

Number: 3339

Rep.: 2011/8314

**Hearing of
26th SEPTEMBER 2011**

final ruling

Copy - art. 792 Judicial Code
Exempt from despatch fee
art. 280 2^o Registration Code

Copy of ruling to
FPS Economy
(Copyright)

The COURT OF APPEAL, hearing held at ANTWERP, FIRST CHAMBER, ruling on civil matters, has handed down the following ruling:

regarding: 2010/AR/2541

VZW BELGIAN ANTI-PIRACY FEDERATION, abbreviated to VZW BAF, whose registered office is situated at 1200 Sint-Lambrechts-Woluwe, Almaplein 3, box 10 and registered with the Crossroads Bank for Enterprises under n^o 0427.907.283

APPELLANT

against a ruling handed down by the president of the commercial tribunal in Antwerp, sitting in interlocutory proceedings under article 87 §1 of the Copyright Act dated 8th July 2010, known there under n^o A.R. A/10/05374;

appearing in the person of Christophe VAN MECHELEN in his capacity as general manager and supported by Mr Benoît Michaux, attorney-at-law, whose office is situated at 1040 Brussels, Nerviërsiaan 9-31 (ref.: 00100574);

against:

1. **NV TELENET**, whose registered company offices are situated at 2800 Mechelen, Liersesteenweg 4 and registered with the Crossroads Bank for Enterprises under n^o 0473.416.418;

represented by Mr Thomas De Meese, attorney-at-law, whose office is situated at 1000 Brussels, Koningsstraat 71 (ref.: TDM/KJA/10980.0000065);

2. **BELGACOM NV (public company) UNDER PUBLIC LAW**, whose registered offices are situated at 1030 Brussels, Koning Albert II-laan 27 and registered with the Crossroads Bank for Enterprises under n° 0202.239.951;

represented by Mr Laurent Masson, attorney-at-law, whose office is situated at 1050 Brussels, Louizalaan 235, box 1;

RESPONDENTS

Having regard to the proceedings documents required by the law, submitted in the appropriate form, including the disputed ruling handed down by the commercial tribunal in Antwerp on 8th July 2010 in the defended action, of which there is no memorandum of service and against which was lodged in good time and validly a higher appeal in the petition submitted to the bailiff of this court on 10th August 2010.

Having regard to the petition submitted to the bailiff of this court on 11th August 2011 for the reopening of the debates.

Subject of the action for the first court

The appellant's claim, lodged in the writ dated 11th June 2010, encompasses:

- establishing that with the assistance of the websites of "The Pirate Bay" an infringements are being committed against the copyright and/or similar rights over works and/or performances from the repertoire of sub-members and clients of the appellant;
- that the respondents be ordered to desist from the litigious infringements in their capacity as Internet access providers;
- consequently that the respondents, in their capacity as Internet access providers, be ordered to make access impossible for their customer Internet users to the websites of "The Pirate Bay", more specifically thepiratebay.nu, thepiratebay.se, piratebay.org, piratebay.net, piratebay.se and other possible extensions of "(the)piratebay" on pain of incurring a penalty of € 10,000 per day or part thereof during the time in which they act in breach of the ruling to be implemented;
- by way of a provisional measure, in application of article 19 §2 of the Judicial Code, that the respondents be ordered provisionally to make the websites of "The Pirate Bay", more specifically thepiratebay.nu, thepiratebay.se, piratebay.org, piratebay.net, piratebay.se, inaccessible to their customers via DNS blocking, i.e. to ensure that the domain names mentioned are no longer linked to the IP address of the websites in question, on pain of incurring a penalty of € 10,000 for each of these parties, per day or part thereof, during the time in which they act in breach of the ruling to be implemented;
- that the right of the provisional measure will apply until such time as the court has handed down its ruling on the claim in the property dispute;
- that the respondents be ordered to pay court costs;

- that the ruling be declared enforceable by anticipation, notwithstanding any recourse and without surety or delimitation of claim.

Decision of the first court

The first court rejected the measure requested in relation to article 19, paragraph 2 of the Judicial Code.

Objective in appealing to a higher court

The appellant is seeking the amendment of the disputed ruling. It is requesting:

- that with the assistance of the websites of “The Pirate Bay”, a breach is established of copyright and/or similar right on works and/or performances from the repertoire of sub-members and clients of the appellant;
- that the respondents each be ordered separately in their capacity as Internet access providers to desist from the litigious infringements;
- consequently that the respondents, in their capacity as Internet access providers, be ordered to make access impossible for their customer Internet users to the websites of “The Pirate Bay”, more specifically www.thepiratebay.org, www.thepiratebay.net, www.thepiratebay.com, www.thepiratebay.se, www.piratebay.org, www.piratebay.net, www.piratebay.se, www.piratebay.no, jimkeyzer.se, ripthepiratebay.com, using “IP-blocking” technology, on pain of incurring a penalty of € 10,000 per day or part thereof during the time in which they act in breach of the ruling to be implemented;
- that the aforementioned ruling should also apply for any other websites of “The Pirate Bay” that the appellant brings to the knowledge of the respondents, on the understanding that the order will only apply after notification by e-mail;
- in subordinate order if the court should suspend dealing with the dispute while awaiting the response of the Court of Justice on the prejudicial application in matter C-70/10; that the order be issued provisionally while awaiting a final ruling in the property dispute;
- that the respondents each be ordered to pay half of the court costs (administrative fee: € 1,320).

The statement from the first respondent concludes:

- the lack of grounds of the appellant’s claim
- subordinate: to send the matter to the case list while awaiting a ruling from the European Court of Justice about the prejudicial question asked in the matter of Scarlet/Sabam (court ruling, Brussels 28th January 2010) and Sabam/Netlog (record Brussels 28th June 2010);
- in more subordinate order insofar as the appellant’s claim is declared admissible and with grounds: establish that with the assistance of the websites www.thepiratebay.org, www.thepiratebay.net, www.thepiratebay.com, www.thepiratebay.se, www.piratebay.org,

www.piratebay.net, www.piratebay.se, www.piratebay.no, jimkeyzer.se, ripthepiratebay.com there were breaches of copyright and/or similar rights and/or performances from the repertoire of the appellant's members;

- to order the first respondent to cease these breaches within 15 working days after the handing down of the ruling to be made to apply IP blocking on its network in relation to IP address 194.71.107.15 on pain of incurring a penalty of € 500 per day's delay and per IP address;
- to state before the court that the first respondent will be deemed to have complied in full as soon as it has taken and maintained the "IP-blocking" measure described above;
- to state before the court that the appellant will have checked on a daily basis to see whether the blocked IP address is still linked exclusively to the websites that the court has established are in breach;
- to state before the court that the appellant is required to protect the first respondent in full against all claims from third parties arising from the blocking of the IP address described in the cessation order;
- to state before the court that the appellant is required to lodge the same claim against other Belgian Internet providers within a period of one month after the ruling to be handed down;
- to order the appellant to pay court costs (administrative fee: € 1,200).

The statement from the second respondent concludes:

- the lack of grounds of the appellant's claim;
- in subordinate order to send the matter to the case list while awaiting a ruling from the European Court of Justice about the prejudicial question asked by the Court of Appeal in Brussels in the ruling handed down on 28th January 2010 in the matter of Sabam versus Scarlet;
- in further subordinate order:
If the appellant's claim is declared to be with grounds, to order the second respondent only within 14 days after the ruling is handed down on the Belgacom NS servers to apply the so-called DNS-blocking technique, limited to the domain names listed below:

1. www.thepiratebay.org
2. www.thepiratebay.net
3. www.thepiratebay.com
4. www.thepiratebay.nu
5. www.thepiratebay.se
6. www.piratebay.org
7. www.piratebay.net
8. www.piratebay.se
9. www.piratebay.no
10. www.jimkeyzer.se and
11. www.ripthepiratebay.com

and this on pain of incurring a maximum penalty of € 1,000 per day during the time in which Belgacom has not applied the so-called DNS-blocking technique on the Belgacom DNS servers;

- to order the appellant to pay the court costs (administrative fee: € 5,000).

The facts

The appellant is a Belgian professional association whose corporate aim is to fight piracy and counterfeiting in the name and on behalf of its members (parties with interests in the entertainment sector: film, music, and computer games) on Belgian territory.

The respondents are two Internet providers that provide their subscribers with access to websites, including the websites of “The Pirate Bay”. This latter website was founded in 2004 and helps Internet users to download film and music files.

On 7th June 2010, the first and second respondents were served notice of default by the appellant’s legal adviser requiring them immediately to take the necessary steps to make it impossible for Belgian Internet users to access the websites thepiratebay.org, piratebay.org, piratebay.se, thepiratebay.com, thepiratebay.net, thepiratebay.nu, thepiratebay.se and other possible extensions of (the)piratebay.

On 8th June 2010, the second respondent informed the appellant that it was prepared to enter into a voluntary agreement with the appellant to block specific domain names via “DNS blocking” on condition that the first respondent and VOO sign the same agreement.

On 11th June 2010, the appellant issued a writ.

Judgment

Reopening of the debates

The court is of the opinion that it has sufficient information. There is no reason to reopen the debates.

PREVIOUSLY: The respondents sought to send the matter to the case list while awaiting a ruling from the Court of Justice in two matters. However, there is no reason to defer the handling of this matter while awaiting a response from the Court of Justice on two other matters, specifically *Scarlet/Sabam* and *Sabam/Netlog*. The claims and facts in these cases are entirely different from this matter. The prejudicial questions put to the Court of Justice are based on the premise that the claim extends to having the Internet service provider install a filter system so that specific files can be identified and then blocked. The claim in this matter is on a different subject: specifically only to make websites inaccessible (without a filter system for identifying the files). The response from the Court of Justice serves no purpose in resolving this dispute.

The subject of the dispute regarding the appellant’s claim is in relation to the respondents in order to force them to working actively in the fight against breaches of copyright committed via the Internet. The respondents would have to take

technical measures to stop breaches of copyright on the grounds of article 87 of Copyright Law.

The court establishes that the grievances of the parties are mainly the same as those submitted to the first court.

More specifically, the appellant maintains that action taken against the founders of "The Pirate Bay" is insufficient. Belgian Internet users would still be able to access "The Pirate Bay" (via another provider). Taking action against the local Internet access providers would be the correct course. The interested parties would be able to seek a ban against intermediaries whose services are used by a third party to commit a breach of copyright or similar law. The Danish Court of Cassation is said to have handed down a ruling on 27th May 2010 stating that the Internet access providers were to receive a court order to make access impossible to "The Pirate Bay" website for their customers. The Internet access providers were to delete a specific domain name from the database so that there could no longer be a link between the domain name and the site's additional IP address, meaning that the subscriber's Internet browser would no longer be able to establish a link to the site in question.

The first respondent states that there is an exemption from liability for Internet intermediaries. Internet intermediaries should not have any overall obligation as to supervision. The claim would be disproportionate. The cessation order would lead to serious effects against the fundamental rights and freedoms and the legitimate activities of third parties. It would place a significant burden on the first respondent and only generate limited benefits for the appellant. The blocking measures would be inefficient to the extent that the claim against the Internet access providers would not create the best way of putting an end to infringing actions. If the cessation order requested were to be imposed, a due date would have to be allocated in order for the necessary preparatory work and implementations to be put in place. In any event, the appellant would have to provide safeguards against all possible claims from third parties.

On its side, the second respondent is of the opinion that the measure being requested by the appellant is not technically possible. It would not be technically possible to prevent in full a specific website from being visited by a Belgacom customer. It could never be held liable for information passed on (article 18 of the Act of 11th March 2003 regarding certain legal aspects of services provided by the information society (abbreviated below to WEH – Electronic Trade Act). Under article 21 of the Act of 11th March 2003 regarding certain aspects of the services provided by the information society, no overall obligation can be imposed as to any supervision that would be placed on service providers regarding the information that is passed on. There would be possibilities for circumventing "DNS-blocking" and "IP-blocking". With "IP-blocking" there is the danger that legitimate information would also be blocked. The measure being requested would be obviously unreasonable and disproportionate. The measure would adversely affect interests, fundamental rights and freedoms and the legitimate activities of third parties. There would be no proof that visitors to "The Pirate Bay" are breaching copyright: i.e. they are downloading for their own use. The implementation of "IP-blocking" would bring a significant burden with it. The measure being requested would make a very modest

contribution to the fight against the illegal activities that the appellant is fighting against. The measure would not be required from other Internet providers. In any event, a due date would have to be allocated in order for the necessary preparatory work and implementations to be put in place.

The court is aware that the appellant no longer insists on the provisional measure of article 19 §2 of the Judicial Code. Only if the request from the respondents to ask the Court of Justice a prejudicial question were granted would it lodge a new application for a provisional measure. This is not the case (see above). It is only seeking the cessation measure on the grounds of article 87 §1 of Copyright Law.

About the entitled organisation

Article 87 §1, paragraphs one and two of the Act of 30th June 1994 regarding to copyright and similar laws (abbreviated below to C.L.) states:

“In circumstances that come under the respective jurisdiction of these courts, the president of the court of first instance and the president of the commercial tribunal establish the existence of any breach of copyright or any similar right and order the cessation thereof.

They may also issue a cessation order against intermediaries whose services for third parties are used to commit a breach of copyright or similar law.

...”

On the grounds of the aforementioned article, the appellant is entitled to lodge a claim extending to the cessation of acts that breach the copyright and/or similar rights of its members and sub-members. The appellant is a professional association in the sense of article 87 §1, paragraph six of C.L.

About the infringement

It is not disputed that with the assistance of the “The Pirate Bay” website, files featuring works from the repertoire of the appellant’s (sub-)members are downloaded on a massive scale without permission and without payment and then made available to the world audience via peer-to-peer software.

All of these files are then stolen by Internet users who are the respondent’s subscribers without permission and without payment to the entitled parties – hence in breach of the exclusive right to reproduction and dissemination to the public on the part of the entitled parties (article 1 §1 C.L. and article 39 C.L.). Hence the infringement is established.

About the cessation measure

Despite action taken against the founders of “The Pirate Bay” in Sweden and the Netherlands, Belgian Internet users still have access to “The Pirate Bay”. The individuals responsible for (The) Pirate Bay still persist, notwithstanding the court rulings in other countries, in keeping their sites accessible.

The question arises of whether this claim against the local Internet access providers is the most appropriate way of acting against the form of Internet piracy being fought against.

In any event, the respondents themselves are not offenders.

Under article 87 §1, paragraph two of C.L., referred to above, there is the possibility for the court, once it has established the existence of a breach of copyright, to issue an order against intermediaries whose services are used to commit this breach.

The respondents, as Internet access providers, are to be considered as intermediaries (CoJ, 19th February 2009, case C-557/07, LSG/Tele 2). They are addressed in this capacity by the appellant.

The respondents contend in the first instance that they are not liable for information passed on, even if they are technically capable of withholding the passing on of certain unlawful information. They refer to article 18 of the Act of 11th March 2003 regarding certain aspects of the services provided by the information society (Electronic Trade Act), which states:

“When a service of the information society consists of the passing on information in a communication network by a purchaser of the service, or providing access to a communication network, the service-provider is not liable for the information passed on if each of the following conditions is complied with:

- 1) the initiative to pass on the information is not taken by the service-provider;*
- 2) the recipient of the information passed on is not selected by the service-provider;*
- 3) the information passed on is not selected or modified by the service-provider”.*

Along with the appellant, the court is of the opinion that the liability of the respondents is not the issue here. The appellant is not asserting that the respondents are breaching copyright. All that is being stated is that the respondents are best placed to put an end to copyright breaches committed by their subscribers. Indeed, precisely for this situation, article 87 §1, paragraph two of C.L., in accordance with European regulations (article 12 §3 of Directive 2000/31 regarding certain aspects of the services provided by the information society, in particular the electronics trade in the internal market) provides for the possibility of a court order being made against Internet providers (intermediaries). The legal rules relating to the limitation of liability of Internet providers constitutes no obstacle for the demand for cessation. This demand extends exclusively to making a website inaccessible, which means that the respondents cannot pass on unlawful information on “The Pirate Bay” website. Consequently, they are not liable for the unlawful content passed on over their network.

The respondents are also of the opinion that they do not have to be subject to a general obligation as to supervision, as provided for in article 21 of the Electronic Trade Act mentioned above:

“With regard to the provision of the services dealt with in articles 18, 19 and 20, service-providers have no general obligation to monitor the information that they

pass on or store, nor are they required actively to look for events or circumstances that point to unlawful activities.

The principle stated in the first paragraph applies only to general obligations. It does not affect the right of the official bodies with legal jurisdiction to impose a temporary obligation of supervision in specific cases, if there is a law that provides for this possibility”.

The order being requested “*to use their capacity as Internet access providers to stop litigious infringements*” does not create an obligation regarding monitoring on the part of the respondents of the information that they pass on or store. The respondents are not required to carry out any checks on unlawful information. The order being requested is limited simply to making the identified websites of “The Pirate Bay” inaccessible through the application of a specific technical measure (see below). Subsequently, the respondents are not required to verify whether certain subscribers have found a way round the measure or not, or have gained access to “The Pirate Bay” websites and have committed breaches of copyright.

It would also be, according to the respondents, unreasonable and disproportionate to oblige the respondents to implement blocking measures from which it can be seen that users are already able to circumvent (limited benefit for the appellant). It would be sufficient that Internet users simply adjust the settings on their browser. Also, not every visit to “The Pirate Bay” would be unlawful. The out-and-out blocking of “The Pirate Bay” would also adversely affect legitimate activities (i.e. downloading purely for private usage). The measure being requested would also constitute a serious operational burden for the respondents and contain a risk for falsifying competition.

The order for cessation may be refused if the imposition of such a measure were to be unreasonable or disproportionate. Also, the measures ordered in the context of the copyright case must be proportionate.

The fact that not all of the material is copyright protected with the assistance of “The Pirate Bay” websites does not detract from the fact that a very significant proportion of the material is indeed in breach. Internet users are also able to access those parts that are not protected using channels other than “The Pirate Bay”.

Insofar as the respondents state that downloading for private usage is not a breach of the law, it has to be noted that this does not apply to the making available of the works to other participant via the peer-to-peer network (direct exchange between the computers of individual Internet users).

The assertion by the respondents that they are not able to implement a watertight form of making the litigious websites inaccessible is no reason to reject granting the order being requested. The fact that the cessation order will not put an end to all possible illegal activities on the Internet does not result in this order being disproportionate. It may contribute towards restricting breaches of a kind that may reasonably serve the interests of the appellant. The respondents are not expected to guarantee that none of their customers is still able to visit the website(s) in question.

As a party with an interest, the appellant is entitled to tackle any form of piracy with the legal resources provided by the lawmakers. It cannot be obliged to act first against the actual offenders before applying for an order against the Internet access providers (subsidiarity). Such an obligation is not to be found anywhere in the law. In addition, the European lawmakers have taken the decision to offer entitled parties the ability to act directly against intermediaries (article 8.3 of Directive 2001/29/EC regarding the harmonisation of certain aspects of copyright and similar laws in the information society).

The respondents may be asked to make certain websites inaccessible for their subscribers for the purpose of fighting against breaches of copyright. It is up to the court, which is able to define a specific positive measure aimed at putting an end to breaches of copyright, to determine the terms for such a measure.

The bottom line of all this is that the cessation order does not conflict with the principle of proportionality. The appellant has the right to the full protection of its repertoire. The respondents are not contending that this protection is in conflict with other rights that are just as fundamental. Their considerations do not weigh against the interest of the appellant, which is confronted with the large-scale free distribution of its members' works via "The Pirate Bay". This method of working means that the appellant's members are suffering undeniable damage.

There is no question of falsifying competition. The respondents are the biggest players on the Belgian market for providing access to the Internet.

There is the question of whether there are any technical measures that exist to obstruct breaches of copyright via the Internet. It is certainly not absolutely impossible for an Internet access provider to put a stop to litigious breaches of copyright in view of the fact that Internet access providers can be required by the State Prosecutor/Investigating Magistrate to make websites inaccessible where they have other purposes (e.g. the fight against child pornography). In its letter dated 8th June 2010, the second respondent itself proposed blocking the litigious websites, albeit on condition that its main competitor sign the same agreement.

There are apparently two ways of making a website inaccessible. The first of these techniques is "DNS-blocking" (Domain Name System blocking). The second technique is "IP-blocking" (IP stands for Internet Protocol). Internet users are connected to a website via the domain name or IP address. When a blocking system is requested at a DNS level, the Internet provider is asked to delete the domain name in question from its database. This has the effect of the IP address that goes with it can no longer be found. With an "IP-blocking" system, the Internet provider is also asked to block the IP address of a website. In this case, no connection to the website can be obtained either via a domain name or via an IP address.

The appellant is of the opinion that "DNS-blocking" is only a partial solution insofar as it can be circumvented. For results in the longer term, use should be made of the more radical technique of "IP-blocking".

The first respondent contends that "IP-blocking" places a significant additional burden on its customer services because its subscribers will not know whether the

inaccessibility of “The Pirate Bay” websites is due to a technical fault or a court order. The second respondent states that “IP-blocking” is not a technically acceptable solution. Any Internet user would be able to find sites to circumvent the blocking measures. A number of different websites can be found behind a certain IP address.

The parties agree that there is no single technique that provides a watertight solution for all infringements. The respondents can only be requested, within the limitations of their capabilities, to make a contribution towards ending the breaches, especially as there is no technical solution that will prevent “The Pirate Bay” websites from being visited. It has to be assumed that the average Internet user will not look for ways of reaching a blocked website via other means.

There is a need to examine what positive measure lies within the reach of the respondents. It must be possible for the respondents, as intermediaries, to act at a cost that is acceptable.

The court is of the opinion that “DNS-blocking” in relation to the websites indicated by the appellant is the most acceptable solution. Using this technique, the link between the IP address of the website and the domain name for that site can be altered at a DNS level so that customers can no longer enter the domain name into their browser to reach the website they want. Through “IP-blocking”, all websites concealed behind the IP address will also be blocked, including any legal ones. This latter technique has undesirable effects for third parties. As a result, the risk that “IP-blocking” leads to the blocking of legitimate information (at websites hosted at the same IP address) is greater than with “DNS-blocking”. There is also a need to invest the time required to develop an IP-blocking system.

Imposing the technique of “DNS-blocking” cannot be considered as a restriction of the freedom of expression or any other fundamental rights in a way that constitutes a breach of the European treaty on the protection of human rights.

A penalty should be linked to the blocking measure imposed, as stated in the wording of the ruling. This will serve as encouragement to prompt the respondents to abide by the order.

About the appellant’s obligation to provide indemnity against claims from third parties

There is no need to safeguard the respondents against claims from third parties. The IP technique is not being imposed. Also, if third parties believe that they are able to apply rights, then these third parties should oppose the endorsement of the decision made.

About court costs

Under article 1017, paragraph one, of the Judicial Code, the respondents are ordered as the parties in the wrong jointly to pay the court costs.

The administrative fee for a claim that cannot be evaluated in money terms is € 1,200 (€ 1,320 indexed on appeal). There is no reason to deviate from the basic amount. One of the criteria set in article 1022, paragraph three, of the Judicial Code, has not been complied with.

FOR THESE REASONS:

THE COURT,

Ruling in a defended action,

Having regard to article 24 of the Act of 15th June 1935 on the use of language in court cases;

Refuses the application to reopen the debates.

Declares the appeal to be with grounds.

Amends the disputed ruling.

Declares the appellant's application to be with grounds, as follows:

Establishes that with the assistance of "The Pirate Bay" websites, mentioned above, breaches of copyright and/or similar laws are being committed against works and/or performances from the repertoire of the appellant's (sub-)members.

Orders the respondents each separately in their capacity as Internet access providers to cease the litigious offences by way of the aforementioned "DNS-blocking" technique.

Orders the respondents each separately in their capacity as Internet access providers to apply "DNS-blocking" within fourteen days of this ruling is handed down in relation to the following limited domain names listed below:

1. www.thepiratebay.org
2. www.thepiratebay.net
3. www.thepiratebay.com
4. www.thepiratebay.nu
5. www.thepiratebay.se
6. www.piratebay.org
7. www.piratebay.net
8. www.piratebay.se
9. www.piratebay.no
10. www.jimkeyzer.se and
11. www.ripthepiratebay.com

and to do so on pain of a penalty of € 1,000 for every day that the respondents do not apply the so-called "DNS-blocking" technique to their DNS servers.

States before the law that the respondents will have complied with their obligation as soon as they have applied this “DNS-blocking”.

Orders the respondents to pay their own costs, established on the side of the appellant as follows:

- writ fee:	€ 522.52
- administrative fee first instance:	€ 1,200.00
- listing fee for appeal:	€ 186.00
- indexed administrative fee for appeal:	€ 1,320.00

Thus implemented and handed down in open court session on the **TWENTY SECOND OF SEPTEMBER, TWO THOUSAND AND ELEVEN**, in the presence of:

M. BAX	president
M. BLEYENBERGH	counsellor
B. CATTOIR	counsellor
G. VELTMANS	bailiff

(signature)
G. VELTMANS

(signature)
B. CATTOIR

(signature)
M. BLEYENBERGH

(signature)
M. BAX