

Gates trial in the Netherlands: Lawyers bitterly complain about charges

October 23, 2026



Defendants in the civil trial: Gates, Rutte, Bourla (center) Photo: Report24 AI

On Thursday, a hearing was held at a district court in the Netherlands in a highly controversial case: Bill Gates, Mark Rutte, and Albert Bourla, among others, were accused of misleading the public and causing harm in connection with COVID-19 vaccines. The defense attorneys bitterly complained that no one would want to get involved in politics or advise scientists if they faced the risk of being taken to court for their actions. This is indeed a very peculiar strategy.

On October 22, a civil trial was held at the District Court of North Holland in Leeuwarden against multibillionaire Bill Gates, Pfizer CEO Albert Bourla, NATO Secretary General Mark Rutte, and 14 other defendants. The plaintiffs accuse them of intentionally misleading the public regarding COVID-19 vaccines and the resulting health damages. The plaintiffs' legal representatives allege the use of biological weapons and participation in an international conspiracy. The defendants reject all charges, criticizing in particular the attempt to prosecute politicians and scientists. A verdict is expected between December 2026 and February 2027.

Problems with the foundation that financed the legal dispute

The case is being heard before a three-judge civil chamber of the North Netherlands Court of Appeal in Leeuwarden. Originally, seven Dutch citizens filed suit, two of whom have since died – possibly as a result of Covid-19 vaccinations. Their interests are being represented by lawyer Peter Stassen. The case has so far been supported by the foundation Recht op Recht (Law against Justice).

A rift developed before the trial. The Recht op Recht Foundation, which had provided organizational and financial support for the proceedings for years, announced its impending dissolution on October 4th. According to the foundation's board, the organization of public relations, fundraising, and the press conference on October 22nd were unexpectedly removed from its purview. Board members were even prohibited from attending the press conference. The reasons for this remain unclear. Recht op Recht is no longer accepting donations and intends only to settle existing debts.

Seven plaintiffs against 17 defendants

The 17 defendants include Bill Gates and Pfizer CEO Albert Bourla, former Dutch Prime Minister Mark Rutte, former government officials such as Hugo de Jonge, Sigrid Kaag, Wopke Hoekstra and Ernst Kuipers, as well as scientists and medical advisors, including Marion Koopmans, Jaap van Dissel and Diederik Gommers. The Dutch state and media representatives such as Giselle van Cann and Paul Jansen are also among the defendants.

The legal basis is the **allegation of a tort (*onrechtmatige daad*) under Dutch civil law**. The plaintiffs claim that the defendants, individually and collectively, influenced their vaccination decisions through misleading statements regarding the safety, efficacy, and necessity of the COVID-19 vaccines.

The plaintiffs are seeking a judicial declaration of unlawful conduct and joint and several liability for damages. The exact amount of damages could then be determined in separate proceedings. **No criminal charges have been filed; therefore, imprisonment or fines are not part of this process.**

The plaintiff's lawyer speaks of biological weapons and deliberate deception.

In his opening statement, **attorney Peter Stassen placed the COVID-19 vaccination campaigns in the context of the "Great Reset" propagated by the World Economic Forum**. According to him, the defendants had acted as participants in an internationally organized project that extended far beyond health policy.

Stassen explicitly described the coronavirus injections as bioweapons and claimed that their use was only possible through widespread deception of the population. He accused the defendants of deliberately portraying the preparations as safe and effective vaccines, even though they were aware of their dangerous nature.

As justification, he referred, among other things, to the accelerated development and approval of the preparations, alleged quality problems, DNA contamination, lipid nanoparticles, and differences between individual production batches.

The statements submitted by Sasha Latypova (pharmaceutical entrepreneur and analyst), former Pfizer senior research manager and vice president Michael Yeadon (pharmacologist, biochemist), Catherine Austin Fitts (investment banker, former government official, financial analyst), and Joseph Sansone (psychologist, psychotherapist) played a central role. Stassen relied in particular on Latypova's account that the development and procurement of the drugs had taken place, in part, within military structures. Latypova and Sansone were personally present in the courtroom as observers.

Der Anwalt erklärte außerdem, die ihm vorliegenden Beweismittel seien von den Beklagten bislang nicht ausreichend inhaltlich behandelt worden. Er verlangte eine umfassende gerichtliche Prüfung dieser Unterlagen.

He based his legal argument, among other things, on **group liability under Article 6:166 of the Dutch Civil Code**. In his view, it was therefore not necessary to prove for each individual defendant that their personal statement had triggered a specific plaintiff's decision to be vaccinated.

Stassen also invoked legal terms such as bodily harm, high treason, and genocide. He cited these to justify the alleged illegality, not as independent criminal charges.

The defense rejects all accusations.

The defendants' legal representatives fundamentally disagreed with the plaintiffs' account.

The lawyer for the Dutch state stated that the coronavirus pandemic had indeed occurred and that the vaccines had been assessed as safe and effective based on scientific studies. He cited hospitalizations, deaths, and the strain on the healthcare system, as well as the approval processes carried out by the relevant authorities.

The claim that the vaccines were used as bioweapons to deliberately harm the population lacks any sound basis, according to the state's legal representatives.

Albert Bourla's defense also cited clinical trials, reviews by the European Medicines Agency, and ongoing monitoring of vaccine safety. They argued that the plaintiffs were misrepresenting essential facts regarding the development, composition, and approval of the products.

Bill Gates' legal representatives focused particularly on the question of his personal liability. It had not been proven that Gates had acted unlawfully towards the individual plaintiffs. His public statements had served to provide information about the pandemic and vaccines. Furthermore, the plaintiffs themselves had stated that they had been primarily motivated to get vaccinated by statements from Dutch government officials. Therefore, no direct causal link to Gates' statements had been established.

The existence of concrete vaccine injuries was also disputed. Gates' lawyer explained that three of the five remaining plaintiffs had not reported any physical ailments as a result of the vaccinations. In the case of the other two, such damages had not been sufficiently substantiated.

Criticism of the personal persecution of politicians and scientists

The defense was particularly critical of the approach of personally suing individual politicians, scientists, and doctors.

The lawyer for the Dutch state explained that every citizen is free to have political decisions and government actions reviewed in court. However, it is a different matter to subject individuals to lawsuits in their private lives and at their home address because of their official duties.

Several defendants had already been confronted with hate messages, death threats, and public harassment. Their legal representatives cited, among other things, internet comments, public wanted posters, and campaigns using the names and images of the victims.

The public prosecutor in the civil sense, i.e., the representative of the Dutch state, posed the question of which scientist or doctor would still be willing to assume responsibility in a national crisis if they were subsequently confronted personally with such accusations.

The defendants requested that the action be dismissed.

Judges question plaintiffs personally

The public hearing began at 12:30 p.m. At the outset, the presiding judge noted that none of the 17 defendants had appeared in person. Even those who had originally planned to participate online had cancelled. The court regretted their absence but clarified that personal attendance at this civil hearing could not be enforced. Following the closing arguments of the plaintiffs' and defendants' representatives, there was a recess, after which the court questioned the parties extensively.

The hearing focused particularly on the legal scope of the lawsuit, the evidence submitted, the alleged health damages, and their potential connection to the vaccinations. The judges wanted to know, among other things, whether the lawsuit targeted only mRNA vaccines from Pfizer and Moderna or also other COVID-19 vaccines. Stassen clarified that the allegations could, in principle, apply to all COVID-19 vaccinations.

The question of the extent to which individual plaintiffs could assert claims that go beyond their personal involvement was also addressed.

The court examined the plaintiffs' health complaints in particular detail. One plaintiff reported a brain hemorrhage, which he attributed to his COVID-19 vaccination. Another described his former partner's severe Parkinson's disease, which he also linked to the vaccination.

The presiding judge expressed her concern in light of the personal accounts, but repeatedly emphasized that the court could only rule on the claims related to the injections. The other COVID-19 measures were not the subject of the proceedings.

Stassen was subsequently given another opportunity to respond to the opposing side's objections. He reiterated his demand for a comprehensive review of the expert reports submitted. The defendants' representatives maintained their objections.

According to the presiding judge, the court file now comprises nearly 14,000 pages, in addition to numerous video files. The court stated that it had already thoroughly examined these documents.

Verdict no earlier than December

At the close of the hearing, presiding judge TP Hoekstra announced a written decision. The case was formally scheduled for December 9, 2026. However, the court explicitly stated that it was highly unlikely a ruling would be issued by that date. A decision is expected sometime between December 9, 2026, and the end of February 2027.

The judges must first assess which of the facts relevant to the lawsuit have been proven. Additional evidence may be required before a final decision can be reached.

The exact date of the verdict will be announced in advance on the court's website. The parties' continued presence in the courtroom is not required for the written decision.

Thus, after the several-hour hearing, it remains open whether the court will establish the alleged unlawful deception and a resulting liability for damages on the part of individual or all defendants.