said: "We live in a preferred reality. Telefast reality. Scientists are very much in that, in that lying

1:19:23

1 hour, 19 minutes, 23 seconds

Reality. They are connected in it with money, are they connected to it with other

1:19:30

1 hour, 19 minutes, 30 seconds

agreements, with subsidies." Uh, and that's actually a closed circuit. Those are closed rows. And

1:19:38

1 hour, 19 minutes, 38 seconds

as long as you can't really offer a platform to any of the scientists who aren't in that circuit, before a judge in a public trial,

1:19:48

1 hour, 19 minutes, 48 seconds

you keep waving with, "uh, yes, I have here, and what I've presented to you are really very serious experts,"

1:19:55

1 hour, 19 minutes, 55 seconds

but you're not going to get them recognized as long as they're not before a judge, uh, and also in a legal debate, and you see, there's no

1:20:02

1 hour, 20 minutes, 2 seconds

debate here, because these people don't want a debate. Um, but as long as you can't, at least with the opportunity for a hearing, have this

1:20:09

1 hour, 20 minutes, 9 seconds

judicially established as their sworn statement, and a serious judge also asks serious questions about it in the context of

1:20:18

1 hour, 20 minutes, 18 seconds

such an expert examination. Only then will you have evidentiary value for those expert statements, legally speaking, that you can make a

1:20:27

1 hour, 20 minutes, 27 seconds

difference with them procedurally. And otherwise we'll always keep going on about this, it's irrelevant, and uh, consensus and

1:20:35

1 hour, 20 minutes, 35 seconds

well, that's all familiar jargon, of course. Because that consensus is, of course, a very wrong idea. In

1:20:42

1 hour, 20 minutes, 42 seconds

science, it's not about consensus. It's about the quality of the research, right? And if 1000

1:20:50

1 hour, 20 minutes, 50 seconds

scientists agree that something that's wrong is actually correct, then that doesn't make it good scientific research, right? And so

1:20:59

1 hour, 20 minutes, 59 seconds

I called that scientific consensus a monstrosity because science isn't consensus at all. There's no

1:21:07

1 hour, 21 minutes, 7 seconds

consensual aspect. It's about the quality of the investigation, and we have to get through that. And I really don't see how I could achieve that for my clients

1:21:15

1 hour, 21 minutes, 15 seconds

if there isn't finally a judge who allows it. And that's also a necessity. So that's the reason why.

1:21:25

1 hour, 21 minutes, 25 seconds

Yes.

1:21:26

1 hour, 21 minutes, 26 seconds

Yes. Clear. Yes. And you've outlined the context that's very important to you in detail. There,

1:21:33

1 hour, 21 minutes, 33 seconds

I have no further questions about that. Um, I'll just check with my colleagues to see if they have any questions. No questions, any questions?

1:21:45

1 hour, 21 minutes, 45 seconds

No, no, well, maybe one question. Is there, uh, a similar procedure pending in any foreign country? I see behind you

1:21:53

1 hour, 21 minutes, 53 seconds

nodding. You can't see that. But well, uh, the question is always: what is similar? Um, well, this same issue is at stake.

1:22:01

1 hour, 22 minutes, 1 second

Um, I didn't see it such litigation myself. Uh, the project, well, this procedure is precisely about the expert. Did you mean that one, or did you mean the main proceedings?

1:22:12

1 hour, 22 minutes, 12 seconds

I want both.

1:22:14

1 hour, 22 minutes, 14 seconds

Um, the main proceedings, so the separate other case. Yes,

1:22:18

1 hour, 22 minutes, 18 seconds

I, uh, personally am not aware of a case that, in the context of COVID-19, the Great Reset, addresses a group liability civil case in the

1:22:26

1 hour, 22 minutes, 26 seconds

form of tort personally, uh, these kinds of executors of COVID-19, the Great Reset. I don't know of any other cases.

1:22:35

1 hour, 22 minutes, 35 seconds

You don't know of any others, but one where the expert side is before a judge.

1:22:43

1 hour, 22 minutes, 43 seconds

I haven't seen that myself. Yes, thank you.

1:22:49

1 hour, 22 minutes, 49 seconds

Okay. Um, then we had planned a break, but that would be very shortly after lunch. So I propose

1:22:56

1 hour, 22 minutes, 56 seconds

that we now, uh, uh, start the second round. Is that okay with you,

1:23:02

1 hour, 23 minutes, 2 seconds

Mr. Stasen, or did you, uh, still need a short break?

1:23:06

1 hour, 23 minutes, 6 seconds

Um, well, I think it will

1:23:14

1 hour, 23 minutes, 14 seconds

work out. I'll organize my thoughts in the time I have here.

1:23:21

1 hour, 23 minutes, 21 seconds

Then, uh, I'd like to give you the floor. We had planned for, uh, fifteen minutes. Well, if you should go a bit overboard, then, considering our lead

1:23:29

1 hour, 23 minutes, 29 seconds

in the planning, I won't make too much of a fuss about it, but yes, you'll understand that it has to stay somewhat within limits. Go ahead.

1:23:37

1 hour, 23 minutes, 37 seconds

I started by saying that this is a matter of global importance, and it is. And the ease with which, uh, my

1:23:45

1 hour, 23 minutes, 45 seconds

honorable opponents dismiss this is really inappropriate. Imagine, I have the evidence

1:23:52

1 hour, 23 minutes, 52 seconds

that the COVID-19 injections are a bioweapon. I didn't just submit it to some irrelevant parties, but I submitted it, among others, to the States of the Netherlands,

1:24:00

1 hour, 24 minutes

of which, at least most of us here, are citizens and who should be protected by the state. When filing the appeal, I also requested a

1:24:08

1 hour, 24 minutes, 8 seconds

interim injunction. Nothing happened with that either. I did that because the COVID-19

1:24:16

1 hour, 24 minutes, 16 seconds

injection campaign also started the day. I filed the appeal. And I included reports from Latypova and Katherine Watt. And the state has received all that

1:24:23

1 hour, 24 minutes, 23 seconds

, and all the OMT members, defendants, and press have that too. And they did nothing. Absolutely nothing. 1:24:32

1 hour, 24 minutes, 32 seconds

Except for continuing with a COVID-19 Great Reset project and ignoring all this. Because that

1:24:40

1 hour, 24 minutes, 40 seconds

is what they are. They are the executors of that project and are not allowed to go back. Looking at the hearing here today,

1:24:47

1 hour, 24 minutes, 47 seconds

we are essentially seeing an application of the mafia code of silence. What I've told you is very relevant information.

1:24:54

1 hour, 24 minutes, 54 seconds

Any self-respecting government that cares about its citizens would immediately enter into a debate

1:25:00

1 hour, 25 minutes

with these experts to see what's going on. But what's happening here? 1:25:06

1 hour, 25 minutes, 6 seconds

They deploy an army of lawyers to prevent that. You should see that signal!

1:25:15

1 hour, 25 minutes, 15 seconds

And if I look at it procedurally, I actually see no defense at all against the context I've provided. The defence contains essentially nothing.

1:25:24

1 hour, 25 minutes, 24 seconds

Just as little as what is being argued here today.

1:25:29

1 hour, 25 minutes, 29 seconds

We see simply a fearful attempt by the defendants to keep a debate closed. And I also started the hearing by saying to you:

1:25:38

1 hour, 25 minutes, 38 seconds

"This, the oral proceedings should not be closed. You should instruct all these parties to explain their positions".

1:25:46

1 hour, 25 minutes, 46 seconds

How it is still possible that they maintain the position that there is no evil elite. These are currently debates in the European Parliament, which is simply what is being discussed there.

1:25:56

1 hour, 25 minutes, 56 seconds

How can the state know that this isn't the case? While everything is on the table,

1:26:00

1 hour, 26 minutes

millions of pages. I extracted. The findings I presented to you also simply apply to what Professor Homburg from Germany establishes and go ahead

1:26:07

1 hour, 26 minutes, 7 seconds

it's not normal that this is still being denied. And against that context, what's happening here is absolutely scandalous.

1:26:16

1 hour, 26 minutes, 16 seconds

But I do want to bring you back. Um, and I also said:

1:26:20

1 hour, 26 minutes, 20 seconds

"I think it's important that I penetrate your consciousness". The state has not disputed, and neither have all the defendants

1:26:27

1 hour, 26 minutes, 27 seconds

that the WHO declared that COVID was nothing more than a mild flu.

1:26:34

1 hour, 26 minutes, 34 seconds

Then I ask you: how can that lead to a global crisis?

1:26:39

1 hour, 26 minutes, 39 seconds

Why did Von der Leyen call for trusting only the WHO and not accepting disinformation?

1:26:49

1 hour, 26 minutes, 49 seconds

Did the WHO therefore have to introduce intensive care protocols for this, requiring people to lie on their bellies and

1:26:57

1 hour, 26 minutes, 57 seconds

be intubated and then die, because no one could endure that? Did people have to

1:27:04

1 hour, 27 minutes, 4 seconds

die in loneliness? Funerals had to be held for that mild flu, funerals had to be held for that mild flu with

1:27:12

1 hour, 27 minutes, 12 seconds

maximum number of visitors? Schools had to be closed for that mild flu? Mr. Chairman? Elderly people had to sit in a glass

1:27:20

1 hour, 27 minutes, 20 seconds

cage for a mild flu? And did they really have to be given gene therapy for a mild flu?

1:27:30

1 hour, 27 minutes, 30 seconds

LNPs what I explained to you, nanolipid particles, a bioweapon, did that really have to be injected into everyone for a mild flu? You can't

1:27:39

1 hour, 27 minutes, 39 seconds

look away from this criminal madness any longer!

1:27:43

1 hour, 27 minutes, 43 seconds

You can also see that the defendants make all of this possible. They allow everything and do Participate in it.

1:27:51

1 hour, 27 minutes, 51 seconds

The government protects citizens from absolutely nothing. On the contrary.

1:27:58

1 hour, 27 minutes, 58 seconds

I also told you that Mr. Boyle died, but in all likelihood, he was murdered. In the Covid dossier, many

1:28:07

1 hour, 28 minutes, 7 seconds

experts and doctors who spoke out were murdered. Why is Reiner Fuellmich in prison?

1:28:14

1 hour, 28 minutes, 14 seconds

He only wanted to expose the truth. The secret service didn't think that was a good idea. That's clear from the dossier. He had to be arrested.

1:28:22

1 hour, 28 minutes, 22 seconds

Anyone who stands up for the truth is met with an army of lawyers or worse.

1:28:33

1 hour, 28 minutes, 33 seconds

I already mentioned the ruling in the Verwaltungsgericht. Those judges didn't participate. I hope you'll take that as an example.

1:28:41

1 hour, 28 minutes, 41 seconds

Very recently, perhaps you haven't noticed, there's also a Dr. Elfenbein in the US, a physician specializing in emergency medicine.

1:28:49

1 hour, 28 minutes, 49 seconds

who was nationally known in the US for his criticism of COVID-19 policy during the Biden administration. In

1:28:59

1 hour, 28 minutes, 59 seconds

2022, they sued that man, who was simply doing his job, for fraud in accounting.

1:29:10

1 hour, 29 minutes, 10 seconds

But of course, that was completely pointless. This too was an attempt to silence somebody who was telling the truth.

1:29:17

1 hour, 29 minutes, 17 seconds

And just wants to do his job, to shut him down.

1:29:23

1 hour, 29 minutes, 23 seconds

And the jury also convicted that doctor. So he was simply convicted by a jury. But there was a judge and

1:29:31

1 hour, 29 minutes, 31 seconds

that was a real judge. That was James K. Bredar. Bredar, I should say, from the US District Court. And that

1:29:38

1 hour, 29 minutes, 38 seconds

Judge wrote a 93 pages verdict himself, based on his own research.

1:29:46

1 hour, 29 minutes, 46 seconds

And he acquitted this emergency doctor on all charges because he established that

1:29:54

1 hour, 29 minutes, 54 seconds

the burden of proof was not met, right? You have to meet a certain burden of proof to be able to formulate an

1:30:01

1 hour, 30 minutes, 1 second

charge. He simply concluded that hasn't been met, and no reasonable jury could have reached this verdict. So there are judges

1:30:10

1 hour, 30 minutes, 10 seconds

who do something. And I hope you are one of them. 1:30:14

1 hour, 30 minutes, 14 seconds

And if you're really wondering who the good guys are and who the bad guys are,

1:30:21

1 hour, 30 minutes, 21 seconds

despite all the facts I've presented to you,

1:30:25

1 hour, 30 minutes, 25 seconds

then I'd like to refer you to 1 John 13:15 of the Testament. And that's very

1:30:34

1 hour, 30 minutes, 34 seconds

clear. And it says: "By this we can recognize the children of God and the children of the devil.

1:30:42

1 hour, 30 minutes, 42 seconds

Everyone who does not practice righteousness is not of God, nor is he who does not love his brother."

1:30:54

1 hour, 30 minutes, 54 seconds

And here on this side, no justice is being done in the defense they are putting forward.

1:31:01

1 hour, 31 minutes, 1 second

These experts should have been embraced because they love the truth.

1:31:09

1 hour, 31 minutes, 9 seconds

And then you must decide for yourself who are the children of God here and who are the children of the devil.

1:31:19

1 hour, 31 minutes, 19 seconds

Let me conclude with how I initiated the summons in the main proceedings. I have given the defendands and also

1:31:27

1 hour, 31 minutes, 27 seconds

the plaintiffs in these proceedings, who are the same parties, the opportunity to admit liability,

1:31:36

1 hour, 31 minutes, 36 seconds

so that all of this we are experiencing now doesn't have to happen.

1:31:41

1 hour, 31 minutes, 41 seconds

A legal recognition is, in a moral sense, a conversion.

1:31:47

1 hour, 31 minutes, 47 seconds

And that's what we really need. A conversion of the parties who don't even dare come here today, hiding behind black robes.

1:31:59

1 hour, 31 minutes, 59 seconds

They should convert.

1:32:02

1 hour, 32 minutes, 2 seconds

And my clients even understand that these are people too, and that they are caught in a malicious force field. I've described that to you

1:32:11

1 hour, 32 minutes, 11 seconds

, but they don't understand that all this continues and that this malicious project COVID-19, the

1:32:19

1 hour, 32 minutes, 19 seconds

reset, continues before our very eyes, with all its consequences.

1:32:27

1 hour, 32 minutes, 27 seconds

So my appeal to the defendants is as follows.

1:32:33

1 hour, 32 minutes, 33 seconds

Say that you support this appeal and make a fresh start, with which

1:32:40

1 hour, 32 minutes, 40 seconds

everyone can move forward. Because I predict this great reset won't work for you.

1:32:47

1 hour, 32 minutes, 47 seconds

And the truth will come out anyway, and then they'll be smoking a very heavy pipe.

1:32:55

1 hour, 32 minutes, 55 seconds

Thank you for your attention.

1:32:58

1 hour, 32 minutes, 58 seconds

Thank you. Um, thank you, Mr. Stassen. Um,

1:33:05

1 hour, 33 minutes, 5 seconds

I'll come to you both, because ultimately, this case is about both of you. And uh, there

1:33:12

1 hour, 33 minutes, 12 seconds

well, a lot of legal talk today, of course. Whether you can appeal or not, there are also people behind the case who have

1:33:20

1 hour, 33 minutes, 20 seconds

initiated it. That's both of you. Um, is there anything else you'd like to add to the whole story? I'll look

1:33:27

1 hour, 33 minutes, 27 seconds

at you both. Um, if you have the opportunity, then

1:33:33

1 hour, 33 minutes, 33 seconds

can uh uh go ahead, then that's possible. Everything said by Mr. Stassen.

1:33:39

1 hour, 33 minutes, 39 seconds

Fine. Um, then we'll side with the defendant for the second round. And then I'll just go through the same process. Um, Mr. Veldhuis,

1:33:50

1 hour, 33 minutes, 50 seconds

Ms. Möhring.

1:33:51

1 hour, 33 minutes, 51 seconds

The state, uh, is content with a reference to the defense statement in the pleadings. Thank you. Okay,

1:33:57

1 hour, 33 minutes, 57 seconds

Shall I go all the way around, or, uh, should I raise my hand if you want to say something? Because, uh, you're all referring to the defense statement and Ms. Möhring's argument. Yes.

1:34:09

1 hour, 34 minutes, 9 seconds

Okay. Uh, on the respondent's side, uh, we already established that, uh, on behalf of, uh, Mr. Bourla, uh, uh, Ms. Matteo is.

1:34:21

1 hour, 34 minutes, 21 seconds

I'll just check the screen to see if she's still on his behalf. She let us know that she wouldn't do anything about that. is to be added.

1:34:29

1 hour, 34 minutes, 29 seconds

Fine. And Ms. Kant was dialed in. We can see that on the screen now.

1:34:38

1 hour, 34 minutes, 38 seconds

as well. I have nothing to add.

1:34:39

1 hour, 34 minutes, 39 seconds

Nothing to add. Well, it's good that you were here, uh, via digital means.

1:34:45

1 hour, 34 minutes, 45 seconds

Um, that brings us to the end of the session. I think we'll take a break for, uh, 10 minutes so we can take stock

1:34:53

1 hour, 34 minutes, 53 seconds

of whether everything has been discussed, or whether there are any open ends or open questions. And then we'll come back to you afterward to make further

1:35:01

1 hour, 35 minutes, 1 second

arrangements about the next steps. That will be, uh, a few minutes, that, uh, we won't be here all afternoon. Um, I do suggest that we

1:35:10

1 hour, 35 minutes, 10 seconds

leave the room, and then the board will come in about, yeah, what will it be, 10 to 15 minutes before the end of the session.

1:36:00

1 hour, 36 minutes

Welcome back, everyone. Um, well, we've taken stock. Um, there are no more questions, no open

1:36:08

1 hour, 36 minutes, 8 seconds

ends. Your argument, your positions, uh, are clear. And that brings us to the end of

1:36:15

1 hour, 36 minutes, 15 seconds

this hearing. Well, I still need to agree with you on when you can expect our decision. We've already looked into that.

1:36:24

1 hour, 36 minutes, 24 seconds

That will be Thursday, April 9th at 2:00 PM. And our proposal,

1:36:31

1 hour, 36 minutes, 31 seconds

then I'll just check with the lawyer. Is that, after that decision has been made, that we send the

1:36:38

1 hour, 36 minutes, 38 seconds

decision by email that afternoon? Is that, uh, an agreement for you yet? Yes.

1:36:42

1 hour, 36 minutes, 42 seconds

Yes, I see everyone, although I would like to point out that I clearly stated that I think you should not close the miraculous hearing. No, that's the next point.

1:36:50

1 hour, 36 minutes, 50 seconds

Yes. Okay.

1:36:51

1 hour, 36 minutes, 51 seconds

This was the decision that will be issued on April 9th at 2:00 PM, and it will be emailed to the lawyers.

1:36:58

1 hour, 36 minutes, 58 seconds

Then your point of order regarding the oral hearing. Yes, I already said something about that this morning. At this time, the court sees

1:37:06

1 hour, 37 minutes, 6 seconds

no reason not to close the oral hearing. 1:37:10

1 hour, 37 minutes, 10 seconds

This is also because, uh, if we in chambers come to a different, uh, understanding, the oral hearing

1:37:17

1 hour, 37 minutes, 17 seconds

can also be reopened. So that brings me to the end, and I hereby close the oral hearing.

1:37:24

1 hour, 37 minutes, 24 seconds

I thank you all for coming and your explanations, and I wish you all a pleasant afternoon and a safe journey home.

1:37:31

1 hour, 37 minutes, 31 seconds

Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Yes.

Sync to video time