

**District Court of the Northern Netherlands,
Leeuwarden branch**

Van Cann / Janssen / Minks et al.

Reference: C/17/190788 / HA ZA 23-172

Hearing: Wednesday 14 January 2026

**Statement of the parties' oral
hearing**

Re:

1. Ms Giselle Jacqueline Marie-Thérèse van Cann,
hereinafter referred to as: **'Van Cann'**, and
2. Mr Paul Edwin Jansen, hereinafter referred
to as **'Jansen'**,

represented by: Messrs A. Bekema and P. Lichten-dahl

against:

1. [REDACTED]
2. [REDACTED]
3. [REDACTED]
4. [REDACTED]
5. [REDACTED]
6. (the late) [REDACTED]
7. [REDACTED]

lawyer in charge of the case: P.W.H. Stassen, LL.B.

A.ii. The parties' submissions in respect of which the court wishes to have further clarification, and the parties' speaking time;

7. Given that two rounds of written submissions have already taken place and the claimants have introduced a considerable volume of documents into the proceedings, Van Cann and Jansen request that your court indicate in advance the purpose of the oral hearing and, with regard to which submissions, the court wishes to receive further clarification from which party, in order to ensure that the oral hearing proceeds as efficiently as possible and to limit the speaking time of the numerous parties. Van Cann and Jansen consider a speaking time of 10 minutes per group of parties jointly represented by the same solicitor to be sufficient.
8. The speaking time of 120 minutes requested by the claimants is excessive in view of all the documents and arguments already submitted by the parties in these proceedings. This request appears to be partly motivated by the desire to allow experts brought along to speak as well.

A.iii. the scope for witnesses and experts to be heard during the oral hearing

9. It follows from paragraph 2.10 of the Interim Judgment that the court sees no reason to exercise its power to hear party-appointed experts or witnesses during the oral hearing, or to do so during a separate oral hearing, and therefore rejects this request.
10. In the statement of the parties submitted by the claimants, the claimants respond to this by stating that they do intend to bring experts to the hearing and request that the court facilitate this by providing an online connection and allowing an interpreter.
11. For the reasons set out in the Interim Judgment and given that the statements of these experts now form part of these proceedings, Cann and Jansen request that it be made clear once again in advance that, even if these experts are present during the oral hearing, the claimants are free to consult with the experts, but that the experts may not play any further role during the oral hearing. It follows from the Interim Judgment, after all, that the court does not grant permission for the hearing of witnesses or party-appointed experts. Furthermore, the experts may not speak during the speaking time allocated to the claimants, as they cannot represent the claimants in court.

B. DATES OF UNAVAILABILITY

12. The dates on which the lawyers for Van Cann and Jansen are unavailable during the months of May to October are as follows:

May: 1–10, 13, 18, 19–22, 27–29

June: 10–12, 17–19, 24,

July: 2, 4–31

August: 1–19, 26