

EXHIBIT 2.N



Date: July 16, 2021

To whom it may concern:

This is to certify that the attached translation from Dutch and into English is an accurate representation of the documents received by this office.

The document is designated as:

- Select Excerpts from ECLI NL GHDHA 2016 2225

Alexander Danesis, Project Manager in this company, attests to the following:

“To the best of my knowledge, the aforementioned documents are a true, full and accurate translation of the specified documents.”

Alexander Danesis

Signature of Alexander Danesis

ECLI:NL:GHDHA:2016:2225

Court	Court of Appeal of The Hague
Date of ruling	07/19/2016
Date of publication	07/25/2016
Case number	200.180.629/01
Formal relations	Final ruling: ECLI:NL:GHDHA:2017:57
Areas of law	Civil law
Special features	Appeal

Content summary	Claim to inspection of documents pursuant to Article 843a of the Dutch Code of Civil Procedure; Claim to cancellation of seizure of evidence and description; Protection of trade secrets
Sources	Rechtspraak.nl

Judgment

COURT OF APPEAL OF THE HAGUE

Civil law division

Case number: 200.180.629/01

Trial court's case number C/10/482723 / KG ZA 15-889

Ruling in summary proceedings of 19 July 2016

in the matter of:

1 THE DOW CHEMICAL COMPANY,

with registered offices in Midland, Michigan, United States of America,

2. ROHM AND HAAS COMPANY,

with registered offices in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, United States of America,

3. ROHM AND HAAS CHEMICALS LLC,

with registered offices in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, United States of America,

Appellant in the principal appeal, Respondent in the incidental appeal proceedings, hereinafter referred to separately as Dow Chemical, R&H, and R&H Chemicals, respectively, and collectively Dow, attorney: J.P. Heering, LLM, of The Hague,

versus

1 ORGANIK KIMYA NETHERLANDS B.V.,

with registered offices in Amsterdam,

2. ORGANIK LUXEMBOURG S.A.,

with registered offices in Luxembourg, Luxembourg,

3. ORGANIK KIMYA SAN. VE TIC A.Ş.,

with registered offices in Istanbul, Turkey,

4. ORGANIK HOLDING A.Ş.,

with registered offices in Istanbul, Turkey,

5. ORGANIK KIMYA US, INC.,

with registered offices in Burlington, Massachusetts, United States of America,

6. CHEMORG NETHERLANDS B.V.,

with registered offices in Amsterdam,

Respondents in the principal appeal, Appellants in the incidental appeal proceedings,

hereinafter referred to separately as Organik Netherlands, Organik Luxembourg, Organik Turkije, Organik Holding, Organik US, and Chemorg, respectively, and collectively Organik,

attorney: R.M. van der Velden, LLM, of Amsterdam.

right to inspection

4.7. It is not in dispute that the inspection demanded by Dow must be evaluated based on Dutch procedural law and particularly on Article 843a of the Dutch Code of Civil Procedure. Based on this provision, a person who has a legitimate interest can demand inspection and copying of specific documents relating to a legal relationship whereby he is a party. The following text will sequentially examine whether the elements 'specific documents', 'legal relationship', and 'legitimate interest' from this provision have been satisfied, and subsequently whether there are weighty reasons in this case within the meaning of the fourth paragraph of Article 843a of the Dutch Code of Civil Procedure that oppose inspection.

specific documents

4.8. Article 843a of the Dutch Code of Civil Procedure requires that the documents where inspection is demanded are 'specified'. That means that the documents must be described as precisely as can be reasonably expected from Dow in the given circumstances (cf. Supreme Court, 13 September 2013, ECLI:NL:HR:2013:BZ9958, [*name of the party*], ratio decidendi 3.7.1. on the requirements of a seizure for preservation of documents for which inspection is demanded).

4.9. Dow's primary claim fails on this condition. The primary claim includes that Dow will be permitted to inspect all seized documents that are being held in the custody of the bailiff. That is insufficiently specified, also given the fact that it has remained unclear how the bailiff selected the seized documents. In addition, it must be assumed that Dow is in a position in the given circumstances to describe the documents more precisely than it does in the framework of the primary claim.

4.10. In the subsidiary claim, Dow limits its inspection to the following documents:

- i) All documents (in written or electronic form, stored locally or on external (network) computers or other data carries), including but not limited to reports, formulas, production instructions, memoranda and correspondence (including e-mails), starting 1 January 2004, in which Dow, Rohm and Haas, or R&H (however it is written) are named;
- ii) All documents (in written or electronic form, stored locally or on external (network) computers or other data carries), including but not limited to reports, formulas, production instructions, memoranda and correspondence (including e-mails), starting 1 January 2004, in which the following are named:
 - ROPAQUE or ROPAQUE Ultra (however it is written), or
 - one of the 177 Dow non-opaque emulsion polymers (or one of the 354 corresponding brand names) listed in the file paths that were found in the jump lists on the Organik laptops (listed in Dow's Exhibit 13);
- iii) All documents (in written or electronic form, stored locally or on external (network) computers or other data carries), including but not limited to reports, formulas, production instructions, memoranda and correspondence (including e-mails), starting 1 January 2004, in which [Employee 1], [Employee 3] and/or [Employee 2] are named, and which pertain to research, development, or production of (ingredients, including seeds for) opaque and/or non-opaque emulsion polymers;
- iv) All documents (in written or electronic form, stored locally or on external (network) computers or other data carries), including but not limited to reports, formulas, production

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.