23rd November 2018 **UNOFFICIAL ENGLISH TRANSLATION**
District Court The Hague

PETITION FOR PRELIMINARY WITNESS INTERROGATION EX ARTICLE 186 - 1 DCCP*
(*Dutch Code of Civil Proceedings)

Respectfully let it be known:
The Foundation 'e-Court Foundation', located in Amsterdam, hereinafter referred to as "e-Court" and/or the Applicant, chooses for this court-case to reside with Mr. M.Ch. Kaaks and Mr. O.M.B.J. Volgenant, both lawyers at Boekx Advocaten (1017 NA) Amsterdam at the Leidsegracht 9, and who are both appointed by the Applicant as lawyer and acting as such on her behalf, with the right of substitution;

Addressee in this matter is:
The State of the Netherlands (the Council for the Judiciary), chairing in The Hague, ex art. 48 DCCP at the address of the Office of the Prosecutor-general at the Supreme Court of the Netherlands at the Korte Voorhout 8 in (2511 EK) The Hague.

I. Introduction and background

1. e-Court offers independent and impartial private justice at a low cost, by means of arbitration, whereby the proceedings usually take place online. e-Court is also committed to the modernisation and digitization of (public and private) justice in the Netherlands and to for a cultural change within the debt collection practice.

2. For some time, e-Court has been systematically unlawfully thwarted by the state, at least by the Council for Justice and the judiciary. The obstruction seems to be fuelled by competition motives. The judiciary pretends to act as a safeguard for the quality of justice, a fortiori; to protect the rule of law. In this manner they try to give the obstruction a false justification.

3. e-Court is a direct competitor of the State Judiciary branch (the Judiciary Council), especially in the debt collection practice (Canton proceedings). As it happens, the State has been making substantial profits on this type of court cases, due to charging excessive court fees to those who seek justice.

4. Recently, a judge expressed this in 'NRC Handelsblad' as follows (Production 1):

> "(…) *Unfortunately, the state has started to exploit parts of the judiciary. In 2017, the Ministry of Justice (...) received an amount of more than ninety million euros in court fees in Canton proceedings (..). While the same ministry paid more than 54 million to the judiciary as compensation for those cases being finalized. That is a "profit" of 36 million on a part of the State task that should have nothing to do with profitability (...) It is very inappropriate that someone who wants to collect an unpaid account must pay more for costs that seem to be somewhere else be made.*
> *We have seen a decrease of 220,000 canton cases in seven years (from 575,000 to 353,000). Not so strange: an entrepreneur who wants to collect a debt of, for example € 800,--by means of a judgement, pays €476,--registrar, in addition to other costs such as the summons fees and his lawyer or agent. That is a huge cost, while it is not certain that his counterparty can pay (in full). After all, the number of people with problematic debts is increasing. There is little point to the fact that there will be a total disruption when it becomes known that many companies are no longer collecting small claims, let's say below € 1,000,--because it is too expensive.*

One could even argue that proper access to justice is hampered if inappropriate tariffs are applied."

5. Through cost sentencing in default verdicts over the course of many years, consumers have been massively forced to make a disproportionately high financial contribution to the public judiciary. The Judicial branch has tolerated this abuse for years at the expense of the consumer because of the financial 'profit' model of the so-called system of 'output financing '. It is precisely here, that e-Court meets a social need by offering high-quality private justice at low cost.

6. Based on positive experiences, the e-Court initiative has been embraced since 2016, by court bailiffs, and by companies and institutions that have started to use the services of e-Court, such as Bol.com and health insurers. Not only are they saving costs, which is by definition beneficial for litigants (plaintiffs and defendants), but e-Court also has also succeeded in increasing the number of *last minute* Payments and amicable arrangements, and in reducing the number of legal proceedings/convictions.

7. According to the Dutch health insurer CZ This has even led to 2/3 decrease in the number of lawsuits against its customers (Production 2). "*In recent years we see that via e-Court, compared to the trial at the Cantonal Court, an insured person tells his story much more often. As a result, in three times as many cases, the insured person was helped with a tailor made solution."* In addition, in terms of quality, e-Court is no different from the Cantonal Court. On the contrary, tore control and review is performed than what is done in practice in comparable Canton cases.

8. Because the State is experiencing a financial disadvantage due to a sharp decline in the number of debt collection cases (its profitable collection practice is declining), it has decided, evidently from competitive considerations, to intervene

9. The State has made it impossible for e-Court to render its services. By doing so, the State acts unlawfully.

10. The unlawful acts consist of:
    (1) spreading slur, defamatory statements and harmful falsehoods about e-Court; and
    (2) shutting down e-Court in February 2018, since all courts in the Netherlands were advised or instructed[1] to refuse permission for execution of e-Court (arbitral) verdicts.[2]

11. The damage that e-Court suffers from this and will suffer in the future, cannot be established exactly for the time being, but it will exceed millions of euros. The damage consists of, on the one hand, the loss of revenue from February 2018 onwards, because e-Court was unable to continue its services from one day to the other, and thus even endangered its continuity, and on the other hand, of damages and reputational damages.

12. By means of a preliminary witness interrogation, e-Court wishes to examine the State's conduct further. In particular, e-Court wishes to ask witnesses on the facts relating to the unlawful acts

[1] by the National consultations contents civil and cantonal & supeDCCPision (LOVCK&T, formerly LOVCK).
[2] In order to obtain an enforceable title, e-Court (for the time being) is depending on the courts where it files its petitions for exequatur/permission for execution of the arbitral verdicts.

referred to in paragraph 10, and to the question of who is responsible for it.

13. This will allow e-Court to then determine whether the facts constitute sufficient basis for proceedings to establish the unlawfulness of the State's conduct in court and to claim compensation.

14. This is explained further in the paragraphs below.

II. Media assault on e-Court from the judiciary: the ' black hole '

15. On January 17, 2018, two articles were published, in 'De Groene Amsterdammer' and at 'Investico'.

16. In 'De Groene' an article was published that day under the title 'Verdict for Sale' (Production 3). The first paragraph is as follows:

> "*Entrepreneurs have set up a private shadow court that acts in contravention of EU Consumer Law and the European Convention on Human Rights. Nevertheless, almost all health insurers now summon their customers before this ' robot judge' for in case of payment problems. The real judge is out of play and a mere spectator. "*

17. At Investico, an article was also published that day under the title 'Advancing robot judge acts contrary to the law; Judges and professors denounce private 'court' e-Court ' (Production 4). The first paragraph of that publication reads:

> *"Millions of customers from almost all health insurers and internet shop Bol.com are now being sued before the private "court" e-Court. That Internet court makes rulings via a computer-controlled robot judge, publishes no verdicts and keeps secret which arbitrators supervise the proceedings. The procedure is in contravention of EU Consumer Law and of the European Convention on Human Rights, according to real judges and experts in the field of consumer protection, as research shows done by the platform for investigative journalism Investico in Cooperation with Nieuwsuur and De Groene."*

18. Judging from the content of the publications, members of the State judiciary have cooperated. The Chairman of the Judiciary Council, Frits Bakker, also appears to have been part of this publicitary offensive. He has, inter alia, agreed to be interview in advance about the publications for the program Nieuwsuur van Dutch State Television Broadcasting Station NPO2, which was broadcasted on the same day, 17 January 2018 at 22.00 pm (Production 5). Thus, an enormous wave of negative publicity was poured out over e-Court – and it came as a total surprise for e-Court.

19. Mr Bakker made the following statement with certainty, as part of the broadcast of Nieuwsuur of 17 January 2018 on e-Court (the broadcast is online under the title *' Robot Judge E-court is a big and not transparent black hole '* And is on the USB stick at Production 5):

> "*We know what quality the State judiciary branch supplies. We have no clue whatsoever what quality e-Court supplies." And "I think it's also a bit of a black hole, how your case is handled there. Because you do not know exactly who the arbitrators are. You don't know if that's a lawyer. Uh, no idea. We don't know it either. "*

20. On the Website of Nieuwsuur the following extract of the statement from this broadcast is given:

> *"But the judiciary is critical." No one knows what happens at E-Court, says the chairman of the Judiciary Council Frits Bakker. "I think it's a big black hole. You don't know who the arbitrator is and you don't know what he can. Actually you have no idea "."*

21. The chosen negative *One-liner* by Mr Bakker on e-Court – 'A big black hole' – was chosen as a title for the statements of the State Broadcasting Services NOS (Production 5), and then taken over by all other media.

22. In the broadcast of Nieuwsuur on e-Court dated February 16, 2018 titled *'Robot Judge e-Court in trouble now that judgments are no longer being approved '*, the video clip of the broadcast of 17 January 2018 is repeated in its entirety (Production 5).

23. The information on the website of the NOS about the broadcast of Nieuwsuur dated 16 February 2018 again contains an extract of the statement by Mr Bakker from the broadcast of 17 January 2018, as follows (Production 5)*:*

> *"The State Judiciary is critical of the digital court. The chairman of the Judiciary Council, Frits Bakker, earlier expressed his fear that e-Court is damaging the legal rights of citizens. "e-Court is cheaper, but there is probably a lot in it for legal protection, while the quality of the district Court is guaranteed." He called the company a big black hole. "No one knows what happens at E-Court. You don't know who the arbitrator is and you don't know what he can. Actually, you have no idea. "*

24. It was foreseeable for chairman Bakker that his statements would cause major reputational damage to e-Court. The Judiciary Council's opinion weighs very heavily as it stands in high esteem; journalists do not doubt the correctness of his statement and they have accepted it without hesitation. His statement has been widely disseminated via television, radio and the internet,

which immediately created an extremely negative image, against which it was almost impossible for e-Court – and it still is – to defend itself.

25. e-Court summoned President Bakker to revoke his rulings or to rectify, which he, however, refused (Productions 6 and 7).

26. Also on 17 January 2018, the Judiciary Council issued its own press release entitled '*Lower the court fees to ensure access to justice*' (Production 8). The call for a reduction in court fees is based on the negative media statements, and is the direct response to the successful rise of e-Court.

27. E-court also found that other members of the judiciary have been negative about e-Court and/or contributed to the negative imaging and/or attempted to made attempts to call for lower court fees in response to the success of e-Court since 17 January 2018 (Production 9).

28. Everything suggests that there has been a national, wide-ranging degree of cooperation and coordination within the Judiciary branch, in order to disseminate, among other things, the following falsehoods and erroneous assumptions by the press:
    - Arbitration was said to be no (full) substitute of public justice[3];
    - e-Court was said to hold civilians away from the public courts against their will, on a large scale;
    - Citizens were supposedly insufficiently informed or they would be incapable to assess their position, when it comes to the choice of private court proceedings by e-Court;
    - e-Court was thought not be transparent, f.e. would not hand over the list of arbitrators to litigants;
    - Large-market parties were said to try and circumvent public courts, supported by court bailiffs, and they would only have turned to e-Court in their hope to obtain a swift, inexpensive and uncritical verdict;
    - No one would supposedly know what the e-Court working methods are, who the arbitrators are, what their qualifications are or how a judgment is created;
    - The State judiciary is supposedly the best geschilbeslechter; and
    - e-Court is supposedly a danger to legal protection, because one supposedly loses out on quality and/or e-Court endangers the rule of law.

III. The shutdown of e-Court

29. In the commotion that was thus created, a justification or concrete reason was found for the shutdown of e-Court in February 2018. However, this shutdown also seems to have a long preparation.

30. Over a year earlier, in January 2017 (Production 10), the LOVCK&T had suddenly 'decided' that they stopped the practice of issuing the 'exequaturs' (permission for execution of an arbitral verdict) in compliance with article 22 Wgbz.[4] Until then, e-Court paid a single court fee for one permission (ruling) for the execution of a single arbitral verdict. Suddenly, there would be multiple court fees to be paid for one permission. In fact, e-Court used the legal arrangement of the merging of proceedings into one (one court case and one verdict),[5] but the LOVCK&T thought it would

[3] This, whilst (1) arbitration is traditionally a full-fledged alternative for public case law, in national and international cases, according to Parliamentary history, and (2) the State has attempted over the last decades to reduce the role of public courts and to promote alternative dispute resolution.

[4] The text reads: "*For each (...) ruling/permission (...) a court fee of € 122 is charged. "*

[5] Since the new Arbitration law came into effect as of 1 January 2015, parties may designate a third party to decide on the manner and the legal consequences of merging arbitral proceedings. At e-Court, the administrator is appointed as such.

benefit its own business operations to generate more income from e-Court verdicts. They also realized that e-Court could be made more expensive and unattractive via this 'decision' than the State Cantonal court.

31. On that basis, e-Court proceeded to a different way of merging within the scope of the laws and regulations, so that it could continue its service, in the interest of litigants. After January 2017, there was ongoing turmoil within the Judiciary branch because of the sharp decline in the number of debt collection cases and its consequences for its own position (lagging results on financial targets). This became apparently by the questions received by court bailiffs from the public courts. That was the situation by the end of 2017.

32. Without any prior notice, let alone any prior consultation, it turned out in February 2018 that exequaturs (permissions) would no longer be granted for any arbitral verdict of e-Court with immediate effect, based on the 'recommendation' of LOVCK&T. First of all, 'prejudicial questions' would have to be presented to the Supreme Court, in relation to the scope of the marginal review by the public court for arbitration. An argument for this last decision was not mentioned.

33. It was refused to continue the issuing of exequaturs for the time being, pending the answer to the prejudicial questions referred. By doing so, the activities of e-Court were deliberately shut down.

34. The shutdown is at odds with article 1063 para 1 DCCP (marginal review), article 392 para 2 DCCP, article 392 para 6 DCCP, as well as with article 26 DCCP (Prohibition to refuse justice).

35. Another publication by Investico shows that within the Public Judiciary as far back as 2016, there has been talk of the – apparently existing – desire to transform the marginal review of e-Court judgments into a full review (Production 11). e-Court was not informed at all about this. The pursuit of a full review by the judiciary seems to be aimed at making e-Court completely redundant.

36. There was no serious argument in favor of such a draconian measure as a complete shutdown, so that e-Court has good reasons to believe that this measure has long been prepared. Its timing seems mainly motivated by the sudden sharp decline in the number of debt collection (default) cases at the Cantonal courts. The occasion the pr was then served by the negative publicity created by the judiciary itself, in order to get rid of a difficult competitor.

IV. Damages

37. It has now become clear that the behavior of the State, namely the negative and incorrect expressions and the shutdown of e-Court, has caused major damage to e-Court, even in such a way, that its existence is threatened. For this reason, e-Court is considering civil proceedings because of illegal (government) deeds.

V. Legal framework

38. Before initiating civil proceedings, e-Court has a right and an interest in requesting preliminary witness interrogations.

39. On the basis of art. 186 paragraph 1 DCCP, a preliminary witness interrogation may be ordered forthwith at the request of the person concerned in cases where evidence is authorized by the law by means of witnesses, before a court case is actually pending.

40. The Supreme Court has issued the following ruling in 1995 on the character of the provisional witness interrogation[6]:

> *"3.4.4 The preliminary witnesses interrogation (...) aims to make it possible not only that witness statements can be made soon after the occurrence of controversial facts, and to avoid that evidence is lost; but it also extends, in particular, to interested parties in a case which may subsequently be brought before the civil court - by the party who intends to initiate such proceedings, the party who expects it to be filed against him or a third party who has other interests, to provide the opportunity to clarify the facts (perhaps not yet exactly known), in order to enable them to better assess their position, in particular as regards the question against whom the proceedings must be brought. "*

41. A preliminary witness interrogation before proceedings may be requested for three reasons, namely (i) preventing evidence from being lost; (ii) being able to assess whether it is advisable to commence proceeding by providing clarification in advance, of the facts and circumstances which are relevant to the decision of the dispute, which may not be exactly known to the requesting party; and (iii) providing evidence of facts and circumstances which the requesting party will have to produce in any future proceedings. In the case of e-Court, in particular, reasons (ii) and (iii) apply.

42. The Supreme Court has recently once again stressed that the right to hold a preliminary witness hearing is broad. The starting point is that a request is assigned.[7]

43. The Applicant for a preliminary witness interrogation must under art. 187 Paragraph 3, introductory words and (a) and (b), DCCP state in its application, and indication of the nature and quantification of the claim and the facts or rights which it intends to prove. He must do so in such a way that for the judge who has to decide on the request, the judge for whom the interrogation will be held, as well as the other party, it is sufficiently clear to which event the interrogation will relate. It is not necessary for the applicant to accurately indicate in the petition which facts and statements support his claim, nor the facts on which he wishes to hear witnesses.[8]

---

[6] HR 24 March 1995, ECLI: NL: HR: 1995: ZC1683, NJ 1998.414 m. nt. P. Flax. Recently repeated in HR 22 December 2017, ECLI: NL: hr: 2017:3250, NJ 2018.45

[7] See Supreme Court NL 7 September 2018, ECLI: NL: HR: 2018:1433.

[8] See A.O. HR 19 February 1993, ECLI: NL: hr: 1993: ZC0878, NJ 1994/345 m. nt. The latest HR 22 December 2017, ECLI: hr: 2017:3250, NJ 2018/45.

44. The fact that it is not possible to produce documents and that knowledge is lacking about the actual circumstances cannot be a reason for rejection of the request.[9] It is precisely in the event that the preliminary witness interrogation seeks to retrieve relevant facts and circumstances prior to any proceedings, such a condition would go against the nature of the preliminary witness interrogation. The preliminary witness interrogation is designed for the purpose of allowing to specify the claim further. The specification of the claim and the *probandum* of the preliminary witness interrogation should therefore not be subject to excessive demands.[10]

45. Neither does the applicant have to state the exact nature of the claim to be set up and, where appropriate, the exact amount of the damages suffered. A request for preliminary witness interrogation should in fact, enable the applicant to assess whether it makes sense to start a proposed action. Therefore, in the procedure for the holding of a preliminary witness question, the applicability of the claim referred to in the application for review is not valid.[11]

46. According to settled case-law, a request for the holding of a provisional witness hearing, if it satisfies the requirements for the allocation thereof, may be rejected (i) on the ground that the power to engage in this plea is abused (Article. 3:13 BW), (ii) on the ground that the request is contrary to a good procedural order, and (iii) on the ground that the request is against another objection judged by the judge ponderous. Furthermore, there is no authority to request a preliminary witness hearing if the applicant has insufficient interest in its allocation (art. 3:303 BW). These rejection grounds are not present in this case.

VI. Research through witnesses

47. As explained in the above statement, an investigation by means of witness interrogation is indicated. e-Court is entitled and has sufficient interest for these hearings to be ordered without delay.

48. This is mainly about further research into the following facts:
    1. What is the reason that the State (the Judiciary Council, the LOVCK&T and others) have actively thwarted the functioning of e-Court? When and by whom has been talked about e-Court, and what has been discussed?
    2. To what extent is the media action of the Judiciary Council (or members of the Judiciary branch) defined by the wish to close or shutdown e-Court? When and with whom has been talked about the public statements issued by the Judiciary Council(and others) concerning e-Court, and what has been discussed?

49. To this end, e-Court wishes to hear the following witnesses:
    A. Dr. R.C. Hartendorp, judge in The Hague;
    B. Mr. F.C. Bakker, chairman of the Judiciary Council;

---

[9] Asser Procedural Law/Asser 3 2013/240, with reference to HR 19 February 1993, ECLI: NL: hr: 1993: ZC0878, NJ 1994/345 m. nt. A.

[10] The petition has to contain (only) the core of the facts that qualify as the basis for the claim (s), see HR 13 September 2002, ECLI: NL: hr: 2002: AE3345, NJ 2004/18 m. nt. A. See also Asser procedural law/Asser 3 2013/240 and A-G wesseling-van Gent in its conclusion before HR 22 December 2017, ECLI: NL: hr: 2017:3250, NJ 2018/45, under 2.10.

[11] See A.O. HR 19 March 2010, ECLI: nl: hr: 2010: BK8146, NJ 2010/172, with reference to HR 6 June 2008, ECLI: nl: hr: 2008: BC3354, NJ 2008/323, en HR 22 December 2017, ECLI: nl: hr: 2017:3250, NJ 2018/45.

C. Mr. D. Vergunst, Chairman of The LOVCK&T, also a member of the Coordination Group on debt collection cases 2018;
D. Prof. R.H. de Bock, Advocate General at the Supreme Court of the Netherlands, and special Professor at the University of Amsterdam;
E. Prof. T.N.B.M. Spronken, Advocate General at the Supreme Court of the Netherlands; and
F. Dr. Y. Buruma, justice at the Supreme Court of the Netherlands.

Ad A. Mr. Hartendorp can explain the relationship between the State judiciary and e-Court and the view of the judiciary on e-Court, and the cooperation from the judiciary branch to the publications on e-Court in the media of January 2018. This, because of his publication on the subject in RM Themis of 2014, but also because he is the one who initiated contact in the autumn of 2017 via the supervisory board of e-Court, and presented a number of questions from the Judiciary Council. He can declare with whom he has been in contact about e-Court within the Judiciary branch, and about the publicity assault of January 2018, and what was discussed.

Ad B. Mr. Bakker may explain his reasons for cooperating regarding the publications, and the preparations that have been made, as well as the relationship between the State judiciary and e-Court, and with whom within the Judiciary branch he had contact about the publicity attack of January 2018 and what was discussed. He can explain to what extent the Board of the Judiciary Council was aware of or has been involved in the decision-making within the LOVCK&T and what was discussed. He can also explain to what extent the press release of Judiciary Council of 17 January 2018 is part of a campaign aimed at lower court fees, and whether the consequences for e-Court were involved. He can explain to what extent the negative imagery around e-Court was considered instrumental.

Ad C. Mr. Vergunst can explain the discussions within the LOVCK&T on e-Court, in particular on questions relating to the review of arbitral verdicts, and on coordination with judges in the country at media appearances. He can declare with whom he has been in contact over the publicity attack of January 2018 and what has been discussed within the Judiciary branch. He can explain what discussions have taken place in The LOVCK&T and those involved in the judiciary. He can also explain to what extent the press release Of The Justice Council of 17 January 2018 is part of a campaign aimed at lower court fees and whether the consequences for e-Court were involved. He can explain to what extent the negative imagery around e-Court was considered instrumental.

Ad D. Prof. De Bock can explain her reasons for participating in the broadcast of Nieuwsuur, and she can also explain by whom she has been approached and with whom she has been in contact within the Judiciary branch and what has been discussed.

Ad E. Prof. Spronken can explain how her article with criticism of e-Court in the NJB of March 2018 came into being, and she can also explain by whom she has been approached and with whom she has been in contact within the Judiciary branch and what has been discussed.

Ad F. Dr. Y. Buruma can explain his reasons for his cooperation in the negative publicity about e-Court, for example in the radio broadcast of BNR Newsradio on 22 January 2018, and he can also explain by whom he was approached and with whom within the Judiciary branch he had contact, and what was discussed. He may also explain to what extent he has had contact with the Judicary

Council and/or persons involved in the decision-making of The LOVCK&T on E-Court judgments, and what has been discussed.

VII. Competent court

50. Pursuant to article 187, paragraph 1 of the DCCP, the request for the preliminary witness interrogation shall be submitted to the court responsible for judging the main proceedings; In this case that is the District Court in The Hague under Article 99 DCCP.

51. Although it is customary for the courts to refer the case if one of its own judges, in this case Mr. R.C. Hartendorp, is to be heard as a witness, e-Court waives its right to require referral. The law does not provide for the situation where the Judiciary branch as an institution -in its entirety- is itself party to a dispute. e-Court therefore requests the Court in the Hague to deal with the case itself.

Reasons why:

The Applicant turns to your Court with the respectful request to commend that a preliminary witness interrogation on the facts mentioned in this petition will be held without delay, with the appointment of the Judge-Commissioner before whom the witnesses shall be interrogated, with determination of the time at which such preliminary witnesses are to be heard and of the time at which the Applicant must present a copy of this petition and the decision to the witnesses.

Lawyer

[signatures]

This case is handled by Mr. M.Ch. Kaaks and Mr. O.M.B.J. Volgenant, Boekx Advocaten, P.O. Box 15988, 1001 NL Amsterdam, T: + 31 20 528 95 32, F: + 31 20 528 95 37, E: Kaaks@boekx.com and Volgenant@boekx.com

OveDCCPiew of Productions

Production 1: NRC Handelsblad, the Toga column, 23 October 2018, Mr. Matthieu Verhoeven: *The state exploits parts of the judiciary, unjustly.*

Production 2: News item CZ, 16 February 2018: *CZ is looking for an alternative to accessible and affordable arbitrage.*

Production 3: De Groene, 17 January 2018: *Private jurisdiction in the debt collection industry- Verdict for sale.*

Production 4: Investico, 17 January 2018: *Rising robot judge violates the law.*

Production 5: NOS.nl/Nieuwsuur, 17 January 2018: *Robot Court e-Court is a large and not transparent black hole*
NOS.nl/Nieuwsuur 18 January 2018: (without title, from minute 7.43)
NOS.nl/Nieuwsuur 16 February 2018: *Robot Judge e-court in trouble now judgments are not approved*

USB-stick with the broadcasts of Nieuwsuur from 17 and 18 January and 16 February 2018.

Production 6: Letter from e-Court of 21 February 2018 to the Judiciary Council.

Production 7: Letter from Mr. F.C. Bakker on behalf of the Judiciary Council of 1 March 2018.

Production 8: Press Release of the Judiciary Council of 17 January 2018: '*Lower registry costs to ensure access to justice*'.

Production 9: Eight examples of negative statements on e-Court and/or competition.

Production 10: Letter from the District Court Amsterdam dated 13 February 2017 about the cecision of the LOVCK&T on the court fees for merged arbitral verdicts of e-Court.

Production 11: Investico, 16th February 2018: *Overijssel's Court refuses to issue exequaturs for the time being. Robot Judge e-court is dead.*