

The horrifying saga of systemic institutional failure in the Netherlands, designed to perpetually shield the untouchable figures of alleged rapist **Joris Demmink** (former Secretary-General of the Ministry of Justice) and **Jaap Duijs**, has resulted in a devastating cascade of procedural rejections across the global spectrum of justice. These rejections are presented not as neutral legal decisions, but as irrefutable evidence of the pervasive, chilling success of the Dutch state's alleged obstruction campaign, which mercilessly trapped the victim in a cruel, agonizing paradox.

The following is a detailed chronicle of the international bodies that, tragically, refused to grant Hans Smedema access to justice, cementing the alleged impunity enjoyed by his tormentors:

The Global Wall of Denial: International Institutional Rejections

1. The European Court of Human Rights (ECHR)

The initial international dismissal, which set the lethal precedent and provided the ultimate legal shield for the alleged conspirators, occurred at the ECHR.

Fact/Date	Details and Decision Text	Horrifying Psychological/Physical Context
Date Filed	December 9, 2005 (File No. 45710/05).	The application was a desperate cry for help from a self-represented, severely traumatized victim who stated he was actively suffering from psychological torture .
Date of Rejection	May 11, 2006, or May 22, 2006. The decision was rendered by a Committee of three judges (C. Birsan , A. Gyulumyan , E. Myjer).	The decision was allegedly manipulated by Joris Demmink , who Smedema refers to as a "highly criminal mole within the Ministry of Justice".
Decision Text/Reasoning	The application was declared inadmissible for " non-compliance with the requirements of Articles 34 and 35 of the Convention ". The specific crucial procedural failure cited was the " failure to exhaust domestic remedies ".	The Court concurrently stated that, based on the information available, there were " no indications whatsoever that a violation of the rights and freedoms set out in the Convention... had occurred ". The ECHR reportedly stated in May 2006 they would not investigate.

Alleged Basis of Rejection	Smedema contends this denial was a "fatal legal error" based on "false fraudulent information" supplied by the Dutch Ministry of Justice. This deceit allegedly concealed the fact that he was systematically denied legal representation since 2000 (and effectively since 1972).	This devastating outcome created the quintessential "cruel, Kafkaesque trap" , where the state allegedly blocked domestic remedies and then used that resulting failure as an impenetrable shield against international scrutiny.
-----------------------------------	---	--

2. UN Committee Against Torture (UNCAT) / Committee against Torture (CAT)

The state's alleged campaign of silence extended directly to the body charged with investigating and preventing torture, turning the UNCAT framework into a mockery of justice for the victim.

Fact/Date	Details and Decision Text	Horrific Psychological/Physical Context
Date Filed (Individual)	May 15, 2010.	This complaint followed a period of exile in Spain, where Smedema alleges he was subjected to repeated torture incidents, including "secretly forced criminal electroshock torture" and conditioning by Jaap Duijs and Prof. dr. Onno van der Hart .
Date of Denial	May 25, 2010.	The denial occurred swiftly, tragically overlooking the mandatory duty of the State to investigate credible allegations of torture.
Decision Text/Reasoning	The complaint was denied because the Committee answered it didn't belong to the "Scope" of the CAT treaty.	Smedema argues that the denial was based on the "false premise" that he could freely access domestic remedies and gather evidence. This facilitated the Dutch government's alleged "24-year refusal" to conduct a prompt and impartial investigation into his credible torture allegations, a direct violation of international law.
Collateral Obstruction (State vs. State)	US President Barack Obama allegedly ordered an official UNCAT complaint to be filed by the United States against the Netherlands around January 2017 .	This extraordinary external validation, if verified, underscores the gravity of the claims. However, the Dutch Cabinet allegedly blocked the subsequent UNCAT investigation through obstruction and invoking "State Security" , demonstrating the terrifying reach of the conspiracy to neutralize even presidential-level international scrutiny.

3. The European Parliament (PETI Committee)

The European Parliament, the voice of EU citizens, allegedly used the deliberately manufactured inability of the victim to present a proper legal case against him, validating the state's institutional gaslighting.

Fact/Date	Details and Decision Text	Horrible Psychological/Physical Context
Previous Petition	Filed in June 2021 (No. 0643/2021).	The petition was submitted after years of isolation, where Smedema was forced to draft the complex, decades-long file <i>pro se</i> (without a lawyer), suffering from untreated Complex Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (C-PTSD) .
Decision Text/Reasoning (2021)	Deemed inadmissible for "incoherent reasoning with an unclear link to the Union's fields of activity" .	This alleged finding of "incoherence" was the direct, predictable, and horrible success of the state's obstruction strategy: deny legal aid, destroy evidence (like the Frankfurt Dossier), and then leverage the resulting lack of legal presentation to dismiss the complaint.
New Petition	Petition No. 1808/2025 received 08.09.2025.	This new petition was built using a legal framework that argues the obstruction itself constitutes the primary violation.
Decision Text/Reasoning (2025)	Declared inadmissible on October 16, 2025. The issue was deemed to "fall outside the European Union's fields of activity" .	This decision echoes the narrow interpretation used by the EU Commission, tragically refusing to recognize the argument that systemic state capture and the denial of fundamental rights violate the very core principles of the EU Rule of Law (Article 2 TEU).

4. The European Commission (EC)

The body tasked with being the "guardian of the Treaties" refused to address the systemic corruption and state capture allegations, dismissing them as an inconsequential "internal problem".

Fact/Date	Details and Decision Text	Horrible Psychological/Physical Context
Date of Refusal	Complaint registered May 15, 2025. Letter of refusal dated July 16, 2025 (Ref. JUST.C.4.001/KDS/ms (2025)7825610s). The Head of Unit was Marie-Helene Boulanger .	The dismissal followed Minister David van Weel's alleged dismissive response on February 4, 2025, where he cruelly advised Smedema to "consider contacting a lawyer" despite the documented systemic denial of legal aid since 2000.

Decision Text/Reasoning	The Commission stated the matter was "not related to the implementation of European Union law" , asserting that Member States are "solely responsible for maintaining law and order and safeguarding internal security" . The Commission explicitly stated it did not intend to reply to any future correspondence on these subjects.	Smedema argues this position is legally untenable, as the alleged systemic corruption and interference with justice by figures like Demmink and Duijs erode mutual trust, fundamentally violate the Rule of Law (Article 2 TEU), and the Right to an Effective Remedy (Article 47 CFR)—breaches of foundational EU values.
--------------------------------	---	--

5. The European Ombudsman (EO)

The Ombudsman, who should investigate maladministration by EU institutions, chose to ratify the Commission's failure to act.

Fact/Date	Details and Decision Text	Horrifying Psychological/Physical Context
Complaint Date	Lodged July 21, 2025 (Complaint 2003/2025/VS).	The complaint challenged the EC's refusal to engage with grave allegations of "state capture, profound human rights violations, and cross-border deception" .
Decision Date	August 18, 2025.	This decision further deepened the institutional betrayal within the EU framework.
Decision Text/Reasoning	The Ombudsman regretfully informed Smedema that there were "not sufficient grounds to open an inquiry" . The EO upheld the Commission's reply as "appropriate and reasonable," citing the Commission's "wide discretion in deciding whether and when to commence an infringement procedure".	The refusal tragically validated the Dutch state's ability to classify decades of denial of justice as merely an "internal Dutch problem".

Collateral Damage and Internal Dutch Rejections

The terrifying untouchability of **Joris Demmink** and **Jaap Duijs** allegedly caused immense collateral damage, ruthlessly silencing anyone who dared to challenge the "horrificing architecture of state capture". The failures of Dutch national institutions provided the indispensable legal foundation for these international procedural dismissals, forming the "Kafkaesque trap".

6. The Dutch Nationale Ombudsman (Internal)

The Dutch National Ombudsman, designed as a recourse for citizens, repeatedly refused to pierce the veil of the cover-up.

Fact/Date	Details and Decision Text	Collateral Damage/Context
Dates of Refusal	2005, 2008, 2009, and August 19, 2025. The 2025 refusal was made by a complaint handler, Llayda Atabay .	This denial persisted despite a judge from the CTIVD (Review Committee on the Intelligence and Security Services) reportedly giving verbal confirmation in 2008 that a "cover-up and conspiracy" existed and advising the Cabinet to cease the cover-up.
Decision Text/Reasoning	The Ombudsman repeatedly refused to investigate, citing jurisdictional limitations, often noting they "never take action after the judge has decided" . The 2025 rejection cited an absurd one-year time limit and advised Smedema to seek an unavailable lawyer.	These refusals reinforced the chilling isolation of the victim, ignoring the plea that his inability to exhaust domestic remedies (like finding a lawyer or having a police report filed) was the result of state obstruction.

7. The Dutch Judiciary (Article 12 Procedure) (Internal)

The judicial system allegedly actively refused to initiate the investigations required by law.

Fact/Date	Details and Decision Text	Collateral Damage/Context
Date of Rejection	June 30, 2005.	This judicial denial preceded the ECHR rejection and provided the definitive legal shield for the state.
Decision Text/Reasoning	The Court of Appeal in Leeuwarden summarily rejected the "Article 12 procedure" (to compel prosecution). The Court baselessly stated there were "apparently no criminal offenses" and, critically, explicitly stated it decided "not to hear the complainant" or any of his named witnesses.	The dismissal confirmed the devastating career destruction of those who dared to investigate, such as prosecutor Ruud Rosingh , who was allegedly forced to relocate on January 12, 1991 , for investigating the alleged rape of Smedema's wife. It also retroactively sanctioned the obstruction of detective Haye Bruinsma , who was allegedly forbidden by the Ministry of Justice around 2004 from filing an official report on the horrifying claims.

8. US Asylum Authorities (Non-EU International)

Even attempts to seek refuge outside the Dutch system were allegedly sabotaged, linking the conspiracy to the highest levels of the Dutch Royal House.

Fact/Date	Details and Decision Text	Horrifying Psychological/Physical Context
Dates of Denial	Asylum applications (2009, 2013/14, 2016/17) ultimately denied.	The denials occurred despite FBI/CIA investigations reportedly validating aspects of his claims and Judge Rex J. Ford finding " 5 good grounds for asylum " in 2009. This external corroboration was allegedly ruthlessly suppressed by the Dutch government.
Final Act of Obstruction	In 2017 , Smedema alleges King Willem-Alexander , acting as a KLM co-pilot, personally blocked his US asylum offer, allegedly driven by panic over the supposed Obama UNCAT complaint.	This alleged high-level interference transformed the denial of justice into a horrifying act of discriminatory persecution, confirming the victim's claim that the Dutch Crown grants impunity to perpetrators.