De voorzitter
van het Centraal Tuchtcollege
voor de Gezondheidszorg.
Prins Clauslaan 60
2595 AJ Den Haag

Afz.: <afzender>.
<adres afzender>.
<plaats afzender>.

Postbus 16437
2500 BK Den Haag.
Ook via fax: (088) 371 2519
Ook via e-mail: ctg@minvws.nl

Gericht aan thans mevrouw mr. J.M. Rowel-Van der Linde, in persoon.
English version is authentic too

Geacht voorzitter, mevrouw Rowel-Van der Linde, 26 mei 2022.

I have informed you that an open message is published on a Facebook page that is made known to you and that that open message will be continued on www.publicscrutiny.nl, with this message. You know the sender.

The message on the facebook page is quoted below.
Good day Chairwoman of the Central Disciplinary Court for Healthcare, mrs. mr. J.M. Rowel-Van der Linde. I have informed you that this open message is released here; by your cowardly decision to hide behind the human shield in your court, by letter dated May 12, 2022. You are a sworn-in judicial officer in charge of judgement (a judge) and I have the Constitutional Right (Article 5) to lodge written requests to the competent authority so to the chair of the disciplinary court. The legislator wants and means that (implicitly) the competent authority (and not someone else) answers properly. The letter of May 12, 2022 let one read that someone without authority wrote it. So you can always hide behind the excuse that the letter does not reflect your knowledge, will or intention. However, this letter indisputably remains an declaration of will that aims at a legal consequence (Article 3:33 of the Dutch Civil Code), also because it concerns the requested payment of a court fee. Claiming court fees only applies within civil contract law (Book 6, Dutch Civil Code). Then your secretary also writes about an earlier final judgment, but not that this is an evidence document (one of many) and even compelling evidence (!), of the crimes of the judges. Equally cunningly, your secretary then writes about the decision against which is appealed and cites some information that is not forgery, but not the submitted information that for sure is forgery. Your secretary definitely wants that as first the court fee must be received. On the previously submitted legal grounds and sound facts is the asking of this as the first, refused. The claim is lodged that a proper and competent tribunal will be the very first to be composed, plus that beforehand this tribunal is recognized because it has meanwhile tried and convicted its criminal fellow judges. Your secretary does not write about this plus also not write that this is a conflict. Article 6 of the ECHR guarantees my right to lodge my claim and bring it before a tribunal. Your secretary does not write about this and does (only) write that payment must be made first. That is how lying and cheating work in the judiciary, which also includes the disciplinary courts (Article 116, Constitution). We, the individual civil citizens, do not give up our Human Rights and in the end all that remains is (provoked) war. This open message will be continued at www.publicscrutiny.nl/psf01/SPECIAL4/20220526%20CTvG%20ENG.pdf. M. vr. gr..

Correspondence with the competent authority
The (Dutch) civil constitution-rights that written requests can be lodged to the competent authority implicitly obliges the competent authority to respond properly. This can serve no other purpose than to ensure that there are no silly reactions, as a result of which the civil citizen has no or insufficient sound data to make the right (for him/her) decision(s). All behaviour or actions by the corresponding citizen which the competent authority does not want or does not wish is therefore due to the authority's own instigation and guilt. Provoked acts are never a criminal offence or a wrongful act.

Do not let process documents arrive
The secretary has taken over my lodged notice of appeal with the challenge contained therein. The secretary expresses in his letter that at least the challenge will certainly not be submitted to a tribunal. That the submitted procedural and evidence documents do not let arrive at their destination is an offence under Article 201 of the Criminal Code. Each individual civil citizen has the right to lodge any claim.

Regulation to the tribunal
Furthermore, the letter is empirical evidence that the secretary or registry of a court prescribes to the tribunal what it handles and what not. This is part of the top secret model-judgment that every court in the Netherlands uses.

A next conflict
The secretary, mr. H.J. Lutgert, writes his explanation, which is woven into his positions and judgments, of the subjects and data provided by me. This explanation of the secretary does purposefully contradict my will and intent, which are provided in my letter, with the subjects and data. By this, a conflict is created by the secretary. Since there are no questions I am clear with my letter so any other explanation is deliberately striving. The purpose of a conflict appears to be because the secretary has not asked me to verify the correctness of his explanation.

Human Rights
The State has no Human Rights and so neither do civil servants or the clique. Then subsequently, the Public Prosecution Service has publicly (and undisputedly) declared that civil servants/officers, insofar as they execute policy, are the State (https://www.om.nl/actueel/nieuws/2021/01/07/geen-strafrechtelijk-onderzoek-naar-belastingdienst). The secretary has no right to freedom of expression but does have a legal duty to provide the effective remedy (Article 13 ECHR), i.e. to obey the exercise by each individual citizen.

My letter is the expression of my thought(s) or of my opinion(s) plus of my will and of my intention. The right to this expression is mine and no one else's (Articles 9 and 10 ECHR). The secretary has no right to freedom of speech, nor is the secretary's writing indisputably not citing the will and intent of the legislature, if possible from the only previous judicial judgment for all equal cases. The characteristics of this sole judgment are not given. Apart from this and besides it, the secretary does not write the expression of his thoughts; he uses my expressed thoughts but omits the will and intention of mine bound therein. Furthermore, my thoughts and the expression thereof are my eternal and inviolable property right.

Forgery
The letter from the secretary is an authentic deed and therefore compelling evidence. The letter is not a misunderstanding, so it’s purpose is for sure. The forgery aims not only at what is written but also at what, precisely by what is written, has been obscured in order to then convince the competent authority by what is written. The rewrite has deliberately

tampered or altered the dispute and legal claim that is lodged and thus the document is a falsified representation of what is lodged or the claimed legal effects. This forgery is punishable by Article 225 of the Criminal Code and it is perjury.

Another next forgery
It is not the guaranteed tribunal that decides but the secretary, that the lodged challenge cannot be accepted. The secretary writes that this was (also) reported by the Regional Disciplinary Court, while it was written before this that the lawsuit is declared inadmissible by (only) the chairman and it is also written that the lawsuit was therefore not dealt with. As a result, the Regional Disciplinary Court was never able to communicate anything. This is forgery and perjury.

Effective indirect denial of justice
By not communicating about the submitted data, the submitted dispute is brought outside handling. This is denial of justice as the legislator wants and means. But this legislator wants and means that a denial of justice can only be committed by a judge (Article 11, General Provisions Act; the Dutch Code "Wet algemene bepalingen"). In this case, effective denial of justice has been committed by the secretary, the human shield behind which the competent authority hides that protects the tribunal that still must be appointed. While at the same time any dispute or claim that is disliked by the judiciary is disregarded and kept out of consideration. Notwithstanding this political game, the secretary, like any human shield, continues to execute the governing or the lead of the competent authority and, as a civil servant, to execute the governing or the lead of the State.

Compelling evidence of crimes
A court decision is compelling evidence (Article 157, Code of Civil Procedure = Rv). The valuation of evidence is left to the judge's discretion (Article 152, Rv) and therefore not to a clerk of the court or secretariat. The previous "final verdicts" that are not brought before the requested, guaranteed tribunal for serving as compelling evidence, are thus withdrawed from the, for judgment, competent authority. This is a criminal act under Article 189, paragraph 2 of the Criminal Code.

The secretary certainly, and also the chairwoman is legally obliged to report (Article 162, Code of Criminal Procedure) the criminal offences of which they become aware in their civil service duty. The letter is a declaration of will that they do not and will not do this.

Deliberately taunt
The secretary writes that a challenge is only possible against tribunal(members) who are handling a case. In order to prevent a challenge or to first unjustly enforce payment of the court fee, the members of the tribunal are not named. For this reason, the accusation about the lodged challenge is completely unjustified. While the law obliges to submit a challenge as soon as the facts are known to the individual civil citizen (Article 63, Health Care Professions Act refers to, inter alia, Article 513, paragraph 1 of the Code of Criminal Procedure). So …, this is how oppression by the judiciary works, by making demands that are impossible to meet. So by so very cunningly creating scapegoats among individual civil citizens. Apart from the fact that the requirements are against the law.

Own regulations and General Provisions Act, the Dutch "wet algemene bepalingen"
The secretary writes that a challenge at the disciplinary court takes place in accordance with their own made challenge protocol. This is prohibited to any judge by Article 12 of the Dutch General Provisions Act. Failure to observe or maintain the law is perjury from any judge as well as injustice. Even though the secretary writes; he will continue to execute

the governing and lead of the chairwoman. For this, mrs. mr. J.M. Rowel-Van der Linde remains accountable and just as much responsible.

Continue to claim court fees
Continuing to claim a court fee is and remains a crime (one of many) so that the entire court is rightly challenged, lead by a judge who at the same time has also been challenged with all colleague-judges who do not judge and convict this.

Protection of each other against disclosure of crimes
The secretary writes that the Regional Disciplinary Court has already reported on challenge, while this is forgery (paragraph "A next forgery" above). Again, this is empirical evidence that judicial officials write messages for each other, in order to be protected by each other by echoing. This is how the use of each other's human shields works, which method has already been exposed in the IRT affair.

Tribunal

Dear Chairwoman of the Central Disciplinary Court for Healthcare, mrs. mr. J.M. Rowel-Van der Linde, how much and how long you and your court, continue to provoke and bully me or any individual civil citizen, by repeating and forcing us against our will to repeat too, it never did and never does increase our right to bring the crimes committed by you, your court and your fellow judges before a guaranteed and unchallengeable tribunal.

Like the secretary's letter, it is certain, by abundant empirical compelling evidence, that tribunals have falsified disputes and claims put in writing and pronounce them publicly. Thus, the legal public scrutiny requires verification to establish that a guaranteed and unquestionable tribunal is doing justice that is visibly being done.

You can also now immediately compose this tribunal with skilled, sworn judicial officers charged with judgment and who can demonstrate a high moral character. The 'peace negotiations' about this in a war might just as well happen now.

Earlier letter

In an earlier letter from you, mrs. Rowel, dated March 8, 2016 with reference C2016.050, (see appendix 2) is declared that by a legal regulation the original, "wet", signature is required by your court. While at that time it had already been publicly decided by the Supreme Court (and it has agreed with me) that the law does not make this requirement. None of your colleague-judicial officers in charge of judgment have quashed your and your court's decision and judged you and your court; the challenge process never took place, despite the court fee being paid at the time. Due to the lack of the required "wet" signature, the appeal was not handled either. So that because of this you, plus your colleague-"sworn-in judicial officers", have continued with their crimes; So that the medics and their colleagues could and should continue with their crimes. So that this appeal has arisen and is lodged; So that the injustice-economy continues to rampage.

In the meantime, but much too late, your court is carrying out my protests (and the decision of the Supreme Court). Without repair of all damages and compensation for all irreparable. But, now absolutely illegal, there are again demands made in advance.

More forgery
Earlier, the administration confirmed receipt of my notice of appeal against the decision of the Regional Disciplinary Court in Zwolle. Contrary to this determination is the fact that my appeal is against the decision of the chairman of that disciplinary court. Furthermore, I was informed in the confirmation of receipt that the CTG took in handling the cases "<sender> / Rowaan" and "<sender> / Veld". These matters are not my notice of appeal, nor are they the subject of the chairman's decision. Furthermore is omitted, thus destroyed, the notification about and the handling of my challenge and the facts for this. With regard to Article 63 of the Health Care Professions Act, a challenge is a legal right of mine. Omitting, and thus destroying, my rights or the submitted facts is also forgery by means of what is written.

The, by your governing governed administration commits forgery. This is a criminal offence and to govern this is perjury by the chairwoman of the board.

Unauthorized tribunal
The chair of a Regional Disciplinary Court, including the one in Zwolle, is not a registered medic. As a result, a Central Disciplinary Court that has been completed with medical professionals is an unauthorized challenge tribunal. Incidentally, the court has also been challenged and thus the administrative support too. The forgery of the received confirmation confirms the correctness and legality of my challenge.

The decision not to mention my challenge and not to take it into handling is made by the administration and not by the Central Disciplinary Court, as the presentation does suggest. In this occasion the disciplinary tribunal should have reported itself and its composition. Furthermore, is only a Central Disciplinary Court that cannot be challenged by me, pursuant to Article 6 ECHR, authorized for as first to deal with my challenge, by the following.

Injustice-economy case is repeating action
Already on January 4, 2016, your court and its tribunal were challenged. This challenge is not handled and judged. Before this, on September 18, 2014 (your court's request is used on September 29, 2015 and with my reminder on October 14, 2015) crimes committed by the Regional Medical Disciplinary Court in Groningen were submitted to your court. These have not been judged.

I insert here and at this place in full repeating, the facts and the facts of criminality that are submitted at the time, now again for challenge; if necessary supplementing. These have already been physically submitted to your court, with references C2014.380 <sender> / Van Dam, nurse; C2014.465 <sender> / Klaver, geriatric specialist and C2015.155 <sender> / Rijntjes, general practitioner, so that I do not have to resubmit these documents.

Unity of Right and equality of Right
There is not one judicial judgment that resolves this dispute as the legislator at the time wants and means, in all equal cases. This judgment has not been handed over to me or has not been made accessible and downloadable without hindrance, for comment.

The prior and matter-solving communication between the Chair of the Central Disciplinary Court or any President of any Central Disciplinary Court or President of any court in the judiciary and any individual civil citizen has never taken place and the records of such communication are not handed over to me or made unimpeded accessible and downloadable, for comment.

From a legal point of view, it is only important that the presiding judge has been informed and that the court has done nothing and does not do enough to prevent the judicial intervention by the legal public scrutiny, while this is the legal duty, also of him/her. This since many decades ago, for the benefit of work-acquisition in the injustice-economy.

War-preparatory behaviour and actions
Since many years ago I reported the prospect of war and by ignoring this, a war has come again now in Ukraine. This recent war provides empirical evidence that then, suddenly, the points of contention are communicated in the then so-called 'peace negotiations', which points of contention were before that war kept exasperatingly out of communication. For the aggrieved party, there was and is no guaranteed, sound and competent tribunal. Keeping this agonizingly uncommunicationable are war-preparing crimes that have been and are being done by, above all, the tribunals.

Similar are the current points of contention, which have been covered up with lies and deceit since decades ago. The sworn judicial officials have been judged and convicted by the legal public scrutiny (URL: www.publicscrutiny.nl). But these officials and their courts ignore this legal conviction.

Request or summons if necessary.
Entitled to the enjoyment of human, civil and patient rights, I exercise my rights and request, or if necessary summon the chairwoman, now mrs. Rowel, to drop the demands beforehand and to unconditionally take the challenge in admission and have it handled and judged by a tribunal unchallenged and unchallengeable by me. The judges in this can be recognized, for example, by adjudicating their colleagues for perjury and fully carrying out the judgments of the legal public scrutiny.

This reminder for the notice of default is made available to serve the legal public scrutiny on their website with URL: “www.publicscrutiny.nl”.

Yours sincerely,
<sender>

<signature sender>

The first following letter is translatable in:

Tuchtcolleges voor de Gezondheidszorg

Centraal Tuchtcollege voor
de Gezondheidszorg

Secretariaat
Postadres:
Postbus 16437
2500 BK DEN HAAG

Telefoon (088) 3712510
Fax (O88) 3712519

Aangetekend

<sender>
<address sender>
<place sender>

Datum Den Haag, 12 mei 2022
Uw kenmerk
Ons kenmerk C2022/1281 en CO22/1282
Zaaknaam <sender> / Roowaan en <sender> / Veld

Dear <sender>,

In response to your letter of 9 May 2022, I will inform you as follows.

The chairman of the Central Disciplinary Court for Healthcare (CTG),
mr. JM Rowel-van der Linde, has submitted your letter to me (the undersigned) for an answer.

Your appeal is directed against the chairman's decision of 1 March 2022 in which you were declared inadmissible by the chairman of the Regional Disciplinary Court Zwolle, mr. P.A.H. Lemaire, in the cases of <sender> / Roowaan and <sender> / Veld due to failure to comply with the court fee owed. Your complaints have therefore not been processed. Contrary to what you state, there is therefore no question of forgery of documents, nor of unauthorized tribunal. Furthermore, as the Regional Disciplinary Court has informed you, it is only possible to challenge college (members) who are handling a case. In the phase of the procedure (in which you have not paid the court fee owed), no college members are yet involved in your cases and a challenge request is not (yet) processed. It is not possible to challenge an entire college in advance. I also have to disappoint you with regard to the request for challenge you have submitted with regard to the cases C2014.380, C2014.465 and C2015.155 you cited. In all these cases a final decision was already made a few years ago and therefore no challenge is possible (see Challenge protocol for Disciplinary Courts for Healthcare).

Perhaps unnecessarily, I would like to point out that if you do not pay the court fee due (on time), your cases will not be processed on appeal.

I trust to have informed you sufficiently with this.
Yours sincerely
mr. H.J. Lutgert
secretary

When answering, please state the file number and date of the letter. For more information and the regulations, see www.tuchtcollege-Gezondszorg.nl.

Tuchtcolleges voor de Gezondheidszorg

Centraal Tuchtcollege voor de Gezondheidszorg

Secretariaat
Postadres:
Postbus 16437
2500 BK DEN HAAG

Telefoon **(088) 371 2510**
Fax **(088) 371 2519**

Aangetekend

De heer [redacted]

Datum Den Haag, 12 mei 2022
Uw kenmerk
Ons kenmerk C2022/1281 en C022/1282
Zaaknaam [redacted]/Roowaan en [redacted]/Veld

Geachte heer [redacted]

In reactie op uw schrijven van 9 mei 2022 deel ik u het volgende mede.

De voorzitter van het Centraal Tuchtcollege voor de Gezondheidszorg (CTG), mr. J.M. Rowel-van der Linde, heeft mij (ondergetekende) uw brief ter beantwoording voorgelegd.

Uw beroepsschrift is gericht tegen de voorzittersbeslissing van 1 maart 2022 waarin u door de voorzitter van het Regionaal Tuchtcollege Zwolle, mr. P.A.H. Lemaire, niet-ontvankelijk bent verklaard in de zaken [redacted]/Roowaan en [redacted]/ Veld vanwege het niet voldoen van het verschuldigde griffierecht. Uw klachten zijn hierdoor niet in behandeling genomen. Anders dan u stelt is er dan ook geen sprake van valsheid in geschrifte en evenmin van een onbevoegd tribunaal. Voorts is het, zoals het Regionaal Tuchtcollege u heeft bericht, alleen mogelijk college(leden) te wraken die een zaak behandelen. In de fase van de procedure (waarin u het verschuldigde griffierecht niet hebt voldaan) zijn er nog geen collegeleden bij uw zaken betrokken en wordt een wrakingsverzoek (nog) niet in behandeling genomen. Wraking van een heel college op voorhand is niet mogelijk. Ook wat betreft het door u ingelaste verzoek tot wraking m.b.t. de door u aangehaalde zaken C2014.380, C2014.465 en C2015.155 moet ik u teleurstellen. In al deze zaken is reeds enkele jaren geleden een einduitspraak gedaan en is dus geen wraking meer mogelijk (zie Wrakingsprotocol Tuchtcolleges voor de Gezondheidszorg).

Wellicht ten overvloede wil ik u erop wijzen dat indien u het verschuldigde griffierecht niet (tijdig) betaald uw zaken in beroep niet in behandeling zullen worden genomen.

Ik vertrouw erop u hiermede toereikend geïnformeerd te hebben.

Hoogachtend,

Mr. H.J. Lutgert
secretaris

The first following letter is translatable in:

Tuchtcolleges voor de Gezondheidszorg

Centraal Tuchtcollege voor de Gezondheidszorg

Secretariaat
Postadres:
Postbus 20302
2500 EH DEN HAAG

Telefoon (070) 3405417
Fax (O70) 3405401

Aangetekend

<sender>
<address sender>
<place sender>

Datum Den Haag, 8 maart 2016
Uw kenmerk
Ons kenmerk C2016.050
Zaaknaam <sender> / Rijntjes

Dear <sender>

I received your letter dated March 4, 2016, in good order, which was received by the Central Disciplinary Court on March 7.
In response to your questions and requests, I inform you that I am not allowed to change or reassess decisions of the Central Disciplinary Court. This concerns a judicial judgment, which cannot be adjusted in a hierarchical line.
This also applies to decisions of the Regional Disciplinary Courts. The only option to have it reassessed is through appeal. You have already instituted this and a final decision has been made in a number of cases.

Like you, I value the correct application of the rules. This also means that we have you request an original signature. This requirement is included in Article 4, second paragraph, of the BIG Disciplinary Decree. Any complainant in default on that point will be asked to provide an original signature.
I therefore request that you place a handwritten signature on your notice of appeal, so that we can process it in accordance with the regulations.
I trust that I have informed you sufficiently with this.

Yours sincerely
J.M. Rowel-van der Linde.
Chairman Central Disciplinary Court for the Healthcare

Tuchtcolleges
voor de Gezondheidszorg

Centraal Tuchtcollege voor de Gezondheidszorg

Postbus 20302
2500 EH DEN HAAG

Telefoon (070) 3405417
Fax (070) 3405401

Dhr. [redacted]

Datum Den Haag, 08 maart 2016
Uw kenmerk
Ons kenmerk C2016.050
Zaaknaam [redacted] / Rijntjes

Geachte heer [redacted],

In goede orde ontving ik uw brief van 4 maart 2016, die binnenkwam bij het Centraal Tuchtcollege op 7 maart.
In antwoord op uw vragen en verzoeken laat ik u weten dat het mij niet is toegestaan uitspraken van het Centraal Tuchtcollege te wijzigen of te herbeoordelen. Het gaat nl. om een rechterlijk oordeel, dat niet in een hiërarchische lijn kan worden bijgesteld. Dat geldt ook voor uitspraken van de Regionale Tuchtcolleges. De enige mogelijkheid om die te laten herbeoordelen is via het hoger beroep. Dat heeft u inmiddels ingesteld en in een aantal zaken is daarop definitief geoordeeld.

Net als u hecht ik aan het correct toepassen van de regels. Dit maakt ook, dat wij van u een originele handtekening vragen. Dit vereiste is opgenomen in artikel 4, tweede lid, van het Tuchtrechtbesluit BIG. Aan elke klager die op dat punt in verzuim is, wordt gevraagd een originele handtekening te plaatsen.
Ik verzoek u dan ook om een handgeschreven handtekening te plaatsen op uw beroepschrift, zodat wij het reglementair in behandeling kunnen nemen.
Ik vertrouw erop dat ik u hiermee afdoende heb geïnformeerd.

Hoogachtend,

J.M. Rowel-van der Linde,
Voorzitter Centraal Tuchtcollege voor de Gezondheidszorg