

verdict

COURT NORTH NETHERLANDS

Civil law

Sitting place Leeuwarden

Casenummer: C/17/190788 / HA ZA 23-172



Verdict of March 11 2026

in the case of

1. [REDACTED]
in Sneek,
2. [REDACTED],
in Sneek,
3. [REDACTED],
in Sneek,
4. [REDACTED],
in Doetinchem,
5. [REDACTED],
in Doetinchem,
6. (WIJLEN) [REDACTED],
7. living in Zaandam during her lifetime, hereinafter referred to as: Tiekem,
8. [REDACTED],
in Leeuwarden,
claimants,

hereinafter jointly referred to as: plaintiffs,

attorney: Mr. P.W.H. Stassen,

against

1. EVERHARDUS ITE HOFSTRA,
2. JAAP TAMINO VAN DISSEL,
3. MARIA PETRONELLA GERARDA KOOPMANS,
4. MARK RUTTE,
5. SIGRID AGNES MARIA KAAG,
6. HUGO MATTHEÛS DE JONGE,
7. ERNST JOHAN KUIPERS,
8. DIEDERIK ANTONIUS MARIA PAULUS JOHANNES GOMMERS,
9. WOPKE BASTIAAN HOEKSTRA,
10. CORNELIA VAN NIEUWENHUIZEN,
14. FEIKE SIJBESMA,
all choosing residence in The Hague
17. DE STAAT DER NEDERLANDEN,
hereinafter referred to as the State
based in The Hague, hereinafter
jointly referred to as Hofstra et
al.,

lawyers: mr. R.W. Veldhuis and mr. M.E.A. Möhring,

11. **ALBERT BOURLA**,

living in [REDACTED] (United States of America),

hereinafter referred to as Bourla,

lawyers: mr. D. Roessing and mr. Bredenoord-Spoek,

12. **GISELLE JACQUELINE MARIE-THERÈSE VAN CANN**,

living in [REDACTED],

13. **PAUL EDWIN JANSEN**,

living in [REDACTED],

hereinafter referred to as Van Cann

c.s.,

lawyers: mrs. A. Bekema and P.A. Lichtendahl,

15. **WILLIAM HENRY BILL GATES III**,

living in [REDACTED] (United States of America),

hereinafter referred to as Gates

lawyer: mr. W. Heemskerk.

16. **AGNES CATHARINA VAN DER VOORT-KANT**,

choosing place of residence in

Amsterdam

hereinafter referred to as: Van der Voort-

Kant,

lawyer: mr. A.H. Ekker,

defendants

hereinafter jointly referred to as: defendants.

1. The further course of the proceedings

1.1. The further course of the proceedings appears from:

- the interim judgment of November 26, 2025,
- the deed of deposit on behalf of the claimants dated December 8, 2025
- the deed of statement of parties on behalf of the plaintiffs
- the deed of statement after the interlocutory judgment on the part of Hofstra et al.,
- the deed of statement after interlocutory judgment on the part of Gates,
- the deed statement on the part of Van der Voort-Kant,
- the deed of statement of oral hearing on the part of Bourla,
- the deed of statement of parties oral hearing on the part of Van Cann et al.,
- the decision announced to the parties by letter dated 27 January 2026 that the oral hearing will take place on 22 October 2026 at 12:30 p.m..

1.2. Finally, the verdict is determined.

2. The further assessment

2.1. The court has again taken cognizance of the procedural documents, including its interlocutory judgment of November 26, 2025 (hereinafter: the interlocutory judgment). The court adopts and upholds its considerations and decisions in that interlocutory judgment and the previous interlocutory judgments and court decision.

2.2. In the interim judgment, the court gave the parties the opportunity to express their wishes regarding the substantive part of the scheduled oral hearing. All parties submitted a statement to that effect.

Furthermore, the court determined that the plaintiffs must also state in their statement who plaintiff sub 7 is.

Identity of claimant sub 7

2.3. In their statement, the plaintiffs substantiated that plaintiff sub 7 was given the surname [REDACTED] at birth and has also borne his wife's surname, [REDACTED], since marrying his wife. Now that it is clear that this is not a different person, the court will continue to refer to plaintiff sub 7 as [REDACTED], as stated in the summons.

Wishes of the parties regarding the oral hearing

2.4. The court will now address the wishes regarding the substantive part of the oral hearing that the parties expressed in their statement.

Purpose of the oral hearing

2.5. Van Cann et al. requested the court to indicate in advance the purpose of the oral hearing and which arguments the court requires further clarification from each party, in order to ensure the oral hearing is as efficient as possible and to limit the speaking time of the many parties. They pointed out that two written rounds had already taken place and that the plaintiffs had submitted a significant number of documents.

2.6. Referring to the interlocutory judgment, the court considers that the oral hearing is primarily intended to allow the parties to speak, as written submissions have already been submitted in two rounds. Nevertheless, the court can imagine that in a case of this magnitude, the parties may wish to emphasize certain points, and they are free to do so, within the limits of the speaking time allowed by the court.

Speaking time

2.7. The plaintiffs requested an extended speaking time of 120 minutes. Hofstra et al. requested an equal amount of speaking time as the plaintiffs, should the plaintiffs request an extended speaking time. The other parties argued that a speaking time of ten minutes per party should be sufficient.

2.8. In its interim judgment, the court considered whether and why the parties' lawyers may use concise speaking notes during the oral hearing to further explain the parties' legal positions. The plaintiffs substantiate their request for an extended speaking time of 120 minutes primarily by citing the enormous social importance and the scope of the case. Furthermore, it is important that the defendants, despite having already held two written rounds, have not demonstrated any procedural willingness to address the plaintiffs' core arguments, supported by evidence, including that Covid-19 is not a disease but a project and that the Covid-19 injections are indistinguishable from a bioweapon. In addition, the claimants, with their deed of deposit, provide very crucial evidence for this

presented key arguments in the form of expert video messages and written expert reports. This evidence must be able to be explained. A speaking time of 120 minutes is therefore not excessive, according to the plaintiffs. The court disagrees with this view, as the need for a longer speaking time does not follow from these arguments. This is only different insofar as it concerns the desire to provide an explanation of the recently filed statements and video messages. In the court's opinion, this can be done concisely.

2.9. The court will set the speaking time for all parties in the first round at half an hour per party. The court notes that Van der Voort-Kant, Bourla, Van Cann et al., and Gates have indicated that ten minutes of speaking time is sufficient. The court will schedule the hearing accordingly.

Deadline for submitting additional documents

2.10. Bourla has requested the court to order that the plaintiffs submit any new exhibits at least one month before the hearing. According to Bourla, this will give the plaintiffs ample opportunity to determine whether and, if so, which exhibits they wish to submit, while simultaneously ensuring that the defendants have ample opportunity to submit any responses to them, no later than two weeks before the hearing..

2.11. The court considers that it assumes that all relevant documents have now been submitted. Should a party nevertheless wish to submit documents, the court will, in the interest of due process, order the following: this party must submit the relevant documents no later than four weeks before the oral hearing. If another party wishes to submit documents in response, they must do so no later than ten calendar days before the oral hearing.

Organizational wishes

2.12. The court notes that the plaintiffs and Van Cann et al. have also raised requests that are essentially organizational in nature. The court will address these requests in a letter at a later date.

Final thought

2.13. Any further decision will be postponed.

3. The decision

The court

3.1. stipulates that if parties wish to rely on documents not yet submitted at the oral hearing, these must be sent to the court and the other parties no later than four weeks before the oral hearing;

3.2. stipulates that if any of the other parties wishes to submit further documents in response to the documents referred to in 3.1, these documents must be sent to the court and the other parties no later than ten calendar days before the oral hearing.;

3.3. informs the parties that 5 hours will be set aside for the oral hearing;

3.4. postpones any further decision

This judgment was rendered by Mr. C.M. Telman, Mr. T.P. Hoekstra, and Mr. P. van Eijk and pronounced in open court on March 11, 2026.