

The public Court Trial of Dutch Court “Raad van State”

Case: decision of not-admissible



Introduction

This case is a national matter, but impossibly only in this country in Europe due to the violation of discrimination.

In the Netherlands are two Supreme Courts. One is titled “Hoge Raad” and the other is titled “Raad van State” (hereafter mentioned as: “RvS”). The RvS has exclusive jurisdiction on one law that rules deeds, actions or behaviour of official bodies or official authorities. On this one law is only one “Court of first instance” (not in number), which is a regular Court and accessible for individual civilians. Appeal is only possible at the Supreme Court “RvS”.

In the Netherlands is a special Court Trial titled (in Dutch) “Wraking”. This Court Trial is handled by a distinct tribunal in the same Court. By law must each accusation that a litigant may have against a judge and this accusation damages the case-law, be submitted before the main case is handled. In practice the Court Trial “Wraking” is demanded in the same document that starts the Court Trial of the ‘main’ case. Each accused judge or tribunal loses instantly the empowerment to judge and must postpone the litigation.

After a Court Trial and conviction at a “Court of first instance” the obligation is open to appeal. An appeal –and the bounded Court Trial “Wraking”– is submitted to the RvS.

Due to accusations in and for the Court Trial "Wraking", no true judge as guaranteed is available to judge this Court Trial "Wraking". This results in addressing both Court Trial ("Wraking" and the main case) to the Dutch King. The Dutch King is chairman of the institution "Raad van State".

The Dutch King did not respond and kept hiding behind the human shield of the RvS. Between the Court's registrar's office and the civilian welled-up a dispute about the priority of two obligations: must first there be the guaranteed Court (staff) or must first a court fee be paid.

Out of nowhere came suddenly a judge-decision of the Supreme Court "RvS". This secret litigation must have been ignited by the Court's registrar's office, because it impossibly can be ignited by some one else. In the decision is nothing mentioned about the demanded "Wraking" and almost nothing is mentioned about the dispute. Only the opinion of the Court's registrar's office is considered and its decision that the civilian was in default. The judge's decision is that the appeal is not-admissible. This last decision is appeal able at the same Supreme Court.

The appeal –a notice of resistance– is submitted in time. Since then keeps the Supreme Court "RvS" silence.

The judge-decision is attached although it is written in Dutch. A translatable in English writing version is attached to the decision. Dutch remains the origin.

The facts of violation

The following facts are selected by their international judgeable ability.

The national law violations are submitted and addressed to the Dutch King in the appeal that is available in the webdossier "www.de-openbare-zaak.nl" in the international section in English in the rubric "Exceptional Letters" behind item 00 "Higher appeal to the Dutch King". These are involved because in other countries is a judiciary comparable working.

(01) The judge-decision is ignited by the Court or the Court's registrar's office, which did not pay a court fee –as the petitioner– either. The judge knows this court fee free access but do not determine this in the decision.

Corollary:

So, an obligated pay of a court fee is a lie, with evidence proven by the decision itself. First the Court's registrar's office lies and followed by the judge. Also is the unstoppable lying predicted with one of the accusations.

(02) **(Quote):** "Uitspraak na vereenvoudigde behandeling (artikel 8:54 van de Algemene wet bestuursrecht (hierna: de Awb)) op het hoger beroep van: **<civilian's name>**, wonend in **<civilian's town>**, petitioner, tegen de uitspraak van de rechtbank Noord-Nederland van 22 November 2019 in de zaak nr. 16/4977 in het geding tussen: **<civilian's name>** en Belastingdienst/Toeslagen."

This is translatable in **(English Quoted):**

"Judgment after simplified treatment (Article 8:54 of the General Administrative Law Act (hereinafter: the Awb) on the appeal of: **<civilian's name>**, residing in **<civilian's town>**, appellant, against the decision of the court Noord-Nederland of 22 November 2019 in case no. 16/4977 in the dispute between: **<civilian's name>** and the Tax and Customs Administration."

Corollary:

The Supreme Court "RvS" and its judge pretend a case of a dispute between the civilian and the Court which decision is appealed or a case between the civilian and the Tax and Customs Administration.

Refutation:

The demand of the first payment of a court fee is a complete lie, also because these litigants are impossibly involved due to that case's ending by the decision. Another fact of the lie is that the document's content writes only about a demanded payment of court fee by the Supreme Court's registrar's office.

(03) (Quote): "Tegen deze uitspraak kan verzet worden gedaan bij de Afdeling".

This is translatable in **(English Quoted):**

"Against this decision can be appealed to the Department".

Corollary:

This judge-decision is about a not as first paid court fee. After this decision is a –by law prescribed– free Court Trial offered to appeal against the judge-decision.

Refutation:

This emphasizes the lie (determined in paragraph 01 and 02) in or about this case. The resistance or appeal is submitted and instantly came into reality the exact same juridical situation as before the judge-decision.

- * The judge-decision did not solve or settle the dispute and the points of dispute;
- * With the notice of opposition is the "Wraking" Court Trial demanded again and it is added with the recent judicial crimes and evidence. So, the civilian's contra facts and contradictions are brought-up again and a court fee is not paid.

(04) (Quote third paragraph): "Bij brief van 27 februari 2020 voert *<civilian's name>* aan dat hij het niet rechtvaardig vindt om griffierecht te betalen en derhalve geen griffierecht zal betalen."

This is translatable in **(English Quoted):**

"By letter of 27 February 2020, *<civilian's name>* argues that he does not consider it fair to pay court fees and therefore will not pay the court fee."

Corollary:

The Supreme Court "RvS" and its judge feign this one-liner as the reason for the civilian to dispute, but without the civilian's approval and signature.

Refutation:

Again a (third) lie of the Supreme Court "RvS" and its judge. Because this one-liner is undisputed the feint of the Court's registrar's office's and without facts.

This appeal at the Supreme Court "RvS" is from another Court's decision, for which undisputable a court fee is paid. Also this payment states the facts that the civilian had no problem with the justice of a court fee, had no problem with paying a court fee and had no problem with the obligation to pay a court fee. The judge again bases its decision –after deliberation regardless by whom– on a major lie, as one of the accusations predicted.

The judge does and writes what the Supreme Court "RvS" orders him/her to do or to write. For the public is verifiable that the judge did not have a dossier. So, the judge did not examine any document by itself. This simple determination would have alarmed an honest being, fair acting and sworn judge.

(05) No public hearing took place.

Corollary:

This Supreme Court's judge pretends a legal use of a law article for a decision that further examination –in a public hearing– is not needed.

Refutation:

With this use does the legislator aim on cases in which the inadmissibility is beyond doubt. Already the sole and easy verifiable fact that the one-liner is the Supreme Court's registrar's pretending, states a complete doubt about what is the matter and the civilian's dispute with this Supreme Court's registrar's office.

Public hearing compulsion

The above is proven evidence that a public hearing is always obligated. Each true judge is compelled –by law and his oath– to verify in a public hearing the facts and who argues with exactly what and with what intention or aim.

Besides the above refutation and refutations given in the preceding paragraphs, is this decision taken and given by an accused judge, by which the judge is lawfully not-empowered to do judging work. The Dutch Court Trial "Wraking" must compelled by law take place.

(06) The by the civilian demanded "Wraking" Court Trial did not take place.

Corollary:

The Supreme Court's judge took the case in handling: as readable is the decision is the case handled to examine for a reason to decide not-admissible.

Refutation:

When a judge is accused then the involved judge must –also compelled by law– instantly postpone the treatment or handling of the litigation. Also this legal fact results that the decision could never lawful have taken place. Added to this that the judge is lawful not-empowered to do judging work.

(07) The public is not able to verify that the Court Trial "Wraking" is demanded by the civilian; What the accusations and their facts are; What the civilian's facts and rights are that are disputed by this Supreme Court's registrar's office. Neither is the public able to verify what paragraph is a lie and what paragraph is true.

Corollary:

The Supreme Court "RvS" and its judge pretend that the verifiability is only needed for what is (pretended as) pronounced publicly.

Refutation:

The public's right of scrutiny is first of all to examine the verifiability of the decision's information and facts. This is the basic of justice. Making this verification impossible by the Court or the judge is a capital crime.

Even when the public assumes that the information is complete and true or proven by evidence does this not change the assumption in a determined fact. To unveil a lie is necessary that first something is presented as being genuine.

(08) The decision about a not-existing –fake– matter destroys completely the possibility to complain about the real matter at the European Court for Human Rights.

Corollary:

Again the European Court is fooled with a fantasy. A cunning language use creates a –illegal– look-alike of a real case.

Refutation:

There is no refutation, only confirmation. The criminalities of each of all Courts or judges are the core issue of the cases in this section "Court Trials to the public". Here reference to "European Court of Justice versus the public" or "European Court of Human Rights versus the public" where Courts and judges bring itself or its deeds unlawful out of judgement and outside the law.

(09) The appeal –a notice of resistance– is submitted in time. Since then keeps the Supreme Court “RvS” silence. The Human Right to a decision –by the Dutch King– in an equally reasonable time is deliberately violated. This has the only possible aim of a cover up.

The accountability of the Court “Raad van State”

At the Court of Human Rights is the knowledge published that this Supreme Court “RvS” is known as a supervisory tribunal that seeks to ensure legal (*1): in this case in the General Administrative Law. By the General Administrative Law is this Supreme Court “RvS” appointed as the Court of higher appeal.

Regardless the ‘overhead’ accountability of the Dutch King as chairman of the institution “Raad van State”, does this Supreme Court have an own or individual accountability. Each judge of the Supreme Court “RvS” has not sworn to be independent.

The legal empowerment of the public to judge

The public is by law empowered to examine and judge court-decisions or judge-decisions on the Human Rights (*2).

Both the European Courts brought their deeds, behaviour and actions or themselves out of judgement. So, the public is the only left empowered, independent judge over the Courts.

Legal frames and arised rights

Due to the deliberate lack of legal frames in judge-decisions –in particular the ones that state Human and Civil Rights or out of which these rights corollaries– it becomes necessary to pronounce publicly these legal frames and arised rights.

(10) The Warranty Agreement

Rights do solely arise out of a preceding law article. The Human Rights are proclaimed in and by the Universal Declaration (*3). This declaration is a pledge, so a normal contract. This UN-contract has at the supplying side each Member State of the United Nations and at the receiving side each of the civilians or inhabitants of each Member State.

The UN-contract is in the European Union further elaborated into the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms. This EU-Convention is a Warranty Agreement (*4) on the supply of protection, so a normal contract. This EU-contract has at the supplying side each Member State of the European Union and at the receiving side each of the civilians or inhabitants of each Member State.

By ratification became the VN-contract and the EU-contract implemented in the national law. What more is agreed on is in the ECPHR and guaranteed the supply to everyone. Example: The Dutch Constitution –by article 94– establishes the priority and dominance of the ECPHR over each law-article.

Agreements Rights.

Each country has Agreements Rights in which is elaborated what precise mutual rights, out of a contract arise. Undisputable and crystal clear is, that in the legal frame of the contract on Human Rights first of all must be supplied, a Court with an impeccable staff and the guaranteed tribunal with an average or better quality of

sworn judges. The European and national judiciary, Courts and judges work under the Warranty Agreement and Agreements Rights.

(11) Human Rights are possession

Due to the contractually stated possession of –worldwide– everyone civilian, are the Human Rights impossibly a charity. Because these rights are everyone's possession these are impossibly an economic object.

Due to the contractually stated possession of everyone European civilian, is the Protection of Human Rights impossibly a charity. Because this Protection is everyone's possession this is impossibly an economic object.

So, the economic status of a country is no reason or justification to steal –some of– the Human Rights. Besides a theft, is this also a breach of contract of their's Protection. The economic status of a country is impossibly a redress or compensation of damages.

Because the Human Rights and their Protection are no economic objects both are easy to supply everywhere, in any situation and in any legal relationship. Each notice of a stolen possession is an undiscussable and undisputable –instant compulsory– restitution, of which a delay causes a huge financial and immaterial damage.

(12) Only one (1) Court, in fact the Court of first instance

Confirmed by the European Court of Human Rights, contains the Human Rights only one (1) Court, namely the "Court of first instance" (*5). An appeal is only a notice of default and solely the right of a State to repair: nothing more.

Confirmed by the European Court of Human Rights (*5), is it prohibited to create levels of justice with levels of Courts like a Court of first instance and a 'higher' Court like Court of appeal or Supreme Court.

Due to the Warranty Agreement or contracts has each individual civilian the right that an appeal is not needed. Each appeal is by default about an –at the least partly– irremediable damage.

(13) The supremacy over the judiciary, a Court, a tribunal or a judge

Only the Governments signatory are the High Contracting Parties involved in the ECPHR, that secured to everyone the Rights and Freedoms defined in the Convention (*6). This excludes the presumed law-base of a "Judicial Power".

Nothing in the European Convention may be interpreted as implying for any State, group or person any right to any act aimed at the destruction of any of the rights and freedoms or aimed at their limitations to a greater extend then is provided in the Convention (*7).

The Human Rights are protected by the supremacy of the rule of law and not by a Court's tribunal or judge (*8).

(14) The compelling obligation of a public hearing

Each judge's task is to judge the case that the individual civilian submitted for the determination of his Human and Civil Rights (*14). To be sure to understand the writing in the documents a judge must order the Court to let a public hearing take

place. To verify the points of dispute by whom of the litigants the judge must order the Court to let a public hearing take place. Already these two necessities clears up the legislator's will by a compelling prescription that a public hearing takes place.

Even when an inadmissibility seems to be beyond doubt then still this is the prohibited opinion of the Court. Then the litigant must be notified with a request for points of dispute with the Court and to start a court fee free Court Trial against the Court on the justice of these points.

(15) The judge-decision for everyone executable

Each judge-decision is the determination of the Human and Civil Rights of everyone (*14). So, this decision must emphatic determine to be for everyone and thus by everyone executable at every place in the country.

Also this by law compelling property does require that the decision makes verifiable how the settled case is detected as a case in the category which the legislator intends and aims at.

(16) Each appeal must be reproducible

When the litigation is not reproducible as it took place –like any other scientific research or investigation– then the right of the public to examine or judge is impossible to execute and thus destructed. Equally is a just appeal impossible. The judge-decision is indisputable on forehand an offence with irremediable damage.

(17) The effective remedy against Courts and judges

Against criminal Courts and criminal judges who commit perjury must be supplied to everyone an effective remedy (*9). This remedy can impossibly be effective at a Court and tribunal that beforehand does not judge and condemn its colleague-judges. When this Court and tribunal is not made available then the public –or the involved civilian– is the only legal empowered judge.

(18) The equalizing power of Human Rights

The Human Rights are an equalizing power (*10) and nothing less and nothing more. In case the civilian and the public with Human Rights should take-over the oversize of power then the difference in power remains: Nothing improves by turn-over the roles. This wisdom gave birth to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

(19) The sole detectability of the presence of Human Rights

Human Rights exist unconditional (*11), so are always present for everyone and valid.

Everywhere where an oversize of power is used, undisputable the Human Rights not exist because Human Rights are present or not. In particular the equalizing power of these Rights is impossibly a little present and is impossibly the most powerful.

Note: The use of power is just doing the job right.

So, each misuse of power –like ignore or not use the critics– is a crime, but leave this misuse unpunished is a capital crime.

The call for violence

The absence of Human Rights is a call for violence in whatever way (*8).

(20) The ownership of an expression

The EU-contract contains the Protection of the Fundamental Freedom of speech or expression (*12). To express freely one's will is one's Fundamental Freedom and thus is this expression the speaker's or writer's and signatories' enduring possession.

Stealing this expression and exchange it for some interpretation or some perception of a tribunal or judge, is a crime, but leave the theft or the exchanged expression unpunished is a capital crime. Therefore does also each law-article remain the sole ownership of the legislator who made it.

(21) Only the Dutch legislator's intentions and aims rule

By the ownership of its expression does also the legislator remain the sole owner of each by this legislator made law-article. In the Netherlands is also a Court or judge lawful not empowered or not entitled to decide by its own opinion. A judge or tribunal or public are prohibited to ignore the legislator's intentions and aims (*7). By Constitution article 94 does the priority and supremacy of the Convention for Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms rule over each law-article.

Conclusion

(22) verified and correct,
after reinvestigating the preceding refutations is,

that this Supreme Court "RvS" 's judge pronounces publicly,

- * major lies, continues doing this and cheats the authorities and public;
- * and after deliberation, a case with not-involved official bodies;
- * a judge-decision which leaves the case exactly unchanged plus leaves the by the civilian executed human and civil rights unmentioned, unhandled, unconsidered, unjudged and undecided;
- * its theft of the civilian's freedom of speech and expression plus replace this with its own opinion, in cunning language disguised as the civilian's expression;
- * the abuse of an extreme seldom case in which inadmissibility is beyond doubt;
- * the abuse of the human and civil right of a public hearing purposed to destroy these human and civil rights;
- * the destroy of the public's human and civil right to verify whether or not the completeness is verifiable of the information and facts in the decision;
- * a major lie by a case in which the civilian contradicted the Court but this is impossible and because the registrar read the appeal did the Court contradict the civilian's human and civil rights;

the facts that,

- * the civilian has no problem with the justice, payment or obligated payment of a court fee;
- * the Court's judge is not independent but on the contrary that the Court and its judge are a unity;
- * the public's presumption of completeness of the information and facts in a judge-decision always is with reservation of the right to change this assumption any time afterwards;

with regards to the lies and crimes that,

- * almost surely the Court Trial "Wraking" is demanded but not took place;
- * presumed that the Court Trial "Wraking" is demanded and not decided thus the unempowerment of the judge still exists;
- * by the unempowerment of the judge the decision could never have taken place and thus the decision does not exist in justice;
- * the judge misused the seldom case of inadmissibility purposed to avoid by the Court and judge disliked case or arguments and bring itself out of judgement;

(23) verified factresults,

that the Supreme Court "RvS" is a role model for each other Court and its judges;
that the Supreme Court "RvS" brings itself out of judgement by any tribunal;
that not one single State, Power, group or person is outside or above the law;
that the Supreme Court "RvS" does not let the Court Trial of resistance take place;
that the lack of appeal erects instantly the claim for compensating the damage;

(24) legal power of the documents

Nevertheless its lack of legal power by its crime, remains each written expression the lasting declaration of the writer's or signatories' deliberated will. A –once in a while– confessed Human or Civil Right surely does not contradict the crimes by a judge in a judge-decision. The fact that these rights are not with consistency determined –in or as a legal frame– but accidentally establishes the deliberately deletion and the crime.

(25) the legal consistency, the unity of legal order and the legal certainty

Some layers of Courts with on top a single or Supreme Court does not erect:

* the unity of legal order.

Exclusively the one legislator guarantees this.

* the consistency of legal order.

Exclusively one decision for everyone civilian and executable at every place in the country guarantees this.

* the legal certainty.

Exclusively the reproducibility of the litigation, the detect-ability of the case and the executive power of the public's judgement –also on the application of the law and derivated rights– guarantees legal certainty.

The Supreme Court "RvS" indicates levels in Human Rights or in judging Human Rights with in the top-level one supreme Court. This is by law prohibited (*5): the Human and Civil Rights are undividable, out of levels, everywhere and equal.

The Supreme Court "RvS" is role model and drags other Courts into similar crimes. This is a unity of crime. Each decision of the Supreme Court "RvS" is the practical model for each judge –in ordinary courts the ones leading the disciplinary courts– on how to put into practice the ruling of its own opinion. Each judge is practical example for the society on how to put cheating into practice and get away with it.

A dictatorial decree

The Supreme Court "RvS" exhibits how to make a complete useless decision that does not change a thing in the dispute and in the judicial or practical situation before and after the decision. This decision is similar with an authorial dictatorial decree.

(26) Discriminating judge-decision

Each judge-decision must determine completely the involved Human and Civil Rights. Also and emphatic must each judge-decision declare to be valid for everyone and also to be executable at every place in the country. Each judge decision must be detectable as a case of the cases in the category at which the legislator intends and aims and also must this category be detectable. These omissions make this decision discriminating and is a crime which causes damage and a huge delay-damage.

(27) Worst crime: lack of self-cleaning and an own righteous conscience

Each Court and judge is assumed to know and apply the law and Human Rights. Each Court must supply a sworn judge with an impeccable craftsmanship. When a Court's tribunal or judge pretends to be the last resort for protection against the injustice then must each Court's judge be enough moral characterised to look in the

mirror. The mirror is brought to and held up in front of the Supreme Court "RvS" by each individual civilian with its case. Each condemnation is equally valid for the doing of this Supreme Court. Not look in the mirror at the same time of the good judging is the worst capital crime against the Human Rights and Warranty Agreement.

To develop the protecting task into a dictatorial power –by doing the job not or too late– is the most terrible crime against humanity by this Supreme Court and its developments.

(28) sole respectable behaviour

Paper rules do not change persons' mentality or thinking.

Each person who developed itself above the "enough"-level of righteousness, exposes itself by the genuine receipt of each criticism like a grateful gift which helps to improve the quality of a highest level of protecting justice and peace. And act this way. Others are identifiable and verified by the remain of fighting plus doing all to keep it in silence or to cover it up in many ways and pretending a defence by accusing and fighting the messenger in return. The Human Right of a decision –by the Dutch King– in an equally reasonable period of time is deliberately violated.

The Supreme Court "RvS" does not exposes itself by the genuine receipt of each criticism like a grateful gift which helps to improve the quality of a highest level of protecting justice and peace. The Supreme Court "RvS" remains fighting and keeps an illegal oversize of power.

(29) Target on the messenger instead of the message

When public servants or public officers are criticized or accused their common behaviour becomes a fall in silence or a fall in doing nothing no more. Create an inadmissible beyond doubt decision without a public hearing, is one way to do this. This reaction indisputably targets only the messenger and exhibits no attention at all for the message. This change and behaviour delivers evidence of hostility against Human Rights and in particular their equalizing power and the messenger. This change and behaviour is –when done by a Court and its tribunal or judge(s)– a capital crime and causes huge damage.

(30) The breach of contract

Each Court, judge or judiciary works under the Agreements Rights and the Warranty Agreement. The secure of the Human Rights is a by law erected normal contract. Due to the Warranty–Agreements Rights is each appeal a notice of default and only the right of a Member State to repair defects or omissions. The obligation of a litigant to appeal avoids an instant claim for compensating irremediable damage. The litigants in an appeal are the State joined by the appellant versus the tribunal that decided and its Court.

Being communicative not available –verified by the period of silence– for an individual citizen does the Supreme Court "RvS" and in particular its judge target the messenger and show to the public no interest in the message and the seriousness of its content.

This is another breach of contract and a crime.

The silent refuse admission to the resistance Court Trial establishes instantly the Supreme Court's –and in the end the Dutch King's– lawful obligation to pay for compensating the irremediable damages and the delay-damage. The payment not dismisses the Supreme Court "RvS" to still fulfil their share of the contract.

(31) call for violence

The injustice and discrimination by the judge-decisions force people to take own measures to protect their rights. The Human and Civil Rights are by law given possessions to everyone which are stolen by Courts, judges and judiciary instead of protected. The arise and grow of violence is primarily and mainly caused by the crimes of each Court and each of its judges (*8). After the notice of resistance is submitted the Court keeps only silence. This is another evidence of the same crime.

(32) unattended, authoritarian and dictatorial judiciary

The –out of a free will done– totally one-side reasoning states with proven by evidence that this Supreme Court “RvS” leads the developing into an authoritarian dictatorial judiciary. This is confirmed by the total control by Court and its judge of what itself likes to write. Each Court performs equal to this Supreme Court, inside a multi-national organisation (*13).

(33) intolerable unfairness

Besides the crime of theft of the legislator’s ownerships, is the replace by a judge’s opinion a perjury due to intolerable unfairness. Each doing together is under rules that are known beforehand, while a judge-opinion is always afterwards.

(34) Business model

To force each individual civilian into appealing or new Court Trials is impossibility to declare otherwise then to benefit a business model of the judiciary. These doings creates more cases which are paid for –by the State and by the litigants– and it creates work. To turn a last resort of justice or peace into a business model is a capital crime.

(35) Perjury and capital crime

By turning away –regardless by which doing– from each crime by the judiciary, does the Supreme Court “RvS” and each member individual commit perjury and a capital crime against the Human and Civil Rights: the Human Rights for everyone are not secure and were not secured. There is impossibility an excuse to turn this into justice, also because the public can not turn away and is empowered to judge.

The evidence for the corollaries of perjury and crimes by Courts or by judges in the Netherlands –as an example but not the only one– are or are delivered in or by the webdossier at “www.de-openbare-zaak.nl” which has a Dutch and an international section in English. Besides this section is also evidence in the section “Court Trials to the public”.

(36) More perjury and capital crime

When the paper decision is not verifiable on the verifiability of the completeness of the information and facts in the decision, then this complete public Human Right by the publicly pronounced decision is destroyed. This is a capital crime.

When the Court Trial or litigation is not reproducible as it took place –like any other scientific research or investigation– then the Human Right of the public to examine or control is impossible to execute and thus destructed. Equally is a just appeal impossible and indisputable is the judge-decision on forehand an offence with irremediable damage.

Now is the case that no independent and impartial Court and its tribunal or a sworn judge is available. In this case the Human Right of access to the “Court of first

instance" (*5) under article 6 and 13 of the Convention for Protection of the Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, is destructed.

(37) special international verifiable

Verifiable with the number and words ("artikel" is translatable in "article") does the appendix not mention the law articles about the "Wraking" Court Trial (article 8:15 up to article 8:20), article 94 of the Constitution that prescribes the ruling priority and dominancy of the European Convention of Human Rights and neither the Dutch law "Wet algemene bepalingen" which prescribes the limitations of each judge's doing, behaviour or actions. Notice that the Public has the Human Rights to be correct and complete informed.

(38) **Finally**, to consider;

This Dutch Supreme Court "RvS" demands the payment of a court fee. Then the Court's registrar starts itself a Court Trial at its own Court and without paying the court fee. Then comes a judge-decision with inadmissibility due to not-paying a court fee and in which decision is an offer to start a court fee free Court Trial about this issue of (not) paying a court fee.

Corollary:

This Supreme Court and its judges –like each Dutch Court and its judges– are in a state of complete judicial disorder.

Notice of resistance

The offer to appeal in resistance against the decision is accepted. The notice of opposition is submitted by facsimile on April 27, 2020. Since then is nothing heard. This note of opposition is available in the webdossier "www.de-openbare-zaak.nl" in the international section in English in the rubric "Exceptional Letters" behind item 00 "Higher appeal to the Dutch King" and is the last added part which is also separate submitted to the Dutch King.

Determination

Deeds are done

The concluded crimes are done, these are done by the Dutch Supreme Court "RvS" and these cause irremediable damages.

Damages

When the litigation is not reproducible as it took place –like any other scientific research or investigation– then the right of the public to examine or control is impossible to execute and thus destructed. Equally is a just appeal impossible and indisputable is the judge-decision on forehand an offence with irremediable damage

The omission of protection of its Human and Civil Rights causes damage to each individual Dutch civilian. The impact of experiencing in full awareness the injustice or discrimination causes a huge damage. The impact of experiencing in appeal that the issues deliberately are not judged by a tribunal or judge causes a huge damage plus a huge delay-damage. By silencing the submitted appeal –notice of resistance– with the purpose to deliberately exceed a reasonable period of time causes a huge delay-damage. The destroyed trust causes a huge damage. Being forced to take own measures and also to be compelled to have at last, to rebel against judicial tyranny and judicial oppression causes huge damage.

The main case in each of the illegal or unlawful national case-law and European case-law causes significant damage.

Executability

It would be insane of the Supreme Court "RvS" and the Dutch King not to obey and execute the law out of an own righteous conscience, but delay again –in fact refuse– until a (yet unknown) public's executive power executes this public's judge-decision with force on the Supreme Court "RvS". The Dutch King is sufficient informed about the damages and all details for payment. The Dutch King is the Chairman of the institution "Raad van State" and therefore responsible and accountable for his share in this.

This payment impossibly dismisses the Supreme Court "RvS" from impeccably executing the contract.

The defence of the freedoms and rights of all citizens is the sworn task of the Dutch King

Before stepping into the office of Kingship the Dutch King swore the oath (among others): *"that I the freedom and the rights of all citizens and all inhabitants shall defend, (...)"*.

To allow the judge(s), Courts or judiciary to commit their crimes against each individual citizen is perjury by the Dutch King; nothing less and nothing more. Doing significantly less to stop this and return the judicial system back under rule and dominancy of the Human Rights is perjury by the Dutch King and probably more crimes. Each public servant and officer swore an oath to be faithful to the Dutch King, also therefore is the Dutch King accountable.

References:

- *1. Case A.M. versus the Netherlands, 05-07-2016, paragraph 69.
- *2. Case Campbell and Fell versus the UK, 28-06-1984, paragraph 91.
- *3. Universal Declaration of Human Rights, preamble last consideration
- *4. Convention for Protection of Human Rights and the Fundamental Freedoms, preamble and article 1
- *5. Case De Cubber versus Belgium, 26-10-1984, paragraph 32.
- *6. Convention for Protection of Human Rights and the Fundamental Freedoms, preamble and article 1
- *7. European Convention for Protection of Human Rights and the Fundamental Freedoms, article 17.
- *8. Universal Declaration of Human Rights, preamble third consideration
- *9. European Convention for Protection of Human Rights and the Fundamental Freedoms, article 13.
- *10. Universal Declaration of Human Rights, preamble first consideration
- *11. Universal Declaration of Human Rights, whole preamble
- *12. Convention for Protection of Human Rights and the Fundamental Freedoms, article 10
- *13. Case European Court of Justice versus the public, paragraph 18
- *14. European Convention for Protection of Human Rights and the Fundamental Freedoms, article 6.

Procesverloop

█ heeft hoger beroep ingesteld tegen de uitspraak van de rechtbank van 22 november 2019.

Overwegingen

1. Het op deze zaak betrekking hebbend wettelijk kader is opgenomen in de bijlage bij deze uitspraak. Deze bijlage maakt deel uit van deze uitspraak.

2. █ is voor het door hem ingestelde hoger beroep griffierecht verschuldigd. Een hoger beroep wordt ingevolge artikel 8:41, vierde, vijfde en zesde lid, gelezen in verbinding met artikel 8:108, eerste lid, van de Awb niet-ontvankelijk verklaard indien storting of bijschrijving van het griffierecht niet heeft plaatsgevonden binnen vier weken na de dag van verzending van de mededeling waarin de indiener van een beroepschrift is gewezen op de verschuldigdheid van het griffierecht, tenzij redelijkerwijs niet kan worden geoordeeld dat de indiener in verzuim is geweest.

3. █ is bij brief van 2 december 2019 op de verschuldigdheid van het griffierecht gewezen. Nadat is gebleken dat █ het griffierecht niet heeft voldaan is █ bij aangetekend verzonden brief van 10 februari 2020 meegedeeld dat het verschuldigde griffierecht binnen vier weken na de dag van verzending van de brief, dat wil zeggen uiterlijk 9 maart 2020, op de rekening van de Raad van State dient te zijn bijgeschreven of contant op het adres van de Raad van State dient te zijn betaald. Tevens is vermeld dat, indien het verschuldigde bedrag niet op de vermelde datum is ontvangen, het hoger beroep reeds om die reden niet-ontvankelijk wordt verklaard, behoudens in uitzonderlijke gevallen. Bij brief van 27 februari 2020 voert █ aan dat hij het niet rechtvaardig vindt om griffierecht te betalen en derhalve geen griffierecht zal betalen. Het griffierecht is geregeld in de Awb. Op de betalingsverplichting is geen enkele andere uitzondering mogelijk dan een geslaagd beroep op betalingsonmacht. █ heeft echter geen beroep gedaan op betalingsonmacht.

Het bedrag is niet binnen de aldus gestelde termijn op de rekening van de Raad van State bijgeschreven of contant op het adres van de Raad van State betaald. Niet is gebleken van feiten of omstandigheden, op grond waarvan redelijkerwijs niet kan worden geoordeeld dat █ in verzuim is geweest.

4. Het hoger beroep is kennelijk niet-ontvankelijk.

5. Voor een proceskostenveroordeling bestaat geen aanleiding.

Beslissing

De Afdeling bestuursrechtspraak van de Raad van State:

verklaart het hoger beroep niet-ontvankelijk.

Aldus vastgesteld door mr. A.W.M. Bijloos, lid van de enkelvoudige kamer, in tegenwoordigheid van mr. R. Klingers, griffier.

w.g. Bijloos
lid van de enkelvoudige kamer

w.g. Klingers
griffier

Uitgesproken in het openbaar op 8 april 2020

Tegen deze uitspraak kan verzet worden gedaan bij de Afdeling (artikel 8:55 van de Awb).

- Verzet dient schriftelijk en binnen zes weken na verzending van deze uitspraak te worden gedaan.
- In het verzetschrift moeten de redenen worden vermeld waarom de indiener het niet eens is met de gronden waarop de beslissing is gebaseerd.
- Indien de indiener over het verzet door de Afdeling wenst te worden gehoord, dient dit in het verzetschrift te worden gevraagd. Het horen gebeurt dan uitsluitend over het verzet.

341-905.

Verzonden: 8 april 2020

BIJLAGE**Algemene wet bestuursrecht****Titel 8.2. Behandeling van het beroep in eerste aanleg****Afdeling 8.2.1. Griffierecht****Artikel 8:41**

1. Van de indiener van het beroepschrift wordt door de griffier een griffierecht geheven.
4. De griffier deelt de indiener van het beroepschrift mede welk griffierecht is verschuldigd en wijst hem daarbij op het bepaalde in het vijfde en zesde lid.
5. Het dient binnen vier weken na verzending van de mededeling van de griffier te zijn bijgeschreven op de rekening van het gerecht dan wel ter griffie te zijn gestort.
6. Indien het bedrag niet tijdig is bijgeschreven of gestort, is het beroep niet-ontvankelijk, tenzij redelijkerwijs niet kan worden geoordeeld dat de indiener in verzuim is geweest.

Titel 8.5. Hoger beroep**Artikel 8:108**

1. Voor zover in deze titel niet anders is bepaald, zijn op het hoger beroep de titels 8.1 tot en met 8.3 van overeenkomstige toepassing, met uitzondering van de artikelen 8:1 tot en met 8:10, 8:41, tweede lid, en 8:74.

Raad van State

201908656/2 / A2.

Date of judgment: 8 April 2020

DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGMENT

Judgment after simplified treatment (Article 8:54 of the General Administrative Law Act (hereinafter: the Awb) on the appeal of:

<civilian's name>, residing in **<civilian's town>**
appellant,

against the decision of the court Noord-Nederland of 22 November 2019 in case no. 16/4977 in the dispute between:

<civilian's name>

and

the Tax and Customs Administration.

1. The legal framework relating to this case is attached to this judgment. This appendix is part of this ruling.
2. **<civilian's name>** owes court registry fees for the appeal brought by him. An appeal is read in accordance with Article 8:41, fourth, fifth and sixth paragraph in conjunction with Article 8:108, first paragraph, of the Awb declared inadmissible if payment or transfer of the court registry fee has not taken place within four weeks after the date on which the notice of the lodging of the notice of appeal lodged to the person submitting the notice of appeal is made, unless it is not reasonably possible to do so. are judged that the petitioner has been in default.
3. **<civilian's name>** was informed by letter of 2 December 2019 of the liability of the court registry fee. After it has become apparent that **<civilian's name>** has not paid the court registry fee, **<civilian's name>** has been informed by registered letter of 10 February 2020 that the court registry fee is due on the account within four weeks of the date on which the letter was sent, i.e. no later than 9 March 2020. of the Council of State must be credited or paid in cash at the address of the Council of State. It is also stated that, if the amount due has not been received on the stated date, the appeal will already be declared inadmissible for that reason, except in exceptional cases. By letter of 27 February 2020, **<civilian's name>** argues that he does not consider it fair to pay court fees and therefore will not pay court fees. Registry law is regulated in the Awb. There is no other exception to the payment obligation than a successful appeal to insolvency. **<civilian's name>**, however, has not invoked inability to pay.

The amount has not been credited to the account of the Council of State or paid in cash at the address of the Council of State within the period thus set. There has been no evidence of facts or circumstances on the basis of which it cannot reasonably be concluded that **<civilian's name>** was in default.

4. The appeal is manifestly inadmissible.
5. There is no reason for a court order against costs.

Decision

The Administrative Jurisdiction Section of the Raad van State:

declares the appeal inadmissible.

Determined by mr. AWM Bijloos, member of the single chamber, in the presence of mr. R. Klingers, registrar.

wg Bijloos member of the single chamber

wg Klinger Registrar

Pronounced publicly on April 8, 2020

against this decision can be appealed to the Department (Article 8:55 of the Awb)

- Resistance must be done in writing and within six weeks after this statement.
- The statement of opposition must state the reasons why the petitioner disagrees with the grounds on which the decision is based.
- If the petitioner wishes to be heard by the Department about the resistance, this must be requested in the notice of resistance. The hearing is only about the resistance.

341-905.

Sent: April 8, 2020