

PELS RIJCKEN

Court North-Netherlands

Oral hearing of 9 July 2025, 13:15

Case-/rollnumber C/17/199273 /HARK 25/17

The State c.s. / [REDACTED] c.s.

Plea of mrs. R.W. Veldhuis eo M.E.A. Möhring

1 The request for preliminary evidence

- 1.1 The applicants wish to hear several individuals as experts. They then wish to ask these individuals various questions, such as whether the disease Covid-19 exists, whether there has been a pandemic, and whether the Covid-19 vaccines are a bioweapon used to commit genocide. The applicants want this to determine their legal position.
- 1.2 This request, to the extent it is admissible, must be denied. It violates due process, constitutes an abuse of authority, and is also without merit.
- 1.3 The State has already explained this extensively in its statement of defense. At this hearing, the State will briefly highlight some of its defenses.
- 1.4 A preliminary hearing, as requested here, cannot take place during ongoing proceedings. It is up to the judge in those ongoing proceedings to determine whether evidence is necessary. This is where the request fails. After all, there are already proceedings underway, in which the same request is also pending.
- 1.5 The individuals named by the applicants are not experts, let alone independent and impartial experts. Moreover, experts can only be heard on relevant factual questions, and many of the questions the applicants wish to ask are not factual and/or irrelevant.
- 1.6 The State, moreover, firmly believes that the individuals named by the applicants, if heard, will answer the questions in a manner consistent with the applicants' position. These individuals hold the following views—that the disease Covid-19 does not exist, that there has been no pandemic, and that the vaccines are unsafe—after all, they have already been publicly stated. Therefore, applicants do not need to hear these individuals as experts to know what they will say. Moreover, these individuals are willing to rewrite their opinions for the applicants, which will also be sufficient for the applicants to determine their legal position

1.7 The fact that these individuals would testify in this way does not mean that the applicants' position on, in short, Covid-19 is invalidated. Indeed, there are many independent and impartial experts who would state the opposite. The opinion of the individuals named by the applicants contradicts the broad scientific consensus. The scientific consensus is that the disease Covid-19 exists, there has been a pandemic, and the vaccines against Covid-19 are safe and effective. Therefore, hearing the individuals named by the applicants as experts would not advance the dispute between the parties.

1.8 Against this background, the State cannot escape the impression that the request actually serves a different purpose. Namely, to hear certain individuals as experts in court in order to accord their views a certain legitimacy. That is not the purpose of a preliminary hearing.

2 Conclusion

The request, if admissible, must therefore be rejected.

behandeld door	R.W. Veldhuis en M.E.A. Möhring
correspondentie	Postbus 11756, 2502 AT Den Haag
telefoon	+31 70 515 3793
e-mail	reimer.veldhuis@pelsrijcken.nl
zaaknr	11023859