



The Judiciary

District Court
Northern Netherlands

Mr P.W.H. Stassen
Eindhovenseweg-Zuid 75, residential
floor (basement)
5683 PW Best

Civil Division
Leeuwarden

Visiting address
Zaailand 102
8911 BN Leeuwarden
Opening hours
08:30–17:00

Postal address
PO Box 20130
8900 HM Leeuwarden

Tel. (088) 361 1352

www.rechtspraak.nl

Please quote the date and our
reference number in your
reply. Please deal with only
one matter in your letter.

date 25 August 2026
section commercial law
Our reference
Your reference C/17/190788 / HA ZA 23/172
Enclosure(s)
re
Subject Minks/Hofstra

Dear Sir/Madam,

In response to the parties' requests regarding the live stream and the hybrid oral hearing in the above-mentioned case, I am writing to you on behalf of the court or the President of the court in connection with the Press Directive as follows.

Hybrid oral hearing

Defendants Van Cann, Jansen, Van der Voort-Kant and Bourla have requested to be allowed to participate in the oral hearing online. All four have cited travel time and distance as the reason for their request. Van Cann and Jansen have also cited the protection of their safety as a reason.

In assessing these requests, the court emphasises that an oral hearing at which all parties are physically present is always preferable and must therefore be the starting point. A hybrid oral hearing may have drawbacks. For example, the examination at the hearing may prove to be less effective if parties participate partly in person and partly remotely. A judge who receives a request from one of the parties to participate in the oral hearing via a video link must therefore always assess whether that request serves a legitimate purpose and whether that party's remote participation can be organised in such a way as to safeguard the right to a fair trial. In this regard, the nature of the proceedings and the status of the requesting party may also be relevant. Furthermore, the judge must take into account in their assessment any objection raised by (one of) the other party or parties to the granting of the request and must give reasons for their decision on this matter.

The court finds that the other parties have not raised any objections to the requests to participate in the oral hearing online. The court grants Bourla's request, on the understanding that, for the sake of completeness, the court notes that this relates to Bourla's own participation in the oral hearing (and therefore not that of someone acting on his behalf, as stated in the B16 form dated 1 June 2026). In view of the fact that he resides in the United States, the court considers the travel time and distance to be such that his request serves a legitimate purpose. The request from

date 25 August 2026
Reference C/17/190788 / HA ZA 23/172
page 2 of

Van Cann and Jansen is granted by the court, as they base this (in part) on the protection of their safety, which serves a legitimate purpose. This does not apply to the request by Van der Voort-Kant. As she has been summoned to an address in the municipality of Doesburg and has not stated that she currently resides elsewhere, the court assumes that she is resident in the municipality of Doesburg. The court does not consider the travel time and distance from the municipality of Doesburg to Leeuwarden to be so long that this factor alone justifies an exception to the main rule that a party must physically attend the oral hearing.

Live stream

The defendants Van Cann, Jansen and Van der Voort-Kant have requested not to be shown on screen or heard in the livestream that the court intends to provide of the oral hearing. The defendants, who are represented by Messrs Veldhuis and Möhring, have requested not to be shown on screen in the livestream. None of the parties has given explicit consent to the making of video and audio recordings. In accordance with the Press Guidelines 2025, the parties will therefore not be shown on camera in the live stream. However, the presiding judge has rejected the request not to be audible in the live stream, as it would undermine the public nature of the oral hearing if not everyone could be heard. This is because viewers of the live stream would then miss out on everything discussed during the oral hearing, and the live stream is specifically intended to give interested parties who cannot attend the physical hearing in person (for example, due to limited courtroom capacity in the courthouse) the opportunity to follow the proceedings.

Timetable for the oral hearing

The oral hearing will be organised in accordance with the following timetable:

- 12.30 pm: opening and introduction of the case / parties
- 12.45 pm: first round of evidence from the claimants
- 1.15 pm: first round of the defendants (Hofstra et al. 30 minutes, Van der Voort-Kant, Bourla, Van Cann et al. and Gates 10 minutes each)
- 2.25 pm: adjournment
- 2.55 pm: resumption and questions from the court to the lawyers and the parties themselves
- 3.45 pm: second session for the claimants
- 16.15: second session for the defendants (same speaking time as in the first session)
- around 17.30: adjournment.

An additional break will be taken if necessary.

date 25 August 2026
Reference C/17/190788 / HA ZA 23/172
page 3 of

Further information regarding the oral hearing

Shortly before the oral hearing, the parties will receive information from the court regarding other matters relevant to its smooth conduct, such as security measures. In order to ensure that the courtroom is arranged as effectively as possible, the court hereby requests all parties to state, no later than two weeks prior to the oral hearing, the number of people they intend to bring to the hearing.

Yours faithfully,

W. van Seijen, LL.B.

Registrar
van Seijen

