

De Hoge Raad der Nederlanden.
Postbus 20303.
2500 EH Den Haag.

Afz.: <sender>.
<address sender>.
<place sender>.

PER GEWONE POST EN PER FAX: 070-753 03 51

Ter attentie van de Procureur-Generaal bij de Hoge Raad, dhr. F. W. Bleichrodt.

Dear Procureur-Generaal, mr. Bleichrodt,

15 november 2022.

With this, the Attorney General at the Supreme Court, in the person of at this moment mr. F.W. Bleichrodt, receives the declaration for prosecution for committing war preparatory war crimes 'willingly and knowingly', in the most common international language. From now on you have the opportunity, limited in time, for a proper defence.

Accountability

By not doing the lawfully required work or not doing as well as a good official of the State must do, injustice is maintained by (not only but at front) the Attorney General at the Supreme Court (including Article 78 and Articles 13a to f, Dutch Judicial Organization Act). The maintenance of both the violations already committed and the continuing of violating of Human Rights (UN Declaration of Human Rights) by officials of the State, who whether or not are charged with judging, cannot left over other means of cessation plus recovery, then by means of national war or international war.

Earlier defense and rebuttal

The Attorney General at the Supreme Court revealed, in a letter dated 28 March 2022, with reference NO/2016/092/INT-PG-Z/2022/8094/PK, about the infringements or the infringing, not to communicate or take any other action, despite being required to do so by law.

This ineffective and inadequate response also conflicts with Article 5 of the Constitution and the will or intention of that legislator with this article, which implicitly establishes the right of everyone to access the competent authority plus (implicitly) that this authority responds properly and effective. This conflict with the Constitution also conflicts with article 8 of the UN Declaration of Human Rights and the will or intention of those declarants with this article. Because the issued right of the effective remedy does not exist, only war remains which has been repeatedly confirmed by history. Due to the omissions or short comings of the Attorney General, another judicial crime has been committed.

Basis of foundation

Fundamental crime

In the meantime a tribunal issued a judicial verdict publicly on July 13, 2022 (ECLI:NL:GHDHA:2022:1301; location is URL "<https://uitspraak.rechtspraak.nl/inziendocument?id=ECLI:NL:GHDHA:2022:1301>"), with in it all kinds of tribunals mentioned for their rulings to take these as a basis for the determination that the State itself cannot be prosecuted (paragraph 6.5). Because acts (including criminal acts) of the State must be deemed to be in the public interest (section 6.5). So that civil servants or officials of the State are also

entitled to this criminal immunity (section 6.5). The aforementioned, selected, judgments, also apply to ordering or actually directing criminal behavior by a legal body (section 6.5). The Attorney General at the Supreme Court is an official of the State too, just like the other judicial officials, whether or not charged with judging or justice.

War preparatory crime

The Attorney General at the Supreme Court has (ever) condemned neither the judgment nor the findings in it due to the violation of, inter alia, Article 8 of the UN Declaration and the will or intention of those declarants with, inter alia, this article. This Attorney General has also not prosecuted the sworn judges in that tribunal for, among other things, perjury. This does not meet, among other things, the standard of conscience of justice.

The standard of conscience of justice

The Human Rights (UN Declaration) is the universal standard (Preamble). All derivatives, ie every Constitution or law, are calibrated to the standard; Exactly like purpose and use of all standards, for example the (derivates of the) kilogram or that of the meter. No one has a right to oppose this (Article 30, UN Declaration). Nor does any subsequent composition of persons of the UN or its agencies.

The UN Declaration is a unit, so all articles are in harmony with each other. This harmony is also an implementation of article 30 of the UN Declaration as those declarants still want and mean. Calibrated to the universal standard, the protection within the European Union by the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (ECHR) is also a unity and its articles are in harmony with each other. No one has a right to oppose this (Article 17 or 18 ECHR). Also any subsequent composition of persons of the European Court for Human Rights.

The standard established with Articles 10 and 8 (UN Declaration) and with Articles 6 or 13 (ECHR) is what the tribunal or national authority has been and is calibrated to from then on. No one has a right to oppose this (Article 17 or 18 ECHR). Not even any later composition of persons of the tribunal or of the national authority.

The Fundamental accountability of the Entire Judiciary

Inextricably following the at the front of the official-personal accountability of the Attorney General at the Supreme Court is the entire judiciary. Each judiciary is also a legal body of its State. The entire judiciary and its officials are represented by the judgment announcing tribunal mentioned above. The judiciary also includes all disciplinary courts (Article 116, Constitution) and a great many 'judicial' committees that are or are chaired by judges in ancillary function.

The fundamental confession or admission of failure

The fundamental judicial crime, that the State itself or its officials have not been or cannot be tried, not even criminally, is the admission and leaves indisputable that it is impossible for the State itself to establish an impartial and independent tribunal; This tribunal is established with article 10 and article 8 (UN Declaration) as those declarants still want or mean with every article; This tribunal must evidently already exist before a violation occurs (Article 8) or before a right, duty or criminal charge is established.

The Fundamental admission of Legal Public Scrutiny

The fundamental judicial crime, that the State itself or its officials have not been or cannot be tried, not even criminally, is the admission and leaves indisputable that the only impartial and independent tribunal against the misdemeanours or crimes by the judiciary itself or its officials, thus is the public scrutiny (European Court of Human Rights, Campbell

and Fell v. United Kingdom case, June 28, 1984, §91; URL: [https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/fre#{%22itemid%22:\[%22001-57456%22\]}](https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/fre#{%22itemid%22:[%22001-57456%22]})).

Nota Bene: the legal public scrutiny is the execution of the will of the civilian population (Article 21, UN Declaration) in the constitutional State.

Recent Continuing

Proliferation of war preparatory crimes

The judicial crimes, which sprout from the foregoing foundation, continue to proliferate unstopably and without conscience of justice, and scatter lasting injustice in civil society.

Attached is the written answer from the president of the Central Disciplinary Court for Healthcare, on that date Mrs. mr. JM Rowel–van der Linde, with reference C2022/1281 C2022/1282 dated 13 June 2022. (The enclosure is unfortunately in Dutch). In this ancillary position, Ms JM Rowel–van der Linde is a sworn judge at the Court of Appeal of Arnhem-Leeuwarden and at the Court of Appeal in The Hague. So a member of the Judiciary.

Fundamental crime

The president rewrites in one sentence my report of the crime, that my right to (timely) access to the competent authority (Article 5, Constitution) has been blocked (Quotation: "*You blame the secretary of the Central Disciplinary Court for the Healthcare (CTG) that he has replied to your earlier letter.*").

Also, in one sentence, the president rewrites my report of the crime, that a properly independent and impartial tribunal does not exist (Quotation: "*The secretary's message that your appeal can only be reviewed after you have paid the court fee is correct and based on the BIG law.*").

Also, in one sentence, the president rewrites my report of the crime, that a submitted challenge has not been and is not being dealt with, nor is it and is not being held in court (Quotation: "*The secretary's statement about the possibility of whether impossibility to submit a challenge request.*").

The rewrites were done unilaterally and self-powered by the president and these rewrites do not have my fiat or permission, nor do they have my agreement.

Rewriting facts, circumstances, right-claims or defenses in judgments or decisions has been the most common judicial crime for many decades.

The president answers inwardly to her own self-desired rewrites, and likewise this crime in judgments or decisions has been the most common judicial crime since many decades.

The president is a judicial official of the State, charged with judging, and furthermore a lawless self-declared (also criminally) unjudgable official.

The president doesn't explain why my latest crime-report suddenly is responded by herself and not by any official.

Judicial combat against the conscience of justice

The UN Declaration is the standard (Preamble) against which the constitution, the law (Article 8), the tribunal (Article 10) or the national authority are calibrated (Article 13 ECHR). To this, inextricably linked, the harmony of the articles is calibrated (article 30). This calibration is done by the tribunal (there is only one) and finally only if necessary, by legal public scrutiny.

Paragraph the standard of inalienability of the Rights

The president insists that a challenge is only dealt with after the court fee has been paid (Quotation: "*can only be assessed after you have paid the court fee, is correct and based on the BIG*").

law.”). Likewise, the president persists about the impossibility of requesting a challenge (Quotation: “on the (...) impossibility of filing a challenge.”).

By on forehand secretly forbidding the calibration of the tribunal to the requirements of Human Rights (the challenge) and by suggesting that this only is done after the court fee is paid, this right is made a commodity and therefore alienable. The preamble to the UN Declaration unmistakably states that Human Rights are inalienable. There are no restrictions on this and restrictions on inalienability are impossible. It's denial of justice. And the suggestion changes nothing. Human Rights are inalienable, so neither is it a charitable gift or a predicate.

Even though the president refers to the BIG law as the basis of his decision to calibrate the tribunal only after payment, there is the fact that the BIG law is not calibrated to Human Rights. So that the entire BIG law is obviously unenforceable due to human rights violations, once it has been enacted.

Paragraph Standard of Fundamental Property Rights (Article 17)

The President has calibrated the Secretary's letter to the President's will and intent.

Every expression is the right plus the property of the independent individual who expresses itself in complete freedom (Article 19). This utterance is the content of, for example, a document. This utterance always has a meaning which thus inextricably includes will and intention. The expression, the will and the intention with it cannot possibly be explained by anyone other than the expressing individual. This inalienable property right (Preamble, Articles 17 and 27) is equally valid under constitution, law or treaty (Article 28); Unless this law or treaty does not express the will of the people (Article 21) for morality, public order and the common good (Articles 28 and 29). For this property, every document is signed by the author for this

The president owns the property right of her decision and, by the calibration, also to that which the secretary wrote. By doing the calibration, the president, who represents his court as well as the entire judiciary, has undisputedly agreed to the right of ownership; Apart from the fact that every letter of her is a fundamental crime.

I have all property rights over my filed appeal and its contents.

Paragraph accountability

While often the expressing person (regardless of individual or a group) and the creator are the same person, in every other case the expressing person is the owner of the property. After all, in all those other cases the maker is not independently free in his expression. The president has also agreed to this. So that the president is liable for the false decision including that one which the secretary wrote.

Paragraph infringed into inalienable fundamental property Rights

The President has rewritten a fragment from my appeal and has woven some into answers and rewritten them.

The lodged appeal, which contained the challenge, is the inalienable property of me. There is no restriction in Article 19 (UN Declaration). Plus no one can restrict my rights. The content of the appeal cannot possibly infringe on another's right, another's remedy or the duties of a tribunal.

This makes the self-powered rewriting, in all kinds of forms, of the points of dispute, my right-claims, facts or of claimed legal consequences a fundamental crime. This or such rewrites are an ultra-extreme disregard for the right of thought, opinion, or expression thereof.

This rewriting is exactly the same as what tribunals or judges do with the execution of the law, by declaring or executing differently than that (authentic) legislator still wants and intends.

More specific injustice

Judicial deceit and policy of injustice

The president has kept the impossibility of calibrating the tribunal to the UN Declaration (challenge) outside the law. What the secretary has written about this is not referenced to a law. Nevertheless, the President considers this to be justified, evidently referring to the President's opinion who, repeated here, represents his court and the entire judiciary. This is a fraud because Article 30 (UN Declaration) expressly prohibits any right to restrict to the State, a group or an individual. Restricting is therefore injustice-politics, because only the law, as the legislator wants and intends, bounds generally everyone to it.

The president has unexplainedly failed to carry out the commodity "public hearing and fair trial before a tribunal" under contract law. While the President is indisputably, clearly and unmistakably (= evidently) enforcing an agreement and committing me, or any individual citizen, to this agreement. Not doing this within the law is cheating (scam). This is evidently an injustice-political deed, act or action by the president who, repeated here, represents his court and the entire judiciary.

Articles 8 and 10 (UN Declaration) establish my right, and that of every individual citizen, that a State tribunal must exist for this conflict between the president and me. This tribunal, evidently, does not exist. So that already because of this the challenge is justified and more than most likely because of this, it is refused. This is evidently a injustice-political deed, act or action by the president who, repeated here, represents his court and the entire judiciary. Finally, there is, and always will be, legal public scrutiny for the final judgment. The legal public scrutiny considers the non-existence of the (calibrated) tribunal a fundamental crime (URL www.publicscrutiny.nl).

In the false decision, the president does not explain why the president suddenly answers with it, and in all previous correspondence not. This cannot possibly be anything other than secret (in)justice-politics.

Paragraph paying first allows the criminal tribunal to proliferate

This conflict shows that paying the court fee first (previously, it was paid first) does not change anything in the rightly challenged tribunal plus the rightly challenged judiciary or the criminal implementation of the UN Declaration. The judicial crimes continue to proliferate and are protected by the colleague-judges.

Nevertheless, the legal public scrutiny has ruled, but at the same time this judgment, like the UN Declaration, Constitution or law, is not carried out as that authentic author still wants and intends and is ignored.

Finally, the criminal precondition of paying first ensures that the judge-crimes are not officially recorded. For other authorities afterwards, that have now been misled.

Paragraph falseness plus forgery

Rewriting is forgery of writing and forgery by the writing and with the content. A public

reader does not or hardly reads sufficiently specifically the facts, circumstances, the right-claims or defences and rebuttals of the defences. The public and legal public scrutiny are falsely misled. So that a judgment about a fair trial is not possible other than that already by this, no fair trial is conducted as a result.

Also the rewrites are a falsification of the truth, such as falsehood about/of the will and intention of me, of the author. Including the omitted the lodged points of conflict, omitted the lodged law-information, the current circumstances and the circumstances intended by that legislator.

Falsehood or the forgery is always done on purpose and intended to deceive by concealing the case-concerned truth. Also by false rewriting it happens that the submitted judge-crimes are and will be written off from the court or judicial documents. This is perjury in addition to denial of justice. For which no law gives a right to a sworn judge, whether or not in a tribunal.

With rewriting, the president or his court effectively determines, self-powered, what is or will be put before the tribunal for trial. There is no tribunal that wants to adjudicate this false submission, or properly try other than the legal public scrutiny with its verdict.

Paragraph abuse dependency destroys civil service

It is this decision, falsely made up by rewrites, that can be appealed to at the appeal court of an appeal tribunal. The decision is written and issued exclusively for one's own colleague officials in the judiciary (Similar as any judgment or verdict to be executed by one's own colleague officials). To maintain this dependence on me and each individual citizen (from the conflicting officials for/on evidence) is a fundamental crime.

Re-judging the appeal that is lodged by me, by the author, is only possible after acknowledging the forgery, which will never happen; So that the entire process and the outcome of the proceedings are already, on forehand, established, but not on the basis of the law or UN Declaration and not on the basis of my appeal.

Paragraph appeal is only language test

It is this false decision against which an appeal can be made; Each appeal has proved to be solely a linguistic test; A test by the appeal tribunal and its temporary, newly formed opinion (URL: www.de-openbare-zaak.nl and URL: www.publicscrutiny.nl). The legal public scrutiny has condemned this.

Paragraph abuse clearance for criminal immunity

Every judge, as a judicial officer of the State, has self-declared criminal immunity. This judgment is the clearance for it and the here considered false decision is its abuse. So that it is also established on forehand that the false decision will remain unpunished and the injustice will remain unrepaired.

Paragraph preparing (implicitly) for war

Every war has in the end of it "peace negotiations" and a "peace treaty". The essential subjects herein are closely the same to those which through bullying led to war. These conversations can just as well be done before a war, without bullying, properly and within a reasonable period of time. The current conflict with the officials of the State and the current conflict with the President, his court and entire judiciary is such a harassment and must lead to a war for a satisfactory outcome.

This bullying is preparing (provoking) a war. Provoking war is a war preparatory war crime.

On top of the judicial injustice piles up, as the result, the continued proliferation of the medical injustice that is lodged for trial. Evidently, here repeated, there is no effective remedy against violation or infringement of the Human Rights and civil rights of any individual citizen. So that as a result, only war remains to stop this medical injustice and to restore democracy and proper justice

Provoking a criminal crime is punished nationally as committing that criminal crime. This is for war crimes (national) not different. This is common in many enough nations similar, to make provoking war an international war preparatory war crime.

Despite the confirmations and acknowledgments of this, the Attorney General continues to persist in not punctually and expeditiously carrying out the judgments of the legal public scrutiny that are accessible every hour of every day on www.publicscrutiny.nl.

Bottle up

Every judgment of a tribunal applies from the entry into force of the law. So that all previous judgments should be restored or that all subsequent judgments should be in close line and close connection (equal cases). So that any subsequent judgment is superfluous or is a discriminatory arbitrariness.

The charge

I lodge and file perjury plus war preparatory war crimes or any war crime provoking it, because provocation of crime is punishable in almost all countries and is punished as perpetrator. This charge is against the judiciary and also against each member of it plus the employees, which concerns a membership of approximately 2600 sworn judging officials including President Lowel-van der Linde plus also her secretary, who each committed perjury (such as by forgery) and continues to commit.

Because,

Almost every war ends with peace negotiations in which the same topics are discussed as those leading into the war. History, functioning as an inquiry into this, confirms this. Doing or wanting to conduct these peace negotiations during the war but not before or not before the war discussing effectively the issues, is provoking a war or preparing for a war.

At the same time, the utter futility of almost every war testifies that every war is almost solely the massacre of innocent civilians, whether or not as soldiers, plus the destruction of property.

Finally, the process of the peace negotiations testifies that any war is completely meaningless because the subjects shall be effectively discussed anyway by the parties. So that this same process can equally well take place before a proper tribunal in a public hearing and before a war, which tribunal just-as-well can determine this 'peace treaty'.

By which,

Many necessary lawsuits from me and a lot of individual citizens, must wait for adjudging until the tribunal that we have calibrated and that is unchallengeable by us exists and is made available inalienably. These include both already lodged lawsuits and those held for lodging due to ignoring filing.

The compulsion to have to wait or to postpone lawsuits is provoking or (let) preparing a war. Because it is completely useless to start lawsuits, as long as there is no war to conduct the peace negotiations effectively and then restore proper justice with the peace treaty. The injustice, delay damage and causal damage continue to grow.

The unrepaired criminal rulings and judgements of a tribunal keep the injustice remain and the injustices continue to rumble. As a result, not only the injustice is sustained, but it grows over time. Then and next to it, the delay damage that has occurred from the start increases due to the lack of recovery plus due to the misuse of judgments as a safe-conduct, as a result of which the injustice continues to repeat with all the unjust consequences and harm, plus the growth due to the lack of prospects of stopping the meanwhile damaging injustice.

So that,

- (1) the cause(s) of war must be ameliorated and thus the judgments of the legal public scrutiny are carried out unabridged-and-punctually without delay by the State;
- (2) the calibration of a tribunal to the requirements that the UN Declaration, as those authentic declarants still want and mean, makes of the proper tribunal;
 - () Which is done inalienably by the two legal parties as soon as any doubt exists;
 - () With one judgment for all equal cases in which the characteristics of equality are stated plus in which the equations for that equality are stated;
- (3) a calibrated and by both right parties otherwise unchallengeable tribunal stops the injustice in every judgment in which I am a party;
 - () Repairs this injustice in and with one judgment for all equal cases whose characteristics are stated therein;
 - () Unshortened-and-punctually without delay, have all damages and delay damages remunerate or compensated to me under the regime of Article 8 of the "Charter of legal public scrutiny";
- (4) all judicial judgments from the coming into force of a law are closely in line and closely related to the first judgment;
 - () to prosecute the judges in tribunals after the first tribunal for perjury and a war preparatory war crime, for treason against the authentic legislator of the law and the judges in the first tribunal;

I also refer to my previous letters and messages, which you know and their contents you know. The internet site of the legal public scrutiny is "ww.publicscrutiny.nl". You know the deeds and the money amounts of damages and delay damages as well as the payment details.

I expect to receive the repairs within a short period of time, with immediate payment of the irreparable damage, by registered post.

Sincerely,
<signature sender>

<sender>.

Enclosure: Decision of 13 june 2022 of the court president mr. J. M. Rowel-van der Linde (Unfortunately only in Dutch).

Centraal Tuchtcollege voor
de Gezondheidszorg

Secretariaat
Postadres:
Postbus 16437
2500 BK DEN HAAG

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

Datum Den Haag, 13 juni 2022
Uw kenmerk
Ons kenmerk C2022/1281
C2022/1282
Zaaknaam [REDACTED] / Roowaan, huisarts
[REDACTED] / Veld, huisarts


Geachte [REDACTED]

Naar aanleiding van uw e-mailbericht van 26 mei j.l. laat ik u als volgt weten.
U verwijt de secretaris van het Centraal Tuchtcollege voor de Gezondheidszorg (CTG) dat hij uw eerdere brief heeft beantwoord. Dit heeft hij op mijn verzoek en met mijn instemming gedaan. Wat u thans aanvoert, komt inhoudelijk verder overeen met uw eerdere brief. Het bericht van de secretaris, dat uw hoger beroep eerst kan worden beoordeeld nadat u het griffierecht heeft voldaan, is correct en op de wet BIG gebaseerd. Bij te late betaling zal geen inhoudelijke beoordeling plaatsvinden. Eveneens is terecht het door de secretaris verwoorde over de mogelijkheid of onmogelijkheid een wrakingsverzoek in te dienen. Mijn slotsom is, dat de inhoud van de brief van de secretaris d.d. 12 mei j.l. correct is en dat uw klacht hierover ongegrond is.

Verdere correspondentie uwerzijds op dit vlak zal niet meer inhoudelijk worden beantwoord.

Ik vertrouw erop u hiermee afdoende te hebben geïnformeerd,

Hoogachtend,


J.M. Rowel van der Linde,
Voorzitter

FAXsession report

VERZEND CONTROLE RAPPORT

TIJD : 15/11/2022 10:51

DATUM, TIJD	15/11 10:44
FAX NR./NAAM	0707530351
TIJDSDUUR	00:06:52
PAGINA'S	09
RESULT	OK
MODE	STANDAARD
	FCM