Amsterdam Court of Appeal

Hearing: 9 March 2026 at 11:00 a.m.

Case number: 200.360.223/01

PS/D100816/PS

PLEADING NOTE
Mr. P.W.H. Stassen

In the matter of:
Three Dutch petitioners with Covid-19 injection damage
Litigation counsel: Mr. P. (Peter) W.H. Stassen

Stassen & Kemps Advocaten

Versus:
1. van Dissel, J.T.
2. Koopmans, M.P.G.
3. Rutte, M.
4. Kaag, S.A.M.
5. de Jonge, H.M.
6. Kuipers, E.J.
7. Gommers, D.A.M.P.J.
8. Hoekstra, W.B.
9. Van Nieuwenhuizen, C.
10. Sijbesma, F.
11. the State of the Netherlands
    Litigation counsel: Mr. R.W. (Reimer) Veldhuis, Pels Rijcken & Droogleever Fortuijn N.V.
12. Bourla, A.
    Litigation counsel: Mr. D.C. (Davine) Roessingh, De Brauw Blackstone Westbroek N.V.
13. / 14. van Cann, G.J.M.
    Litigation counsel: Mr. P. (Pieter) A. Lichtendahl, AC&R
15. Gates III, W.H.B.
    Litigation counsel: Mr. W. (Willem) Heemskerk, Pels Rijcken & Droogleever Fortuijn N.V.
16. Van der Voort-Kant, A.C.
    Litigation counsel: Mr. A.H. (Anton) Ekker, Ekker Advocatuur
17. Hofstra, E.I.
    Litigation counsel: Mr. R. (Reimer) W. Veldhuis, Pels Rijcken & Droogleever Fortuijn N.V.
18. Jansen, P.E.
    Litigation counsel: Mr. P. (Pieter) A. Lichtendahl, AC&R

Most Honorable Court,
Esteemed Presiding Judge,
Interested parties,

Introduction

We are hearing today a case of global importance. This is a given because the petition of my clients is directed against those carrying out the project Covid-19: The Great Reset, in which the Covid-19 mRNA injections are crucial.

You can only arrive at a balanced judgment in this case if you take into account the facts and circumstances under which the petition was made. It is therefore about the context of the petition. A significant part of the grievances against the first-instance ruling concerns the fact that the judge did not take that context into account, or at least did so wholly insufficiently.

In this pleading, I will convince you that this alone constituted a violation of fundamental norms for a fair trial. This is so serious that breaking through the prohibition on legal remedies is a necessity. This is because my clients otherwise have no access to a fair trial. The context of the case is therefore of enormous importance for the assessment of the admissibility of this appeal.

To make you aware of the context of this case, I will first address the official Covid-19 narrative and contrast it with a number of facts that are now common knowledge. I note in this regard that since the filing of the appeal, there has also been a novum; it concerns new facts of such importance that the grievance that the context of the case was not taken into account can now be further substantiated with facts. I am therefore primarily of the opinion that raising these new facts is not in conflict with the two-conclusion rule from Article 347 of the Code of Civil Procedure. In the alternative, I take the position that unrestricted application of the two-conclusion rule leads to a conflict with proper procedural order because there is a new development.

The official Covid-19 narrative of the defendants

Allow me to first remind you what the official narrative is according to the implementers of the Covid-19 project and therefore also the defendants in these proceedings, in order to illustrate the context. This narrative can easily be found in Dutch legislation[1]. It is important to note that this narrative from governments and international organizations, including the UN and NATO, is the same worldwide. The only explanation for this is that the project Covid-19: The Great Reset is a global project. In other words, a project of globalists.

Back to that official narrative. According to the defendants in this case, it reads as follows: *In December 2019, a new coronavirus emerged in the Wuhan region of China, initially designated as (novel-coronavirus) 2019-nCoV and now formally named SARS-CoV-2 (severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus). In the Netherlands, developments surrounding the virus were closely monitored. On 28 January 2020, on the advice of the Outbreak Management Team (OMT), the virus was classified as belonging to Group A as referred to in the Public Health Act (Wpg), and all provisions of the Wpg that apply to infectious diseases belonging to Group A were declared applicable to combating the epidemic of the virus.*

This is the official narrative. The classification of the alleged virus in Group A had far-reaching legal consequences. First, this created a statutory reporting obligation for this alleged new infectious disease. Second, all enforcement powers under the Public Health Act were thereby

activated, and third, the Minister of Medical Care became responsible for leading the fight against this allegedly new disease.

In short, a medical control state was erected in which the fundamental rights of citizens were hollowed out, which to this day is defended by the defendants by invoking this official narrative.

My clients contend that this official narrative and the manner in which the defendants, acting as a group, promoted, imposed, and enforced this narrative was unlawful. As a result of this unlawful conduct, my clients were misled, as a consequence of which they received a Covid-19 injection. To this day, the defendants maintain that the deployment of these Covid-19 injections was a necessity and that these injections qualify as a safe and effective vaccine against the allegedly new disease Covid-19, as per the official narrative.

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

Very little remains of the health of my clients as a result of the Covid-19 injections. I consider it a miracle that they are still able to be present here today. It is for this reason that my clients have a right and interest in hearing the honest and independent experts they have put forward, who would testify under oath before a judge in proceedings with the possibilities of hearing both sides. Only in this way can my clients assess their chances of success in substantive proceedings to be initiated by them. The District Court of Leeuwarden denied them that possibility, and I will explain to you why this violated fundamental norms that safeguard access to a fair trial.

Facts of common knowledge

How does this official narrative, which the defendants defend as implementers of the project Covid-19: The Great Reset, relate to facts that are now common knowledge? I will mention a number of them, not exhaustively, which should not have escaped your attention. But before I do so, I make an important caveat. When I mention the facts of common knowledge, this partly also concerns ‘facts’ that are the result of a preferential and therefore mendacious reality controlled by the defendants. So these are partly lies that the implementers of the project Covid-19: The Great Reset have made part of a new normal. I will return to this later in my explanation. I am now speaking about those facts that have become common knowledge because they have been admitted by the official authorities and made public, or are known to a broad public as though they were true facts.

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

The alleged new disease caused by the coronavirus, Covid-19, was never more dangerous than a mild flu, which is also confirmed by Prof. John Ioannidis of Stanford University in California and now also by the WHO itself.

The PCR test cannot detect infections, which has been repeatedly stated publicly by its inventor and Nobel Prize winner Kary Mullis, and also by former Vice President of Pfizer, Dr. Mike Yeadon, German university professor Dr. Klaus Steger, American university professor J. Jay Couey, Italian professor Gabriele Segalla, and Canadian physicians Dr. Mark Trozzi and Dr.

Roger Hodkinson, who confirmed that the alleged dangers of the coronavirus and the disease Covid-19 never existed, but that the population was panicked on “political orders.”

The Verwaltungsgericht (Administrative Court) Osnabrück, Germany issued a very important ruling on 3 September 2024[2]. This ruling has been published and I have included the ECLI number as a footnote in this pleading note. For your court, this ruling is of great importance. This ruling was made by judges who, like you, are judges in Europe, and you must not look away from what they established as facts in that case. In brief, that case concerned the statutory obligation to receive a Covid-19 injection or to have proof of recovery from Covid-19 in order to be permitted to work in a hospital and in certain other contact professions.

The constitutional Bundesverfassungsgericht (Federal Constitutional Court) in Germany had tested this legislation against the German Constitution and deemed it permissible. For this reason, the case brought before the Verwaltungsgericht on this matter was in principle inadmissible.

However, the Verwaltungsgericht declared itself competent in that case on the basis of new facts and new perspectives. Those new facts and circumstances primarily concerned the interim release of the partially redacted protocols of the RKI Krisenstab (crisis team), which is what we call the OMT here. The Verwaltungsgericht studied those protocols and concluded that the Covid-19 injections did not offer the more vulnerable members of society effective protection against infection, and that as a result, it was already established in the year 2022 that this false narrative of an effective vaccine and the statutory obligations for certain professions based thereon in Germany were in violation of the fundamental rights of citizens. But perhaps even more importantly, the Verwaltungsgericht also established the far-reaching political influence at the RKI crisis team. In short, according to the Verwaltungsgericht, these were criminal measures. The defendants in this case, including members of the OMT, therefore also knew this. Against this background, it is established that the defendants knew at least after 2022 that there was no effective vaccine and that it was in fact a matter of political orders. Yet they continue to lie and deceive about this, which makes clear that they are working as a group on a criminal project.

I draw your attention to this ruling because, although published, it receives no attention due to the deliberate failure of the political, media, and scientific landscape controlled by the implementers of the project Covid-19: The Great Reset. This ruling also receives no attention in the sham Parliamentary Inquiry Committee on Corona installed in the Netherlands, which also does not wish to know about the proceedings brought by my clients and the published findings of the experts put forward by my clients.

The so-called corona measures were economically destructive (especially the lockdowns) and led to the death and serious ‘side effects’[3] of millions of people. In my footnote in this pleading note, I already indicate that in reality these are ‘primary effects.’ According to the findings of Prof. Denis Rancourt and the pathologist and PCR test manufacturer Dr. Roger Hodkinson from Canada, the toll amounts to at least 20 million deaths worldwide and 2.4 billion ‘serious side effects.’

The European agency responsible for the authorization of the 'vaccines' (EMA) has meanwhile confirmed the following[5] in response to questions from former Member of the European Parliament Marcel de Graaff by letter of 18 October 2023[4]:

> *"... You state that the vaccines, based on the authorized indications, 'may only be administered to persons seeking personal protection, and that they are not authorized for the purpose of reducing transmission or infection rates (transmission control).' You also state that the authorized indication does not correspond to the uses promoted by 'pharmaceutical companies, politicians, and health professionals.'*
>
> *You are indeed correct in pointing out that COVID-19 vaccines are not authorized for the prevention of transmission from one person to another. The indications are solely for the protection of the vaccinated persons.*
>
> *The product information for COVID-19 vaccines clearly states that the vaccines are intended for active immunization for the prevention of COVID-19. Furthermore, the EMA's assessment reports on the authorization of the vaccines note the lack of data on transmissibility..."*

Thus the EMA.

This means that receiving a Covid-19 injection, according to the EMA, could only take place on the basis of informed consent within a physician-patient relationship. Everything we have seen and heard in the new normal about what former Minister De Jonge called a 'thoroughly tested vaccine' cannot in any way be traced back to the market authorization granted by the EMA. By repeatedly confirming the safety and effectiveness of the Covid-19 injections explicitly, implicitly, and subliminally over an extended period, the defendants acted using brainwashing methods as developed by the former Nazi-German Minister of Propaganda, Goebbels.

It is therefore now a fact of common knowledge that the official Covid-19 narrative is incorrect and that all campaigns with 'you're doing it for others' were based on nothing other than deception. Yet the defendants maintain this. Their procedural documents are entirely clear on this point, and thus it is also entirely clear that we are dealing with professional liars.

And now the novum I spoke of. You have surely heard of the Epstein files. There is no escaping them. Without any form of speculation or uncertainty, the content of those files establishes the following. There exists a globally organized malicious elite. At the top of this elite are, in any event, a number of families who are the owners of the central banks that have hijacked the right worldwide to create money out of nothing. They are the ones who lend this money at interest to governments and enrich themselves at the expense of the taxpayer. Mr. Epstein fulfills an important role in this network. He is a representative of the bankers and also a very important figure in the Trilateral Commission, which was established by the Rockefellers, also a banking family. Mr. Epstein is a self-declared transhumanist, someone who has no regard for the creation of human beings, unless they belong to the financial aristocracy.

On behalf of his superiors, Epstein gives shape to the transhumanist agenda, which is largely formed by the desire to exterminate the vast majority of the world's population. This

transhumanist agenda is an important part of the Great Reset agenda of which the defendants are implementers.

Mr. Epstein already advocated in 2011, on behalf of Gates, at the largest American bank, JP Morgan Chase, for a financial model to make money from ‘vaccines.’

You should know that the WHO had changed the definition of a pandemic some years earlier in order to be able to declare the fake swine flu pandemic, also known as the Mexican flu, on 11 June 2009. You should also know that the WHO was established after the Second World War and, from the 1970s onward, due to the lack of real pandemics, was increasingly funded by private parties. Private parties do not simply give money but do so to make money. Gates, with his Gates Foundation, leads the way as the largest private financier of the WHO.

Neither the bank nor Gates found Epstein’s known conviction for sexual abuse of minors to be any objection to allowing Epstein’s intermediary role. This entire financial model, with a Donor Advised Fund, offshore structures, and a hedge fund of the bank to invisibly pocket the profits, was set up well in advance of the rollout of the planned and pretextual Covid-19 crisis. Of course, no physician was involved because the bankers and Gates and all other participants were not concerned with health at all. The World Bank Group, where our Queen Máxima serves as an advocate for financial health, inclusion, and economic development, also played an important role. The trigger mechanism in the complicated and murky financial construct was the number of ‘PCR deaths,’ which is why you now understand why the defendants, as implementers of the project Covid-19: The Great Reset, pushed through the PCR test. The planned Covid-19 crisis, including a sufficient number of ‘PCR deaths,’ was a precondition for making the planned financial gain possible and therefore did not come about by chance.

The Epstein files prove that Epstein’s superiors have the institutions that should be enforcers of law and order worldwide in their power. However you look at it, Gates is part of this network and plays a crucial role in making money from so-called vaccines. This fits seamlessly with Gates’s own statement in a TED Talk from 2010[6] that with new vaccines, healthcare, and ‘reproductive health services’ — read: abortion and sterilization — a reduction of the world population by 10 to 15 percent can be achieved. It is shocking, but equally understandable, that none of the defendants in this case has any criticism of Gates. Apparently, they are all vulnerable and cannot afford to criticize.

Now, these Epstein files have been partially released — approximately three and a half million of the more than five million pages, with many redactions — and these files testify to the involvement of bankers, intelligence services, media, Hollywood figures, government officials, universities, and also many so-called scientists who are all corruptly connected in this network and serve this transhumanist, let us call it satanic, ideology.

A remark in passing. The State et al. wrote in the statement of defense in the substantive proceedings — admittedly an entirely separate procedure with different plaintiffs — the following:

> *“The State wishes to emphasize that the consequences of the theories formulated in the summons are not innocent. The narrative of a malicious elite that targets the population, employed with those theories, can ultimately be*

undermining to the democratic rule of law. It already provides a legitimation for a group of people for online hate messages, (death) threats, and worse."

It is now therefore a fact of common knowledge that the State of the Netherlands is lying. After all, the democratic rule of law is being undermined by a malicious elite that targets the population. The Epstein files prove this. That the defendants deny the existence of such a malicious elite is what actually undermines the functioning of a democratic rule of law. It is these kinds of gross lies by the defendants that are entirely in violation of the duty of truth under Article 21 of the Code of Civil Procedure and that have completely led the first-instance judge astray. There is not the slightest doubt that fundamental norms were thereby violated.

Back to the Epstein files. A number of critical observations are in order here. 1. The members of this now partially disclosed elite network are not being prosecuted. 2. The members of this elite network maintain the mafia code of silence and deny everything of essential significance. 3. Citizens do not receive all the information regarding this elite network. 4. The information that is provided at the personal level of the members of this network is always too sparse to draw truly hard legal conclusions regarding those individual persons when it comes to what is known as 'Pizzagate.' If you do not know what that is, you should look it up, because you ought to know. 5. These Epstein files will therefore have a great psychological effect on the world population. It will be a great deception for them that little to no action is being taken against this elite and their accomplices. 6. This failure to act is already leading to further demoralization, which, on closer consideration, must also be the intention of this malicious elite, otherwise the complete package of information would have been released and hundreds if not thousands of arrests would already have been made. 7. This planned demoralization of the world population is already accompanied by a further erosion of trust in institutions. That cannot be otherwise. 8. As a result, resistance is already diminishing among many to the idea of democratically legitimizing the replacement of existing institutions with new ones.

Having arrived at this point, I come to what the Epstein files truly are. It is a psychological operation to further enable the Great Reset. The proposition is that if the first-instance judge had been aware of these facts and circumstances, she would have recognized the importance of hearing the honest experts put forward by my clients and would have granted that request. You as judges must not look away from this reality.

I had already made the caveat that not everything that is recorded as facts of common knowledge is actually true. The truth must be investigated, and it is the primary task of you as judges to establish the true facts and circumstances in order to arrive at a balanced judgment. This is no different in your assessment of the admissibility of this appeal. My task is to provide you with the facts for that purpose.

The adage from Roman law '*Da mihi factum, dabo tibi ius*' — Give me the facts, and I will give you the law — also applies to the assessment of the admissibility of this appeal. This implies that in legal proceedings, it is for the parties to state and prove the facts and thus to delineate the dispute on which the judge rules. The facts I state must therefore be taken into account in your judgment.

The expert evidence and its significance

The context of the petition should by now have penetrated your consciousness.

Now I come to the deeper analysis that is necessary to acquaint you with the true facts, which is essential for a fair trial. The true facts are essentially no different from what I clearly and loudly put forward in the first instance. We are witnessing the greatest genocide of the world population that has ever occurred. This is an important element of the Covid-19 agenda of which the defendants are implementers.

To make this deeper analysis, you need the findings of real experts who are independent from those carrying out the Covid-19 Great Reset agenda. All suggestions by the defendants regarding the persons of the experts put forward by my clients should for this reason be immediately discarded. Given the context of this case, this cannot be otherwise.

In this context, you cannot ignore the findings of the experts put forward by my clients. Their motive is evidently not money, fame, or power, but love of the truth. Truth is the driving force and field of research of the true scientist. A number of them have come to this courtroom today at their own expense for this reason, and you would be wise to ask them questions if anything is unclear from the video messages and reports they have addressed to you. Of course you have read the reports and watched the videos, but I wish to highlight a number of important elements from them.

Statement of Joseph Sansone

I begin with the statement of Joseph Sansone. It is based on a sworn statement of the late Professor Dr. Francis Boyle's findings and conclusions. Professor Boyle was the greatest authority on biological weapons legislation. He knew better than anyone that the Covid-19 mRNA injection is a bioweapon. He made this loud and clear to the world, after which he died despite being in good health, shortly after he had declared his willingness to testify under oath before the District Court of Leeuwarden.

The core of Professor Boyle's argument is that the Covid-19 mRNA injections contain derivatives of illegal military gain-of-function research. As a result, the Covid-19 injections by definition qualify as a military biological weapons system — a bioweapon. This bioweapon consists of two integrated components: the pathogenic payload and the delivery mechanism.

It is beyond doubt that the pathogenic payload is the product of illegal gain-of-function research. Boyle refers to an article in the scientific journal Nature Medicine[7]. When you open that link, you will immediately read the warning that true scientists 'believe' that an animal is the most likely source of the coronavirus. You will then also immediately know that what in the new normal are called 'true scientists' are not scientists but religious fanatics. These are the scientists behind whom the defendants hide.

The article in Nature Medicine that Boyle reported on was published in 2015. The title reads (translated):

> *'A cluster of circulating bat coronaviruses similar to SARS shows potential for human infection.'*

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

> *'Based on these findings, we synthetically developed an infectious, fully SHC014-recombinant virus and demonstrated robust viral replication, both in vitro and in vivo.'*

So it states: we, the researchers, created a SARS-like coronavirus with a spike protein optimized for human infection. I cannot give a better example of illegal gain-of-function research. And who wrote that 2015 article? They include researchers affiliated with UNC Chapel Hill and the Wuhan Institute of Virology. Wuhan? Yes, Wuhan! You know, where according to the official narrative people were simply dropping dead in the street when Covid-19 broke out because a bat had mutated.

The spike protein, the pathogenic payload of the bioweapon, is the result of this research. It is therefore not a natural spike protein but an illegally developed, synthetically produced pathogen optimized for human infection. The spike protein mRNA, with instructions to human cells to produce precisely this disease-causing spike protein, is one of the two crucial building blocks of the Covid-19 bioweapon.

Now the delivery system: the NLPs. You know, the Nano Lipid Particles that envelop the mRNA payload and deliver it into the interior of cells. The propaganda term for this is 'fat globules,' as if it were something as innocent as a packet of butter. What did Boyle declare about this? Boyle declared that it is in reality a delivery platform enhanced with nanotechnology. This technology, as Boyle stated, was paid for, developed, funded, and conceived by the Pentagon and its research institute, DARPA[8].

This nanotechnology platform was no minor matter. Dr. Boyle points out that the virus itself was nebulized and processed with nanotechnology from the very beginning. This indicates a long-term program aimed at the application of advanced delivery systems. This technology was used in the Covid-19 injections.

Boyle established that the NLP delivery system in the injections is the result of a specific military-sponsored program for nanotechnological biological weapons.

In Sansone's exposition, you can read further about the legal implications of this. It also includes a reasoned explanation that Gates and Bourla qualify as suspects of crimes against humanity as defined in the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court.

Statement of Sasha Latypova

Sasha Latypova has a very impressive CV demonstrating that she is uniquely familiar with the procedures and formal requirements in the field of drug development. That CV is part of the procedural documents in this case.

Latypova teaches you that the technology in Covid-19 mRNA injections is officially recognized as 'Dual Use technology.' This concerns technology that can be used for medical applications but is also very suitable for making a bioweapon.

She teaches you that as early as 1997, American defense advisors classified gene therapy platforms based on mRNA and NLPs as technology that can be deployed as a bioweapon.

Latypova explains that even fragmented RNA disrupts the gene expression of the host, even without coding for specific proteins. The officially permitted amount of DNA debris in the Covid-19 mRNA injections is therefore particularly concerning.

Latypova also teaches us that Covid-19 was not a public health incident but a covert global military operation.

In the United States, a state of emergency was declared on 4 February 2020 under the Public Readiness and Emergency Preparedness Act (PREP Act). The PREP Act recognizes a state of emergency for a military chemical, biological, radiological, or nuclear emergency. This state of emergency was thus declared in the US on 4 February 2020 and remains in effect at least until 31 December 2029.

In the European Union, comparable emergency laws came into effect. EU officials and other government authorities entered into predatory Covid-19 injection contracts with Pfizer and other manufacturers in connection with this. In doing so, all consumer safety regulations and import and export laws were circumvented.

The most important relevant statements and timeline regarding the course of events in the European Union and the Netherlands are described in detail in Latypova's documents. I have submitted these documents as appendices to the appeal brief.

All Covid-19 mRNA injections that were promoted as "safe and effective vaccines" were ordered and funded by the U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) as "prototypes" and "large-scale manufacturing demonstrations." The U.S. Department of Defense and NATO oversaw the development, production, and global distribution of all so-called Covid-19 countermeasures.

The Covid-19 injections came to market in December 2020 as 'Emergency Use Authorization countermeasures,' countermeasures permitted in an emergency situation. This legislation has nothing to do with the usual regulations for pharmaceutical products.

When a product is designated as a "countermeasure," all consumer safety laws and regulations, including manufacturer liability, are suspended. This product category may only be distributed in the event of a declared biochemical or nuclear war or terrorism emergency.

The Emergency Use Authorization procedure for countermeasures may only be used in the United States if the U.S. Secretary of Health and Human Services declares a state of emergency based on advice from the Food and Drug Administration, of which the EMA in Europe is the counterpart.

Article 564 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FD&C Act) exempts 'countermeasures' from pharmaceutical regulation and from the requirements of informed consent for administration. This applies for as long as the state of emergency is in effect, which in the United States is at least until 31 December 2029. But you see that exactly the same thing is happening here in the Netherlands. On the day of filing my appeal brief, a new Covid-19 injection campaign simply started again, for which people were summoned en masse.

Under this legal status of a state of emergency, compliance with pharmaceutical legislation is voluntary and unenforceable. As a result, there is in effect a lawless situation. Latypova points out that misleading representations of the safety, efficacy, or contents of products with an

Emergency Use Authorization are permitted under U.S. federal law. Comparable exceptions to the law were invoked in EU member states. EU Regulation on Emergency Support 2016/369 (as amended in 2020) allows the European Commission to completely suspend Current Good Manufacturing Practice (cGMP) standards during a declared emergency.

This suspension actually takes place in Europe through supply agreements with pharmaceutical companies. Pharmaceutical companies, including Pfizer, are fully indemnified therein against injury and death as a result of an unsafe product, except in the case of very narrowly defined 'intentional misconduct.' The European supply contracts are not coincidentally comparable on this point with the provisions of the American PREP Act. The mutual recognition agreement between the FDA and the EMA (fully effective since July 2019) enables qualified persons in the EU to blindly accept American batch data. Therefore, claims by EU member state health authorities or manufacturers cannot be considered reliable sources of information.

Latypova explains in her contribution that although the FDA granted a Biologics Licensing Approval (BLA) to Pfizer's mRNA Covid-19 injection in August 2021, this was in violation of U.S. legislation for biological drug licensing and international legislation concerning clinical experiments on humans. The Covid-19 mRNA injections that came to market through the non-research EUA procedure cannot formally receive a BLA license without first demonstrating that these injections fully comply with the research standards for a BLA license. Yet the legally impossible happened, which demonstrates how far the corruption extends at the highest and most powerful regulators. A formal citizen petition by Children's Health Defense to revoke the BLA license and relabel Pfizer's product as EUA is currently pending before the FDA.[9]

Latypova concludes that the defendants deceptively promoted the Covid-19 injections under a false pharmaceutical label as safe, prophylactic vaccines against Covid-19.

The emergency use authorization (EUA) and the associated public health legislation served as a convincing cover — a legal theater — while the actual governing regime was and remains the legislation on chemical and biological warfare and the associated emergency exemptions.

Latypova establishes that the Dutch government and authorities relied on the regulatory information and decisions of the FDA and therefore knew exactly what was going on. The intentionality of their unlawful conduct is thereby a given.

Katherine Watt, Mike Yeadon, and Catherine Austin Fitts

I must not leave the expert opinions of Katherine Watt, Mike Yeadon, and Catherine Austin Fitts undiscussed. Given my speaking time and the lengthy approach I have taken to reach your consciousness, I am compelled to present their equally important statements more briefly.

Katherine Watt teaches you that everyone who has received a 'vaccination' — any vaccination — has been poisoned. Injecting foreign substances into the bloodstream, which are found in all vaccines, is by definition toxic and makes people susceptible to allergies, cancer, and autoimmune diseases. She describes all laws and regulations in this regard, and her conclusion makes clear that we are being massively deceived by the legislative and regulatory institutions in the field of medicine and in particular by the pharmaceutical companies that produce and sell vaccines.

Mike Yeadon, a renowned scientist who held a top position at Pfizer, is the most qualified person in the world to read the design of a medical product and has seen the building blocks of the Covid-19 bioweapon for what they are. His statement about the maliciously determined design of the Covid-19 mRNA injections leaves nothing to be desired in terms of clarity.

Catherine Austin Fitts, a former high-ranking advisor to the Bush Senior administration and an insider in the banking system, has explained to you in no uncertain terms how the global economic and political playing field is controlled by a collaboration of criminals she refers to as 'Mr. Global.' She places the Covid-19 injections in that reality.

The statements of all the experts put forward by my clients contribute to the evidence that the official narrative of the defendants is malicious and false, and that the defendants in these proceedings, acting as a group as implementers of the project Covid-19: The Great Reset, are acting intentionally unlawfully.

Closing and conclusion

I will close. Article 21 of the Code of Civil Procedure provides that parties are obliged to present the facts relevant to the decision fully and truthfully. From everything you now know, it is clear that the defendants in the first instance violated the duty of truth under Article 21 of the Code of Civil Procedure with no other purpose than to conceal the truth so that the crimes against humanity may continue undisturbed. The most fundamental norm for a fair trial was thereby violated by them. This justifies, without any doubt, a very extensive examination of the admissibility of this appeal as well as a breaking through of the prohibition on legal remedies.

I thank you for your attention.

Litigation counsel

---

[1] See, for example, the Temporary Provisions in Connection with Measures to Combat the Covid-19 Epidemic for the Longer Term (Temporary Act on Covid-19 Measures).

[2] ECLI:DE::2024:0919.3A224.22.00

[3] As will appear below: primary effects.

[4] https://perma.cc/YRR2-6TU5

[5] This concerns a faithful translation of the English text.

[6] https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JaF-fq2Zn7I

[7] https://www.nature.com/articles/nm.3985

[8] Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA)

[9] https://www.regulations.gov/document/FDA-2025-P-6831-0001