



This case is being handled by attorney-at-law mr. Drs A.G.W. van Kessel of the law firm Van Kessel Advocaatuur, with offices in Leeuwarden (8938 AG) at Orionweg 47E and by attorney-at-law mr. P.W.H. Stassen, associated with the law firm Stassen & Kemps advocaten in (5611 CV) Eindhoven at Nachtegaallaan 6;

---

North Netherlands District Court, Leeuwarden location

Roldatum : Wednesday 11 December 2024 at 10:00 a.m.

Zaaknummer : C/17/190788

**BRINGING IN COPY OF VACCINATION CERTIFICATES EX ART. 85 lid 1 Rv.**

**also**

**DEED MULTIPLICATION CLAIM EX ART. 130 Rv.**

**also**

**REQUEST FOR PRE-TRIAL HEARING PURSUANT TO**

**ART. 87 lid 2 sub d Rv.**

**Concerning:**

Plaintiffs:

1. Mister ██████████ residing in Sneek;
2. Misses ██████████, residing in Sneek;
3. Mister ██████████, residing in Sneek;
4. Misses ██████████, residing in Doetinchem;
5. Mister ██████████, residing in Doetinchem;
6. Misses ██████████, residing in Zaandam;
7. Mister ██████████, residing in Leeuwarden;

Attorney-at-Law: mr. Drs. A.G.W. van Kessel and mr. P.W.H. Stassen

**contra:**

Defendants:

(government officials)

1. Mister EVERHARDUS ITE HOFSTRA, residing in ██████████;
2. Mister JAAP TAMINO VAN DISSEL, residing in ██████████;
3. Misses MARIA PETRONELLA GERARDA KOOPMANS, residing in ██████████  
██████████;
4. Mister MARK RUTTE, residing in ██████████;



5. Misses SIGRID AGNES MARIA KAAG, residing in [REDACTED];
  6. Mister HUGO MATTHEÛS DE JONGE, residing in [REDACTED];
  7. Mister ERNST JOHAN KUIPERS, residing in [REDACTED];
  8. Mister DIEDERIK ANTONIUS MARIA PAULUS JOHANNES GOMMERS, residing in [REDACTED];
  9. Mister WOPKE BASTIAAN HOEKSTRA, residing in [REDACTED];
  10. Misses CORNELIA VAN NIEUWENHUIZEN, living at a secret address;
- Attorney-at-Law: mr. R.W. Veldhuis and mr. M.E.A. Möhring

(pharmaceutical industry)

11. Mister ALBERT BOURLA, residing in [REDACTED];
- Attorney-at-Law: mr. D. Roessingh

(mass media)

12. Misses GISELLE JACQUELINE MARIE-THÉRÈSE VAN CANN, residing in [REDACTED];
  13. Mister PAUL JANSEN, living without known domicile or residence;
- Attorney-at-Law: mr. L. Broers

(non-governmental organisation (NGO, WEF))

14. Mister FEIKE SIJBESMA, residing in [REDACTED];
- Attorney-at-Law: mr. R.W. Veldhuis and mr. M.E.A. Möhring.
15. Mister WILLIAM HENRY BILL GATES III, residing in [REDACTED].
- Attorney-at-Law: mr. W.H. Heemskerk

(semi-government)

16. Misses AGNES CATHARINA VAN DER VOORT-KANT, living without known domicile or residence;
- Attorney-at-Law: mr. A.H. Ekker

(government)

17. De STATE OF THE NETHERLANDS, a legal person governed by public law, having its registered office at 's- Gravenhage ("The State") and located at (2511 CB) 's-Gravenhage to the Korte Voorhout 8;
- Attorney-at-Law: mr. R.W. Veldhuis and mr. M.E.A. Möhring



## **I. Bringing in vaccination certificates ex art 85(1) Rv.**

In their summons, plaintiffs invoke the Covid-19 mRNA injections given to them as the result of large-scale deception by defendants. They have sufficiently argued that in their case - by referring to the diagnoses drawn up by a medical specialist (Production 91 of the summons) - the Covid-19 injections were actually administered. Section 85 subsection 1 of the Dutch Code of Civil Procedure stipulates that when any document is relied upon, a copy of it must also be attached to the pleadings, unless the other party declares that he does not want a copy.

For the sake of good procedural order, plaintiffs hereby also bring in their vaccination certificates pursuant to Section 85(1) Rv to supplement Production 91 of the summons. These plaintiffs' data should be treated confidentially in these proceedings on the merits under the General Data Protection Regulation. Plaintiffs also note, that a check of their Covid-19 mRNA vaccination certificates via 'My RIVM' revealed that the RIVM has deleted all of plaintiffs' Covid-19 mRNA vaccination data. A similar will probably apply to the Covid-19 mRNA vaccination data from 2021 / 2022 of the entire Dutch population!?

## **II. Increase claim / extension Basis ex art 130 Rv.**

### **1. Basis:**

Through their petition in the writ of summons, the plaintiffs claim, among other things, a declaratory judgment that the defendants as a group and each of them individually acted unlawfully towards the plaintiffs by deliberately misleading them in an unlawful manner and thereby inducing them to have Covid-19 injections, which the defendants knew, or at least should have known, were not safe and effective.

The summons was served on the defendants on 14 July 2023. The factual basis of the plaintiffs' claim is formed by the statements and evidence in the summons, which logically cannot go beyond the facts as they occurred up to 14 July 2023 and were known to the plaintiffs. By means of this deed, the plaintiffs wish to expand the factual basis of their claims by way of an increase in their claim to include events, facts and evidence that occurred after the issuance of the summons and became known to the plaintiffs. Plaintiffs also wish to express this in an amended pleading.

Defendants have a legally respectable interest in the aforementioned increase in claim. This interest lies first of all in the fact that defendants, even after taking note of the statements and evidence in the summons, continued to support the false narrative as it was deployed at the time of the pretended Covid-19 pandemic, if only by not refuting it. Already by taking their pleadings in reply in which the false narrative was always upheld by defendants, defendants acted further misleadingly and unlawfully. Their social position, their knowledge of the many publicly known new and scientifically supported facts and their knowledge of the summons qualifies that further deception (also) as unlawful towards the plaintiffs.

Secondly, plaintiffs have a legally respectable interest in the increase of the claim, because since the issuance of the writ various relevant events have taken place and facts and factual material have become known on the basis of which it can be legally proven that the (international) project Covid-19: The Great Reset (with the meaning claimed by plaintiffs in the writ), in which defendants play a role, exists and is continued unabated by defendants in a 'military' coordinated context. In particular, plaintiffs hereby name the ministerial public confession known to defendants, that the Dutch cabinet and thereby the Dutch State is actually and exclusively run by the NCTV (National



Coordinator for Counterterrorism and Security), a security service established in 2012 without any legal basis. Similar public confessions have now also been made in Britain, Germany and the United States of America. For the plaintiffs, once the subpoena has been issued, actively and/or passively, this further misleading by the defendants entails very harmful consequences in the form of psychological harm. While plaintiffs can no longer be induced by this further misleading by defendants to have new Covid-19 injections, as they were marketed after the issuance of the subpoena (including in the form of mRNA boosters and flu syringes), plaintiffs' environment (mainly the Dutch people) is further misled and damaged by this. The latter literally concerns the plaintiffs and greatly affects their psychological well-being.

Many in the plaintiffs' living environment become ill and/or die as a result of the further deception by defendants as a result of the further project-promoted Covid-19 injections by defendants. The plaintiffs' living environment is (further) kept in a **“preferred reality”** (= a **big lie**) by the defendants in their role as co-executors of the project Covid-19: The Great Reset.

In this preferred reality, Covid-19 injections are even now 'safe and effective' when in reality they are a bioweapon whose deployment leads to genocide. It goes without saying that living among people in a 'preferred reality' co-created and perpetuated by defendants, who have been misled and damaged with this false narrative, is in itself detrimental to plaintiffs' psychological wellbeing.

The unlawful act committed by the defendants in groups or individually towards the plaintiffs therefore **continues unabated even after the writ of summons has been issued**. Defendants, despite their knowledge of the scientifically substantiated relevant facts regarding the life-threatening side-effects of the Covid-19 mRNA injections, continue to express their support for the life-threatening Covid-19 mRNA injections distributed to the Dutch people via the GGD and the RIVM until today. The defendants - despite their knowledge of the relevant facts and evidence (which appeared after the summons) - also do not speak out against the life-threatening Covid-19 mRNA injections. Consequently, the plaintiffs continuously suffer particularly great psychological damage as a result of the wrongful act committed against them **continuously** by the defendants.

## 2. Claim increase

The petition of the summons under subsection 1. should be replaced as follows:

(1) rule that defendants as a group and each of them individually have continued to act unlawfully towards plaintiffs until the day of the final decision of your court in this case (which includes an unlawful omission) by deliberately misleading them and the Dutch people in an unlawful manner in order to induce plaintiffs and/or the Dutch people to have Covid-19 injections of which defendants knew, or at least should have known, that these injections are not safe and effective, or at least that the false and misleading narrative propagated by defendants in the framework of the project Covid-19: The Great Reset project is false and misleading, and/or that the Covid-19 injections introduced as part of this project are harmful to the health, fertility and psychological well-being of the defendants and/or the Dutch people.

(2) order the defendants, jointly and severally, where one party pays the other, to compensate the plaintiffs for their loss, to be assessed and settled in accordance with the law.



(3) order the defendants to pay the costs of these proceedings pursuant to an order for costs to be issued by your court for that purpose, enforceable on a provisional basis.

### **III. Bringing in additional evidence ex art 21 Rv j° art 152 para 1 Rv.**

As a result of many new successive relevant facts relating to the legal consequences invoked by plaintiffs counted from the date of summons dated 14 July 2023 to the present, plaintiffs request your court, pursuant to Section 150 Rv, to prove these new and additional relevant facts by introducing new evidence and having several national and international party experts heard under oath.

Without being exhaustive at this stage of the proceedings, it is already hereby pointed out that the evidence to be adduced in this respect relates, among other things, to the truth-finding scientific works and statements of Professor Dr Francis Boyle, among others, which show that the Covid-19 injections qualify as a bioweapon in the legal sense. Further evidence for the plaintiffs' contention of deliberate deception in the aforementioned sense is to be found in the statement of former chief scientist and director of Pfizer's allergy and respiratory research division Dr Michael Yeadon, which shows that the Covid-19 injections were designed and manufactured "by design" with the aim of causing serious harm to human health and fertility. Among other things, another important piece of evidence of Dutch origin that should not be missing can be found in the statements made by Minister Agema on 23 October 2024, in which she stated that, upon her appointment as minister, she subordinated herself in her position as public health minister to assignments originating from a supranational military organisation (NATO) and that she had to take stock, **under the guidance of the NCTV**, of all the things that needed to be done in the context of the Covid-19: The Great Reset project and the so-called 'pandemic preparedness' set up by the UN/WHO and WEF in this regard. The plaintiffs wish to bring this and other evidence (including in the form of statements to be made before your court by several expert witnesses) into the proceedings in order to further deepen the defendants' wrongful act of performing their ongoing deceptive role in the Covid-19: The Great Reset project and to enable your court to perform its most primary task of ascertaining the truth.

To clarify the role of the defendants, the plaintiffs have chosen to divide the defendants into groups. That group division has been reflected in the designation of parties in this deed. In the (international) project Covid-19: The Great Reset, the various entities and/or departments have their own tasks and their own objectives to be achieved in creating a top-down prescribed and well-coordinated preferred reality set down. All this is in the strategic interest of the '**stakeholders**' so called by the World Economic Forum in the implementation of the project Covid-19: The Great Reset.

As a result of the many new scientific (peer reviewed) facts, which have come to light after 14 July 2023 to date - despite heavy censorship - the plaintiffs have a strong interest in bringing in additional evidence per defendant and per group in the context of establishing the truth.



#### IV. Request for pre-trial hearing under section 87(2)(d) and (e) Rv.

##### 3. Starting point:

The court may, at the request of the parties or claimants or of its own motion, order an oral hearing in all cases and at any stage of the proceedings. During this oral hearing, the court may discuss with the parties how the proceedings will proceed and give such directions or order such procedural steps as it considers advisable, insofar as the court considers them to be in accordance with the requirements of due process.

The plaintiffs request the court to schedule a pre-trial hearing at which they can consult with the court and the lawyers of all the parties on:

- a. The course of the proceedings by group of defendants;
- b. Providing new and additional evidence as a result of the rapidly succeeding developments regarding the factual basis of the plaintiffs' claims, this evidence to be provided through the introduction of new submissions and the hearing under oath of national and international party experts;
- c. The manner of conducting adversarial proceedings in the context of due process;
- d. Allowing independent media at all public oral hearings and at all national and international party expert interviews;
- e. How the rest of the procedure will proceed.

Noted!

Attorneys at law

