

5. Facts.

I. Introduction to the Factual Basis of the Complaint

The facts of this case detail a calculated evolution of tactics by the State Party, the Kingdom of the Netherlands, specifically the Ministry of Justice, spanning more than half a century. The timeline is divided into two distinct but inextricably linked phases. Phase I (1972-2000) details the foundational crimes of abuse and torture, which provided the motive for the State's subsequent actions. Phase II (2000-Present) documents the institutionalization of a state-orchestrated cover-up and the campaign of systemic obstruction of justice.

II. Phase I: The Foundational Crimes and State-Level Impunity (1972-2000)

- **1972: State protected torture!** The complainant's ordeal began when his then-girlfriend, Ms. Wies Jansma, was drugged, hypnotized, and tortured into becoming a "sex slave" with a dissociative identity disorder, and subsequently used in rape movies. **The perpetrators included State employees who would later rise to high-level state positions, including Mr. Joris Demmink, who eventually became the Secretary-General of the Ministry of Justice.**
- **1972-2000: State protected torture.** During this period, the complainant, Ing. Hans Smedema, alleges he was also drugged, subjected to severe trauma, secretly rendered infertile, and subjected to clandestine conditioning and brainwashing sessions (including electroshock torture) approximately every five to six years. This resulted in a 28-year period of profound amnesia and memory repression.
- **1973-1975:** The foundation for decades of impunity was allegedly laid when Her Majesty Queen Juliana issued a "Royal Special Decree." **This decree is alleged to have explicitly ordered the Ministry of Justice to ensure that no investigation or prosecution concerning these crimes would ever occur, thereby protecting the perpetrators and rendering the victims defenseless.**
- **1973 - 1981: State ordered murder.** A neighbor who investigated and came too close to the truth was murdered according to original rapist Landlord Jan van Beek. First murder attempt on complainant Jan 29, 1975 after birth of child from Jan van Beek as he planned.
- **1991:** In a concrete enforcement of this State impunity, prosecutor Mr. Ruud Rosingh, who had begun an investigation into the rape of Ms. Wies Jansma, was forcibly transferred by the Ministry of Justice. The rape-investigation was subsequently and permanently halted.
- **1972 - 2025: Forensic Resolution of the "Diagnostic Stalemate": The Clinical Validation of the Narrative:** To refute the State Party's persistent

characterization of the Complainant as suffering from a "delusional disorder," a deep clinical analysis was conducted regarding the conflicting narratives between the Complainant and his wife, Mrs. Wies Smedema-Jansma. The State has historically weaponized Mrs. Smedema's written annotations (e.g., "NOOIT GEBEURD"/Never Happened) as the primary evidence of the Complainant's insanity.

- However, the following **Deep Research Report** demonstrates that this interpretation is clinically flawed and constitutes a form of "Institutional Gaslighting". By applying the **Theory of Structural Dissociation**, the report proves that Mrs. Smedema's denials are consistent with the "Inter-Identity Amnesia" of a trauma victim (ANP/EP split), rather than the objective reality-testing of a witness. This psychological conclusion is corroborated by external, verifiable "tie-breakers," specifically the involvement of alleged perpetrator Prof. Dr. Onno van der Hart (the creator of the theory in question) and the credibility findings of US Immigration **Judge Rex J. Ford**. The summary of this forensic analysis is in Annex 12.
- **Crucially, the Complainant's spouse, W. Smedema-J., formally confirmed her support for the investigation.** In a Declaration dated April 11, 2005 (Annex 13), she explicitly stated that she **"DOES NOT object to a further investigation"** of the crimes reported by her husband and **"explicitly consents to it"**. She further asserted that the events were a **"life-altering event"** (*ingrijpende gebeurtenis*) that caused **"serious psychological and material damages"**, directly supporting the core claim of harm. The summary of this forensic analysis is in Annex 12.

III. Phase II: Alleged State Obstruction and Cover-up (2000-Present)

This section documents the alleged ongoing campaign by state actors to conceal the foundational crimes, silence the complainant, and obstruct all paths to justice.

- **March 2000:** The complainant's memories of the abuse began to return. His subsequent attempts to seek answers from authorities were met with a universal, coordinated campaign to label him as "delusional" and "insane". There have also been 5 State ordered murder attempts on his life.
- **2003 The Foundational Act of Pre-emptive Legal Sabotage:** In a State-orchestrated act of financial sabotage, Ministry agent Jaap Duijs (reporting to Secretary-General Demmink) forced the cancellation of the complainant's legal defense funds. This was a pre-emptive State measure to deny the complainant access to legal remedies (Article 13). This was not a routine administrative action but a calculated, pre-emptive strike to legally neutralize the complainant. The cancellation was allegedly achieved by covertly administering the drug Ketamine to the complainant. While he was

drugged, disoriented, and cognitively impaired, he was subjected to "hypnotic manipulation" and "overwhelming pressure like severe gaslighting and abusing his untreated C-PTSD" to sign the cancellation papers, which he signed, unaware. This absurd rare manipulation, combined with the C-PTSD, induced a state of enforced submissiveness in the complainant, compelling them to follow the instructions of agents like Mr. Duijs without question. This act occurred just months before his full memories returned, ensuring he would be financially and legally disarmed for the impending fight for justice.

- **April 26, 2004 (Police Obstruction):** The complainant presented a detailed report of the crimes to police detective Haye Bruinsma of the Drachten police. Detective Bruinsma sent it to Mevr. Duinhoven prosecutor OM Leeuwarden without making up the by complainant requested official Process-verbaal. He was in September (after an August State offer of 5 million to keep silent) subsequently and explicitly forbidden by a letter from the Ministry of Justice (via BIZA) from creating an official report (*proces-verbaal*). This document is a legally mandatory prerequisite for any criminal investigation in the Netherlands. This order blocked the first and most fundamental step of the criminal justice process.
- **June 30, 2005 (Judicial Obstruction):** The Court of Appeal in Leeuwarden summarily rejected the complainant's "Article 12 procedure" (a legal mechanism to compel prosecution). **This rejection came despite the complainant's spouse, W. Smedema-J., having formally requested on April 11, 2005, that the desired investigation be pursued specifically by "judicially established hearing of various named and known possible witnesses" to unequivocally establish what transpired (Annex 13)**

The Court baselessly stated there were 'kennelijk geen sprake van strafbare feiten' ('apparently no criminal offenses') and, critically, explicitly stated that it decided "not to hear the complainant" or any of his named witnesses.

- **2005, 2008, 2025 (Administrative Obstruction):** Complaints to the National Ombudsman were repeatedly rejected in 2005, 2008, and 2025. These rejections occurred despite the Dutch Review Committee on the Intelligence and Security Services (CTIVD) allegedly confirming in 2008 that a "cover-up and conspiracy" existed, advising the Cabinet Balkenende to stop (who refused), and informing the Ombudsman of this fact via Ministerie van Binnenlandse zaken BIZA. The final refusal occurred on August 19, 2025, via a phone call and later file on October 24 from a complaint handler who was reportedly unaware of the case history, cited a one-year time limit, and advised the complainant to "seek a lawyer".
- **2008, April 29:** CTIVD did not act (criminal obstruction) when during official hearing complainant pointed directly to Joris Demmink, then Secretary-General, between 6 photos as the serial rapist from 1972 who made

him infertile, and tortured and raped his girlfriend into a defenseless sexslave. They would advise politicians (Cabinet Balkenende) to stop the conspiracy, they told him. Obstruction by corrupt Politicians likely using art. 120 as false (based on total fraud from Joris Demmink) reason by Parlement for not investigating. Fake criminal reason.

- **2015, June 1: (The Diplomatic Warning):** During the Official State Visit of King Willem-Alexander to the United States, the US authorities (Department of Justice/State Department) explicitly flagged the "Hans Smedema Case" in a briefing document presented to the Dutch delegation (Ministry of Justice).
- **Existence of Evidence:** While the Complainant does not possess this classified diplomatic cable, he asserts its existence within the archives of both the US Department of Justice and the Dutch Ministry of Justice.
- **Significance:** This document proves that "knowledge" of the case reached the absolute highest level of the Dutch State (Head of State) and was a matter of international diplomatic concern. The fact that the obstruction continued after this specific US warning demonstrates that the cover-up is a deliberate, sovereign decision, not a bureaucratic error.
- **Investigative Request:** The Complainant explicitly requests the Committee to use its fact-finding powers to request the production of the "June 1, 2015 State Visit Briefing Notes" regarding the Smedema case from the State Party.
- **2017, Jan:** President Obama initiated an UNCAT State to State complaint against the Netherlands. But apparently the Netherlands blocked this for yet unknown reasons. Case apparently dormant or closed.
- **2017, March 16:** Based on the unfair trials against (!) him, as he was not allowed to file charges himself, for defamation of (sexual predator) Justice/Omerta agent Jaap Duijs, the complainant was totally innocent put in detention for 13 months. Together with one month Ter Apel and 15 horrifying months between asylum seekers during his 3 asylum requests in 2009, 2013/14 when 2009 was reopened, and 2016/17 **the complainant was 29 months in innocent detention. On March 15, 2017 the complainant was offered that asylum while in the air entering the jurisdiction of judge Rex J. Ford, and accepted this 3 times with witnesses, but KLM co-pilot King Willem Alexander blocked this, causing 13 months detention on arrival at Schiphol Amsterdam. KLM did not react on a request for the flight log.**
- **February 4, 2025 (The Final State Blockade):** Following a request for arbitration, the Ministry of Justice and Security (Ref: 6155331) issued a final rejection. The Ministry refused to "respond substantively" ('geen reden zie om inhoudelijk te reageren'), dismissed the detailed claims as "insufficiently substantiated" ('onvoldoende onderbouwd'), denied all liability, and cynically advised the complainant to "consider contacting a lawyer".
- **2025, July 8:** Complainant warned Spanish PM Pedro Sanchez that Spain was being betrayed by the Netherlands and asked for an investigation into the

March 24, 2022 Hospital La Marina internal file of a daily antipsychotic disguised as a baby aspirin without the knowledge of the complainant by Dutch Ministry of Justice. The American FBI/CIA already proved in 2009 the fact that the complainant was NOT delusional at all. Proof of obstruction and annihilation of the complainant.

- **October 21, 2025 (US Legal Escalation):** "Judge Rex J. Ford, on email request for help from the complainant, maintaining his long-standing involvement, advised the complainant to directly contact Todd Blanche, Deputy Attorney General DOJ. This instruction confirms ongoing US judicial recognition of the case and contradicts the State Party's dismissal of the complainant's narrative as delusional."
- **November 12, 2025 (The Final Refusal):** Following a formal "Notice of Liability" (*Aansprakelijkstelling*) sent to the State Party on October 15, 2025, which requested a substantive response within 28 days, the deadline passed. The following day, November 13, 2025, the State Ministry of Justice issued a final response (Ref: 6885286) which refused to engage substantively with the Notice of Liability and repeated the cynical advice to 'seek a lawyer'. This response serves as the State's final act of neglect, confirming its refusal to engage in any form of remedy or dialogue. **They apparently assume that the complainant cannot get a Lawyer because of the secret curatele from the Omerta Org. So they can simply wait and do nothing, as they did for 25 years.**

IV. The Mechanism of Denial: The "Secret Curatele" and "Cordon Sanitair"

- **2004-Present:** Since January 2004, the complainant has been met with a systemic, universal refusal of legal assistance from hundreds of Dutch lawyers, like all fraudulently warned specialised victim Lawyers and Organisations. This has created a "cordon sanitair" (a sanitary cordon), making it impossible to secure representation. Specifically was the appointed (deken) Lawyer Ad Speksnijder in 2006, who was ordered (!) not to provide legal aid! Up to the 'Hof van Discipline' all Lawyers refused both in Friesland and later in Groningen too! Evidence available. Absurd, because of the 'Innocent until proven otherwise' doctrine was criminally totally neglected. Annex 8 and 9.
- **The "Secret Curatele" Hypothesis:** The complainant posits the hypothesis that this otherwise inexplicable, universal refusal is the direct result of his being secretly and unlawfully placed under a de facto state of guardianship (*curatele*) in the 1970s based on fraud and manipulation. But lawyers should have warned the complainant about such a crucial fact causing immense suffering and financial duress.
- Under Dutch law, this measure would render the complainant "legally incompetent" (*handelingsonbekwaam*) and legally unable to perform independent legal acts, such as hiring a lawyer or filing a lawsuit. Any contract

he signed would be "null and void ab initio".

- This "secret curatele" (the legal sabotage) and the 2003 'DAS' insurance cancellation (the financial sabotage) represent a unified, two-pronged strategy by the State Party to ensure the complainant could never access justice, thereby "engineering the collapse of domestic remedies".

Remember that all hundreds of Posts about crimes on hanssmedema.info, legal complaints domestic and international, keeping all crucial information filed, had to be done **without** (!) any legal help. And that while suffering from untreated C-PTSD, and behind your back being treated like the village-idiot. People even warned others to stay away from me. On specific requests I can give more information easily in max a day.

The absurd simple truth behind this all is when I met Joris Demmink in 1972, I warned him not to harm my mentally weak girlfriend. Being two Alfa-Male he secretly started to destroy the rest of my life by drugging, torture and even personality changing mutilating my brain through illegal Electroshock torture by a bribed professional traumatologist.

6. Please include information on steps you have taken to exhaust domestic remedies:

Domestic remedies have not been exhausted because they are unavailable, ineffective, and have been systematically and intentionally foreclosed by the State Party through a coordinated, multi-decade campaign of obstruction. **The procedural requirement under Article 22(5)(b) of the Convention is therefore inapplicable as a matter of law.**

The unavailability of remedies was actively "engineered" by the State Party through two primary mechanisms:

1. **Systemic Denial of Legal Representation:** The most fundamental tool for accessing remedies—legal counsel—has been rendered unavailable. This is evidenced by the "cordon sanitair" (the systemic, universal refusal of hundreds of lawyers to provide assistance since 2004). This is plausibly explained by the "secret curatele" hypothesis, which would make it legally impossible for the complainant to retain counsel.
2. **Pre-emptive Financial Sabotage:** The State Party "maliciously manufactured" the complainant's inability to seek remedies by orchestrating the 2003 coerced and fraudulent cancellation of his 'DAS Rechtsbijstand' legal insurance. This was a premeditated act to ensure he would be financially disarmed.

Every attempt by the complainant to engage with domestic authorities *pro se* has been met with an active blockade. The primary steps taken and their predetermined outcomes include:

- **April-Sept 2004 (Dutch Police):** A formal attempt to file charges (Drachten Police, Det. Haye Bruinsma) regarding torture and conspiracy was blocked. Detective Bruinsma was explicitly forbidden by the Ministry of Justice to create an official report (*proces-verbaal*), thereby blocking the investigation. (Annex 1)
- **April 2005 (W. Smedema-J. Declaration):** The complainant's spouse formally declared her full consent to a further investigation and explicitly requested that the investigation be conducted by judicially hearing named witnesses to determine the truth and confirm the serious psychological and material damages they both suffered (Annex 13).
- **June 2005 (Court of Appeal, Leeuwarden):** An "Article 12 procedure" to compel the Public Prosecution Service to investigate was summarily rejected. The Court found "apparently no criminal offenses" and explicitly decided "not to hear the complainant" or his witnesses. (Annex 2)
- **2005 & 2008 (National Ombudsman):** Complaints regarding systemic obstruction and the failure of the justice system to investigate were repeatedly refused, with the Ombudsman citing jurisdictional limitations. (Annex 3)
- **2008 (CTIVD):** Following a complaint, the CTIVD (Intelligence Review Committee) held an official hearing and reportedly advised the Cabinet to stop the "cover-up" and conspiracy. This was refused and later denied. (Annex 4)
- **Aug-Oct 2025 (National Ombudsman):** A renewed complaint citing new evidence was rejected. A complaint handler, unaware of the case history, refused to investigate, citing an absurd one-year time limit and advising the complainant to seek a lawyer (despite their known unavailability). (Annex 5)
- **Jan-Feb 2025 (Ministry of Justice):** A formal notice of liability and request for arbitration was rejected (Ref: 6155331). The Ministry refused to "respond substantively," dismissed the 'Kafkaesque-trap' claims as "insufficiently substantiated," and denied all liability. (Annex 6)
- **Oct-Nov 2025 (Ministry of Justice & Prime Minister):** A final "Notice of Liability" and request for arbitration was submitted. The State's response (Ref: 6885286), received Nov 13, 2025, again refused to respond substantively, repeating its previous advice to seek a lawyer. (Annex 7)
- **March 12, 2007** Hof van Discipline refusal Friesland (Annex 8)
- **April 13, 2007** Hof van Discipline refusal Groningen (Annex 9)
- **March 15, 2017** KLM Co-Pilot King WA blocked the Asylum I was offered (Annex 10)
- **November 18, 2025 (The Final Act of Exhaustion):** On November 18, 2025, the Dean of the Bar Association (Dean I. Aardoom-Fuchs) formally rejected the complainant's request for a lawyer, citing that the claim against the State was "insufficiently substantiated" which is not true. No Lawyer has recently talked about this case. They keep the real *raison* hidden for the complainant.

Declaration of Exhaustion by Futility:

With this rejection, the complainant formally declares that he has ceased all further attempts to secure legal counsel within the Netherlands. He will not file a pro forma appeal to the Hof van Discipline, as doing so would be futile and constitute participation in the State's stalling tactics.

Justification for Ceasing Domestic Remedies:

The "Catch-22" is Confirmed: The Dean's rejection confirms the circular trap: The Ministry refuses to investigate without "substantiated" claims, but the Bar Association refuses to appoint a lawyer to help substantiate those claims because they are not yet "substantiated". There is no exit from this loop within the domestic system.

Unreasonable Prolongation: The complainant has sought legal help for over 20 years (since 2004). Requiring a 77-year-old victim of torture to file yet another administrative appeal after two decades of rejection violates the "unreasonably prolonged" exception of UNCAT Article 22(5)(b).

The Article 12 Obligation: The State is attempting to shift the burden of its own treaty violation onto the victim. Under UNCAT Article 12, the State's obligation to investigate is triggered by "reasonable grounds," not by the presence of a lawyer. The complainant asserts that the 50 years of evidence provided is sufficient to trigger this obligation. The State's refusal to act ex officio is the violation; the lack of a lawyer is merely the excuse.

Conclusion: Domestic remedies are not just exhausted; they are proven to be structurally unavailable. The complainant submits this case to the Committee pro se.

These final refusals confirm the absolute and irreversible foreclosure of all domestic remedies. The evidence irrefutably demonstrates a complete and deliberate collapse of available domestic remedies, orchestrated by the State Party itself.

List of evidence annexes part 6:

1. Annex 1 - Police not allowed to file charges
2. Annex 2 - Art. 12 procedure refused
3. Annex 3 - Ombudsman refusals 2005 and 2008
4. Annex 4 - CTIVD official hearing April 29, 2008, BIZA advise Ombudsman
5. Annex 5 - Ombudsman rejection Oct 24, 2025
6. Annex 6 - Rejection Ministry of Justice arbitration request (via State Counsel)
7. Annex 7 - Rejection Ministry of Justice Formal "Notice of Liability" (Aansprakelijkstelling)
8. Annex 8 - Hof van Discipline refusal Friesland
9. Annex 9 - Hof van Discipline refusal Groningen
10. Annex 10 - KLM refusal to answer on request for flight-log
11. Annex 11 - Detailed Factual Response to Questions 5 - 8
12. Annex 12 - Clinical Analysis of the Smedema-Jansma Psychological Dyad
13. Annex 13 - Wiesverklaring
14. Annex 14 - International Institutional Rejections

7. Claims

The facts and circumstances described constitute direct, flagrant, and ongoing violations of the State Party's most fundamental obligations under the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (UNCAT).

I. Violation of Article 1 (Definition of Torture) and Article 16 (Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment)

The acts described meet all constituent elements of torture: (1) the intentional infliction of (2) severe pain or suffering, whether physical or mental, (3) for purposes such as intimidation, coercion, and enforcing submission, (4) by or with the consent or acquiescence of public officials.

Physical and Chemical Torture: This includes the clandestine electroshock conditioning torture sessions conducted by Prof. Dr. Onno van der Hart (a state-bribed actor) and the decades-long secret administration of antipsychotics (Risperdal) and ketamine, often disguised as "baby aspirin," to achieve "chemical submission," mutilate brain function, and suppress memories.

Systemic Psychological Torture (The Ongoing Violation): The State Party's coordinated, decades-long campaign of "institutional gaslighting" constitutes an independent and ongoing act of psychological torture under Article 1 and/or CIDT under Article 16. This ongoing campaign, designed to conceal the foundational crimes and silence the complainant, has transformed into a perfected and institutionalized continuation of the initial abuse and constitutes a severe form of **psychological warfare**. By weaponizing state institutions (the judiciary, state-sponsored psychiatry) to procure official reports and tribunal rulings declaring the complainant "Delusional" and suffering from a "waanstoornis", the State is intentionally inflicting severe mental suffering. The clear purpose of this campaign is to destroy the complainant's credibility and sanity, intimidate him into silence, and thereby ensure impunity for the original crimes. **This "weaponization of psychiatry" with a "retaliatory aim" and "intended to exert control" is a recognized form of inhuman treatment, as validated by the European Court of Human Rights' 2025 judgment in SPIVAK v. UKRAINE (Application no. 21180/15).**

The "Deep Research Report" solidifies the claim of psychological torture by defining the State's actions as verified "Institutional Gaslighting". By systematically ignoring the clinical evidence of C-PTSD and Structural Dissociation, and instead weaponizing a false diagnosis of "delusional disorder," the State created a "plausibility structure" of corruption. This was not merely a medical error but a calculated strategy to erode the victim's sense of reality and destroy his credibility. This constitutes severe mental suffering under Article 1, as it transforms the victim's seek for truth into a pathology,

effectively neutralizing his human rights through psychiatric labeling.

II. Violations of Article 12 (Failure to Investigate) & Article 13 (Denial of Right to Complain)

Article 12 of the Convention imposes a non-derogable obligation on the State Party to proceed to a "prompt and impartial investigation, wherever there is reasonable ground to believe that an act of torture has been committed".

The State Party has been aware of credible, detailed allegations of torture since at least 2000 and was formally presented with them in a detailed report in April 2004. The State Party's response has been a direct, flagrant, and continuous violation of Article 12. The evidence of this violation is definitive:

1. The explicit order from the Ministry of Justice in 2004 to police detective Haye Bruinsma not to create an official report (*proces-verbaal*).
2. The 2005 Court of Appeal's refusal to hear the complainant or his witnesses.
3. The February 4, 2025, final rejection from the Ministry of Justice, which dismissed the claims as "insufficiently substantiated".

This continuous, 21-year refusal to launch any form of investigation simultaneously renders the complainant's right to complain under Article 13 completely illusory and violates Article 13 in toto.

III. Violation of Article 14 (Denial of Redress and Rehabilitation)

Article 14 guarantees the victim of torture an enforceable right to redress, including "fair and adequate compensation" and "the means for as full rehabilitation as possible".

By systematically blocking any and all pathways to an investigation (Art. 12) and a complaint (Art. 13), the State Party has deliberately foreclosed any possibility of redress, in total violation of Article 14. This denial of redress has resulted in catastrophic and quantifiable damages, including the loss of a successful career (valued at €145,000 per year), the costs of forced exile, and profound, clinically recognizable psychological trauma. An external legal assessment in 2009 by DOJ has provided a credible benchmark for these damages at US\$50 million to US\$100 million. In 2009 I agreed with American Judge Rex J. Ford and the DOJ to pay 50% of all damages to reward the huge costs and dilemmas the Netherlands has caused upon American officials and many others involved. This cooperation remains active; on October 21, 2025, Judge Ford explicitly instructed the complainant to elevate the matter by contacting Todd Blanche, the Deputy Attorney General, further validating the international scope and legitimacy of these claims."

In calculating the damages this should be taken into account.

There is a lot of collateral damage and ruined lives after this estimate by third parties in the Netherlands, Spain and America too. Inside the Dutch Ministry of Justice and other Ministries many honest people were also innocently fired or harassed.

Furthermore, as part of the right to "redress," the complainant claims the cost of a specific, non-monetary remedy of "Satisfaction" (per UNCAT General Comment No. 3), which the State has refused to provide. The State's psychological torture was the systematic destruction of the complainant's reputation via "institutional gaslighting". The only proportionate remedy is the restoration of that reputation through the "full and public disclosure of the truth".

Therefore, the complainant claims the quantifiable cost of €850,000 plus oversight by complainant, or 1 Million euro to independently commission a professional, feature-length investigative documentary to achieve this "Satisfaction" and "Guarantee of Non-Repetition," which the State is obligated under Article 14 to provide but has failed to do. A public documentary is essential to expose internationally the specific methods of psychological manipulation and absurd rare enforced submission used, thereby preventing other victims from falling into the same trap. Annex 10.

8. Interim Measures.

Yes, the complainant formally and urgently requests that the Committee recommend interim measures under Rule 114 of its rules of procedure.

I. Justification for Urgent Request (Irreparable Harm)

Such measures are essential to prevent irreparable harm to the complainant. The ongoing risk is acute and demonstrated by the following factors:

1. The complainant's advanced age of 77.
2. His status of forced exile and resulting precarious financial situation with huge debts and maxed out credit card.
3. The severe and continuous psychological trauma inflicted by the State Party's ongoing, decades-long campaign of denial, obstruction, and "institutional gaslighting." This situation requires his special mental stimulation with abnormal costs.

The State's active continuation of this harm is proven by the Ministry of Justice's final rejection letters of February 4 and November 13, 2025 by its subsequent refusal to respond substantively to the formal Notice of Liability by the November 12, 2025 deadline. Justice delayed any further is justice denied in its most irreversible form.

II. Requested Measure 1: Cessation of Ongoing Violations and Obstruction of Justice

The complainant requests that the Committee call upon the State Party to take the following immediate measures to halt the irreparable harm of the ongoing obstruction:

1. Cease all forms of harassment, surveillance, and psychological pressure against the complainant.
2. Take immediate and verifiable steps to secure and preserve all relevant files, records, and evidence related to this case held within the Ministry of Justice, the General Intelligence and Security Service (AIVD), and other state bodies, including

declassifying to prevent any further destruction or concealment of information, **specifically including the briefing documents from the June 1, 2015 State Visit regarding the US DOJ warning.**

3. Immediately and verifiably remove all legal and administrative blockades, including any de facto or secret "curatele" (guardianship), that are "illegally blocking" the complainant and preventing him from retaining legal counsel and accessing domestic courts.
4. Force the State to act instantly (after 25 years of horrifying stalling) within two calendar weeks, or pay a fine of 20.000 euro for each calendar week without legally acting including the two weeks, to the complainants 'Stichting Smedema Redress' or another name to be chosen. It should be higher than 4% of 50 million euro or they will drag it on for months if not years by appealing and other acts.

III. Requested Measure 2: Immediate Establishment of a Legal Aid Fund

The complainant's primary and most urgent request is that the Committee recommend the State Party immediately establish a dedicated and sufficient legal aid fund.

- **Justification:** This is an absolute necessity. It is the only action that can begin to remedy the foundational injustice of the State-engineered denial of legal representation, which is an ongoing violation. Without access to competent legal counsel, the complainant remains systemically disempowered and unable to effectively pursue justice, thus perpetuating the cycle of abuse and impunity.
- **Access to Justice (The "Stichting" Solution):** Because the State has blocked my ability to hire counsel (via the secret curatele), the **only** way to ensure my safety and legal representation during this process is to mandate funds be released to an independent entity (the Stichting). To ensure this remedy is effective and to bypass the State's own "curatele" trap, the complainant requests that the Committee specify that these funds be paid directly into a new, independent *Stichting* (foundation), to be established by the complainant for the purpose of financing all legal actions in this case and to take over all legal rights to redress, damages and others from complainant Smedema. This "ownerless" legal entity can legally receive funds and hire lawyers even if the complainant as an individual is unlawfully blocked by a secret *curatele*, or dies.
- **Quantum Justification:** The fund must be sufficient for this complex international case. Its amount is justified by:
 1. **Restitution:** At least €50,000 (plus inflation) as *restitutio in integrum* for the tortious and fraudulent 2003 cancellation of the complainant's 'DAS' legal insurance.
 2. **Precedent:** The €172,000 benchmark 2015 (237,000 in 2025) of state-paid legal costs in the related "Demmink affair," which provides an objective, state-verified standard for a case of this nature.