the far to late and inferior condemnation of the Dutch case law

and only simply as subdivision of the “Toeslagen Affaire”

in the investigation’s report “Unprecedented Injustice”

this version and the Dutch version are authentic

Introduction

In the Netherlands, a large number of parents receive a lawful allowance as a state participation in the costs of childcare for their children while both parents are at work. The tax authority has the executive duty, but carried out a brutal tyranny when even a minor human error was made and irreversibly labeled these individuals as fraudsters.

These tyrannically oppressed individuals turned to the court and its tribunal or judge, but this only increased the oppression. Tax fraud is a very serious crime in the Netherlands.

Only after repeatedly publication in one or more newspapers did parliament ask questions. Just because the parliament was cheated or banned from information in this case and the newspapers revealed documents that parliament had not received, they became a bit more active. Parliament has set up a temporary interrogation commission for this affair. The commission published a report "Ongekend Onrecht", translatable in “Unprecedented Injustice”.

Hereafter the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms will be abbreviated as ECHR.

Survey of the Report

The report is –so far– unfortunately only in Dutch. This scrutiny report is an accurate translation which in companionship with its Dutch version helps in the quest to verify the author’s correct expression.

The report is divided into three parts.
Part I contains the chapter “Constateringen” (english**:** “Observations”), which is the final conclusion for the public scrutiny, which conclusion is the round up of the consequences and which consequences must follow from the findings from the interrogations. This chapter is mainly the subject of the public scrutiny on the application of Human Rights. Part I then contains the chapter “Inleiding” (english**:** “Introduction”) which indicates the erection, purpose, power and limits of the commission with the concrete questions for the inquiry to be clarified.

Part II contains a selection of the findings out of the interviews about what happened, arranged in 5 chapters. This part is concrete, so that herein the perpetrator(s), the victim(s), with whom and within which object are isolated from all others. This as a source, from which must lead to the consequences and then to the conclusions, is a necessity and is thus legitimate and therefore impossible discrimination, which is always illegal, although it factually is. This means that consequences can be discrimination but conclusions always are.

Part III contains the responsibility of the commission with its staff and crew.

An appendix 2 is attached which reports more accurately on the judicial decisions, but (still) not within the field of the ECHR.

Survey of the Public Scrutiny

(Quoted**:**) It would be inconceivable, in the opinion of the Court, that Article 6 para. 1 (art. 6-1) should describe in detail the procedural guarantees afforded to parties in a pending lawsuit and should not first protect that which alone makes it in fact possible to benefit from such guarantees (*Case of Golder v. the United Kingdom, 21 February 1975, §35*). In §36 are the fair, public and expeditious characteristics of article 6, §1 regarded without elaboration. Later is elaborated in the judgment of the Case of Pretto and Others vs Italy, 8 December 1983, §21 the cause and goal of the obligated public pronouncement of a judgment namely, to ensure scrutiny of the judiciary by the public with a view to safeguarding the right to a fair trial (*Case of Pretto, §27*). This case in 1983 does not change the retroactivity of each ECofHR's judgment and so of the public scrutiny down from the date that the ECHR came in power.

The public scrutiny is a unity and an equally "established by law" or an equally by "law making treaty" (*Case of Golder v. the United Kingdom, 21 February 1975, §36*) established judging authority like every (disciplinary) tribunal. The European public sizes to about 450 million citizens minus the governmental employees, public servants and officers. In article 6, §1, ECHR, is also the press excluded from the public. Who are member of the public scrutiny is described in the "Manual for public scrutiny" (*URL: www.publicscrutiny.nl, item 4*). Why the public scrutiny is a unity and by what it is united is sufficiently explained also in the "Manual for public scrutiny" and in paragraph 18e of the report on the Golder case.

Survey of the inquiry commission

The commission is elected out of members of the parliament and consists of 8 members. The means of parliamentary inquiring is now been used for the third time. The aim of the commission is "to gain more insight into political decision-making and the senior civil service responsibility and involvement therein that has influenced the fraud policy with regard to the childcare allowance and the political response to signals about the harsh outcomes of the fraud policy and the "all-or-nothing" approach.". There is nothing further of importance than that the commission is authorized to demand information on documents and it has done so. Also that the commission is authorized to summon persons for public hearings under oath and it has done so.

The obligatory principles for any scrutiny of the judiciary

Good faith is surely absent because otherwise each dispute has two justices while only one is possible to be in line with the author; respecting good faith without discrimination makes a just scrutiny or court trial fake and useless.

The evidences of perjury, abuse or infringements do not change that the offenders are able whether or not by accident to express just findings or conclusions. Also offending courts do not change this.

Each lawsuit is one party who executes his rights (empowerment is a right) against an opposite party who is unwilling to endure this execution. This examined case of Golder attests a government unwilling to agree with the Commission for Human Rights. The reason for just scrutiny is to unveil the cause in effort to a solution**:** is it a contrary right, a lack of knowledge about the (executing) right or sometimes is it to make disadvantage or

worse. A judge is equipped and facilitated to disclose the legislative author's working papers to publish its cogitation, object and purpose with the law and involved articles. This is a demanded obligation.

The place and importance of the ECHR

The ECHR is the non-tolerant and non-exceedable outer boundary of the "Rule of Law", in which all the activities or human resultings happen (*see paragraph "Introduction"*). Not the same but close comparable with the safety rules for products in the society, which have their own particular rules for construction and working. So, how well and according the law a product or part is made, if it does not pass the safety rules then it is out of use and out of the human lives in a together living society.

The ECHR is a regular contract, with at one side the Contracting States and on the other side everyone (*article 1, ECHR*). Each breach of contract has also legal results by the Agreements Rights in the country where the offences take place.

The Human Rights do not turn over roles, exchange with persons in their official capacity or turn over the occurred levels of power. The Human Rights is nothing more and nothing less then an equalizing power.

Final Conclusions on the judgments within the Human Rights

The commission testifies that it is not a representative of the people

(1) In September 2016, the members of the House of Representatives were informed in time and sufficiently complete about the crimes committed by the courts, their tribunals or judges and the judiciary. Then express in December 2020 (quote)**:** "first with surprise and finally with deep indignation (...) came to (...) realization", is a total fake and an extremely shameful pretence, because the proper knowledge about the judicial insanity of judges has already been supplied.

(2) This "Allowance Affaire" proves that the constitutional representatives of the people do not exist because otherwise this destruction of people's lives, the destruction of Human Rights and this inquiry would not have taken place in the Netherlands. On the contrary, the destructions has taken place and it continues to take place.

The commission discriminates and lies or cheats

(3) The commission, being members of the House of Representatives, persists in discriminating against individual citizens. It deliberately isolates the disclosed information to only the individual citizens involved (almost always: (quote) "the duped parents") and the wrongdoing to only the tax authorities or administrative courts. The public scrutiny is not going along with this. By the way, Human Rights are not mentioned anywhere and are not associated with anything.

(4) Quote**:** "Without wanting to comment on individual court decisions, (...)". While on pages 36 and 91 respectively 4 and 3 individual court rulings have been mentioned because the content has been commented on. Furthermore, Appendix 2 is also mentioned, which reports on the substantive search of many judicial rulings on behalf of the Commission, so it was studied and then commented on it.

(5) Quote: "Without wishing to comment on individual court rulings, the Commission has established that administrative jurisdiction has also made a substantial contribution to maintaining the non-mandatory execution of the regulations (. ..) ". If it were true that the commission does not want to comment on individual court decisions, then the inference "That administrative justice has made a contribution for years (...)", is absolutely impossible. On the contrary, the consequence has been drawn.

The commission is seriously negligent with fundamental Human Rights

(6) Original text that contradicts the ECHR: "Protecting the personal policy views of civil servants can be a legitimate reason for not disclosing documents, or in part. (*page 8, section "Information provision not in order", fifth paragraph*). The Commission notes, however, that in practice the concept of 'personal policy view' is regularly stretched too far. (*page 9, section "Disclosure of information not in order", continued from page 8, fifth paragraph*)

Very serious negligence of a Human Right (*Case of Rotaru v. Romania, 4 May 2000, §55*): The Commission finds (1) personal policy views, (2) legitimately not or partially disclosed. This observation is done on the basis of the identification elements used by the commission. The commission itself is then obliged (A) to include these elements in the report and at the same time (B) the task to enshrine these identification elements in the law. Because the individual citizen has the right to true, correct and complete information regardless of who has to provide it (*Article 19, Universal Declaration of Human Rights*).

The factual confessions about some of the foundations of the fair trial

(7) The main point remains, and it remains to be said here, that persons or bodies who lie or cheat, nevertheless, perhaps by accident, are able to make the right or correct statements.

(8) "The group handling, the 'all-or-nothing' approach and the way in which 'intent/gross negligence' was used have grossly infringed the rule of law principle that optimal justice should be done to individual situations of people.". (*page 7, section "Fundamentals of the rule of law violated," fifth paragraph*)

Note: It is appropriate here to highlight the importance that the Human Rights are of the private individual and are the equal to everyone.

(9) "The Commission also notes that in practice transparency, openness and completeness are not the guiding principles in (...) compiling files for court trials.". (*page 8, section "Disorderly disclosures", fifth paragraph*).

(10) "(...) the provision of information (...) was in several cases prompted by desired legal (...) outcomes, resulting in only partial, delayed or no provision of information.". (*page 8, section "Disorderly information provision ", fifth paragraph*).

(11) "Improving the provision of information is essential for the functioning (...) of legal protection. Just like the protection of the individual, the provision of information is therefore an important element of the democratic constitutional state.". (*page 9, section "Disclosure of information not in order", first paragraph*).

(12) "It has been too long within the official and political top persons who saw the seriousness of the problems and took responsibility for the whole.". (*page 9, section "Unprecedented Injustice", second paragraph*).

(13) "All kinds of explanations can be given for this, such as a long-standing practice in execution that persisted in court, (...) and the fear of (. ..) legal or publicity consequences.". (*page 9, section "Unprecedented Injustice," second paragraph*).

Towards the Human Rights, a corrected confession

(14) Corrected text in blue: "They (*ps: individual citizens*) were powerless against powerful institutions of the rule of law, which did not offer them the protection ~~they deserved~~ by the State guaranteed. Those who have ~~had~~ the courage, against the current, to put their finger on the sore spot deserve great respect. (*page 9, paragraph "Unprecedented Injustice," third paragraph*).

The focus on “Fundamental principles of the rule of law violated”

(15) The inquiry has not been conducted within the all-dominating area of Human Rights and its protection**:** the ECHR. So that public control must function again correcting and applying. Pursuant to Articles 17 and 18 ECHR, only the corrected text (blue) applies and applies in all cases.

(16) Corrected text in blue: “The Commission notes that fundamental principles of the rule of law have been violated in the execution of the ~~childcare allowance~~ rights of private individuals. This accusation does not only affect execution ~~– specifically the TAX and Customs Administration/Allowances –~~ - from the Dutch State - but also the legislator and the judiciary.”. (*page 7, first paragraph*).

(17) Corrected text in blue**:** “A fundamental tenet of our rule of law is that when creating and enforcing laws, the ~~interests of people must be taken into account as much as possible~~ constitutional protection of each individual’s Human Rights must dominate.”. (*page 7, second paragraph*).

(18) Original text that contradicts the ECHR**:** "Lawfulness also includes preventing and combating fraud and abuse." (*page 7, second paragraph*).

(19) The original text is impossibly fair, is extremely discriminatory and inappropriate. Every right is, the empowerment to exercise it undisturbed. A temporary right makes a legal distinction and runs through a request, for undisturbed exercise, at the government. An official makes this distinction with the recognition of the law and takes all further administration of the law within the government. In the event of inaccuracies, the debt is always an equally shared debt. The official also confirms with his signature that his verification of all correctnesses has been done truthfully. A nuisance at work is not an excuse to let violations and infringes of the Human Rights happen and continue to let it happen (*See case of De Cubber v Belgium, October 26, 1984, §34 and §35*). To demand an impeccable performance of their duties from individual citizens is the equal demand from every civil servant.

In the event of inaccuracies, the prosecution is no different from all other civil or public breaches of duty.

(20) Corrected text in blue**:** “The executor ~~– the Ministry of Finance –~~ - the Dutch State - has executed the ~~childcare allowance~~ rights of individual citizens as a mass process. (*page 7, fifth paragraph*)

Note: It is appropriate here to highlight the importance that the Human Rights are of the private individual and are equal to everyone.

(21) Original text that contradicts the ECHR**:** “Under the pressure of an overheated political need to fight fraud, in which every mistake was soon seen as fraud, parents were falsely branded in the wheels of the execution by the tax authorities as deliberate fraudsters. (*page 7, fifth paragraph*)

(22) The original text is impossibly fair, is extremely discriminatory and inappropriate.

“An overheated political need to fight fraud” attests to the persistence in using some sweet-words wrapping of an accusation of serious absenteeism to the officials both in the execution and at the same time to those pursuing fraud. The useless suffering in the “Toeslagen affaire” again proves the need to use the ordinary language again, which immediately conveys the correct meaning.

"(...) in which every mistake was soon seen as fraud, (...)" proves the almost criminally hostile view of officials towards the private individual. Although the humane quality is not there to identify a mistake, assumed in the sporadic case that identifying a mistake happens by chance, then the other person (and not oneself) is immediately

seen as a target. Because a mistake almost always comes from the missing requirement of any law**:** written in sufficiently clear terms (*Case of Rotaru v. Romania, 4 May 2000, §34 and §35*). Laws written by officials.

The accusation is aimed at the entire civil servant pillar of the Contracting State**:** in executing, in administration and also in jurisdiction.

(23) Corrected text in blue: "The ~~administrative~~ case law has thus neglected its important function of (legal) protection of individual citizens. The Commission was particularly touched by the reasoning away until October 2019 of ~~general principles of good administration~~ mandatory general principles of law, which ~~should~~ serve as a cushion and protective blanket for people in need. Because of this sum of inability to do justice to the individual, the ~~parents~~ private individual(s) had not a chance for years at the judiciary.". (*page 7, last sentence*).

The focus on "Information provision not in order"

(24) Corrected text in blue: "The commission is of the opinion that bringing information management into order must be a priority. This is necessary for the proper functioning of the ministries, of parliamentary democracy and of the controlling function of the ~~media~~ public scrutiny. (*page 8, fourth paragraph*)

Note: It has been ruled by the European Court of Human Rights that pronounced publicly of the judgment serves the purpose of public scrutiny of the judiciary on the fairness of the trial (*See the section "Overview of the public scrutiny" further above*) and thus other Human Rights too. Article 6, §1 (ECHR) excludes the press from the public. The author foresaw that the press is a profit-making business that does not publish or write improper data in such a way as to attract readers. While Human Rights are inalienable and therefore are not and will not be any object of economics or finance.

(25) Corrected text in blue: "The ~~Constitution, the 2008 Parliamentary Inquiry Act, the Government Information (Public Access) Act and the General Administrative Law Act~~ laws in the Netherlands contain clear provisions and intentions. Despite this, the provision of information - according to the Commission's investigation - was in many cases prompted by desired legal or political outcomes, resulting in only partial, delayed or no provision of information.". (*page 8, fifth paragraph*).

Apart from the consideration in paragraph 6 further above:

(26) Original text that contradicts the ECHR: "Protecting the personal policy views of civil servants can be a legitimate reason for not disclosing documents, or in part. However, the Commission notes that the concept of 'personal policy view' is regularly stretched too far in practice. (*page 9, continued from page 8, fifth paragraph*).

(27) This observation does not in itself harmonize with the observation in, for example, paragraph 9 further above. The commission finds abuse by malicious officials. Because every utterance belongs to a person but by this is it not personal. This approaches the same identification of interpretation and opinion. Each policy view of a civil servant is the individual executing of his office and can not be personal. It is personal when the executive officer deviates, so that it is not the civil servant but the individual civilian person who does the execution according to his personal opinion. Then he is not in office and this is not possible. This is all the more impossible because the policy is already in place and is not in a design phase. Assumed a personal policy view in a design phase, even then not making this public is not a legal execution because it must then be done anonymously. After all, it is the different view of policy that serves an interest. Although it is debatable whether an unruly civil servant serves any public interest.

(28) Corrected text in blue: "Improving information provision is essential for the functioning of parliament, ~~media~~ public scrutiny and legal protection. Just like the protection of the individual, the provision of information is therefore an important element of the democratic constitutional state. (*page 9, first paragraph*).

Focus on "Unprecedented Injustice"

(29) Corrected text in blue: "This has led to the persistence of a situation of injustice for a large group of ~~parents~~ individual citizens for many years.". (*page 9, third paragraph*)

(30) Corrected text in blue: "Unknown, because the way in which ~~parents~~ private individuals were dealt with, was disproportionate to what they were - often wrongly - accused of by the ~~Tax and Customs Administration~~ Dutch State.". (*page 9, first paragraph*).

Some of the other violations or confessions

The deathblow for legal order, legal equality and legal certainty**:** abuse of the term "to interpret" or "interpretation" .

(31) Former government commissioner for the general rules of administrative law Scheltema argues this in a paper**:** "As the judge on closer inspection can arrive at a different interpretation, the administrative body can.".

Combat with the Human Rights

(A) The law is written for the individual citizen, for (only) he must regulate his behavior, act or omission (*See case of Golder v. United Kingdom, February 21 , 1975, §32; and later Rotaru case v. Romania, 4 May 2000, §55*).

(B) In the "Fair Play" only those rules are valid that are known to everyone in advance apply (*The requirement of good faith for a legal effect with Article 3:11 of the Dutch Civil Code*). So by this already is a legal consequence impossible from a divergence view/fake-interpretation or judgment afterwards.

() Furthermore, the other opinion of a deciding authority or a judge is always afterwards and is therefore always intolerably unfair.

() Furthermore, is by this intolerably unfair treatment the individual citizen nothing to be blamed for. Because, for example, how does it know in advance that afterwards "on closer inspection" the created different interpretation shall rise up and be applied? No government and no judge explains this.

(C) Interpretation is fundamentally different from an opinion that always varies. Partly because of the Human Right of respect for the freedom of expression. This is explained in the "Manual for public control" at "www.publicscrutiny.nl".

(32) The commission itself finds the abuse of interpretation in the survey results with a, if correctly interpreted then impossible, amount of options for interpretations: "For the origin of the fraud approach (...) (...) we go back to (...)) the choices in the interpretation of this legislation and the tightening up of the fraud approach during the Rutte I and II cabinets. (*page 33, first paragraph*)

Note: In addition to the existing wrongdoings, this is discriminatory because the interpretation of the citizen, the only one for whom every law is written, is totally ignored.

Furthermore, the approach to fraud by one person cannot be different or sharper are then fraud by the other person, for example by a judge.

Multiple wrongdoings by not only intolerable unfair action but also turning it differently afterwards

(33) Confirmation by professor Zijlstra in the paper he has drawn up on behalf of this commission: "It has in any case proved possible that the Department has itself given a completely different interpretation to the legal requirements; not entirely inconceivable (but in my view not likely) is that the Department would have started doing this earlier if the Tax and Customs Administration / Surcharges had taken the position that this was the correct explanation. " (*page 36, last whole paragraph*)

Former government commissioner for the general rules of administrative law Scheltema argues about this in a paper: "Just as the judge can arrive at a different interpretation on closer inspection, the administrative body can.". Then: "I would even say: the administrative body should do that first, because it can assess the significance of the signals given by the National Ombudsman and the WRR much better than the judge . The reports from both authorities are also addressed to the government, not to the judge." (*page 37, continued from paragraph page 36*)

Administrative authority or legal authority over civil servants is completely gone

(34) "Both Weekers and his successor Wiebes question this harsh approach, but they themselves are not going through any change.". (*page 22, summary*)

"The House of Representatives not only suffered from the same layer of clay that ministers also encountered and was misinformed several times, but also encountered refusals by the cabinet to provide information, for example under the guise of personal policy views, in accordance with the so-called Rutte doctrine.". (*page 29, section "Lack of internal and external counter-forces; little room for criticism"*)

"The distance between policy and execution should be smaller than that of the childcare allowance for individual citizens' rights. Responsible ministers must always be confronted with the consequences of their policies. This insight could have been realized in this case by entering into discussions earlier with parents and individual citizens, 'with people who themselves are involved'. (*page 32, Research question 4, section "Insight into the consequences of policy"*)

The House of Representatives plays a lot of theater with this report, as explained in §1 further above with reference to the webdossier at www.de-openbare-zaak.nl.

The deathblow for the "legal remedy" of objection or notice of default

(35) "Objections from parents were dealt with far too slowly and not independently enough for years , despite the moral and administrative duty of the Dutch Tax and Customs Administration to avoid errors, methods that are open to discussion and disproportionate investigate consequences and correct them if necessary. (*page 29, second full paragraph*)

Note: This treatment of individual citizens is no different for, for example, the larger or internet companies.

Deeply rooted contempt for the individual citizen

(36) "What lessons do the witnesses draw from the rough approach in the execution of the childcare allowance?
Several witnesses state that the benefits system is complex and places a great deal of responsibility on the citizen. That was also the reason for SZW to strive for a different system." (*Page 31, Research question 4, section" Complexity of benefits system"*).

Note: If the individual citizen is accused of fraud, this is impossible different than that this citizen can take responsibility. It is in the reality, which this inquiry is about, is precisely the intolerable unfairness of the Dutch State that completely thwarts this responsible citizen.

Hiding again that there are no Human Rights in the Netherlands
(37) "Several witnesses have mentioned as a lesson that the human dimension should not be lost sight of. One witness indicated that more empathy should be arranged in the execution. We should not only look at the efficiency of execution and of legislation and regulations, but also other public values such as dealing with citizens. (*page 32, Research question 4, section "An eye for the human dimension"*).
Note: Again, is by 'sweet words' the non-existence of the Human Rights in the Netherlands hidden away (*see §23 further above*).

The round up of the final conclusions

Excuses are impossible, for any court, judge or the judiciary

(Quote:) "From 1970 to 1984, the workload of such courts had more than doubled, whereas there had been no increase in the number of judges." (*Case of De Cubber v. Belgium, 26 October 1984, §34*). This is no excuse to let violations and infringes to the Human Rights happen en remain happening. The ECofHR agrees and relies (quote:) "The Court recalls that the Contracting States are under the obligation to organise their legal systems "so as to ensure compliance with the requirements of Article 6 para. 1 (art. 6-1)" and a bit further (quote:) "The Court's task is to determine whether the Contracting States have achieved the result called for by the Convention, not to indicate the particular means to be utilised." (*Case of De Cubber v. Belgium, 26 October 1984, §35*). To not value the increase of the workload of courts as an intolerable increase of violations and infringes against the Human Rights by the Contracting State's government and its public services, including the courts and its tribunals or judges, is a fundamental crime in itself. The legal results are explained in the preceding paragraph.

Considering binding force

The Human Rights is an equalising power, nothing more and nothing less. Equal to the European Court of Human Rights, is the public scrutiny instituted by the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms. The author must have implied the equal authority as stated in article 46 to the public scrutiny.

As publicly pronounced by the European Court of Human Rights is the jurisdiction of the public scrutiny, the scrutiny of the judiciary regardless European or national. It is not the task of the public scrutiny to take the place of any court. Neither can any court of a Contracting State unjustifiable refuse to abide the judgment or report of the public scrutiny. The public scrutiny is equal to the European Court in the field of scrutiny a Contracting State's tribunal, judge or court and the European Court of Human Rights.

Legal effects

These legal effects is the execution of the effective remedy of the human right stated in article 13.

Emphatic must now the begging for returning our stolen human rights, stop. **Equal emphatic** must the ignoring of the public scrutiny, stop. Act after the press publishes shall aggravate the theft and ignoring.

The European Court of Human Rights is obliged to equal operate in the unity of the public scrutiny and stop the method of working to create legal uncertainty and legal disorder. A huge amount of judgments is by default discrimination.

Priority for the European Court is to standardize the respect and obedience of the freedom of expression as is declared by the United Nations and firstly for the author of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms. Close followed with the retroactive correction of all judgments, in public.

The European Court ought to recognise the, in this report, supplied elaborations of article 13 and accept this as the cogitation, object and purpose of the author with its expression**:** the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms. In the event of opposition is needed to refute with citations out of the working papers. Like this necessity with interpreting.

Now that the European Court published a Guide it is obligated to correct this good action and firstly stop the wrong and misleading information. Obligated is to quickly publish the innovated Guide with the articles and attached to each article all the interpreted elaborations of the implied or latent rights. And each interpreted right equipped with the case and paragraph reference. A school example is in the public scrutiny's judgment or report of the case of Golder at the site "www.publicscrutiny.nl".

The European Court is urged to standardize a reformat of its judgment so the section that contains considerations starts with the inheritance of all the existing –correct– interpreted rights per involved article. So the collection is updated with each necessary new judgment. Also needs the end expose the identifiers so the public knows by what, an occurred trouble is identified as equal in the same category.

Note:

This public scrutiny's report is cooperative in harmony with the public scrutiny's other reports at this site in section "The Public Scrutinies".

Inheritance:

In order to acquire knowledge about the violations of the judiciary, it is currently (still) necessary to consult the other reports of the public scrutiny.
The webdossier www.de-openbare-zaak.nl serves for consultation, accusation and return-demand(s) of all our Human Rights with the containing violations by the Dutch judiciary.

The single fact of begging for very many years to return or give back all our, stolen, Human Rights is enough convincing evidence that the Human Rights do not exists in the Netherlands.