

EXHIBIT 2.0



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_HR_2013_BZ9958

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:HR:2013:BZ9958

Court	Supreme Court
Date of ruling	09/13/2013
Date of publication	09/13/2013
Case number	12/05529
Formal relations	Findings: ECLI:NL:PHR:2013:BZ9958
Areas of law	Civil law
Special features	Cassation Preliminary decision
Content summary	Preliminary decision, Art. 392 of the Dutch Code of Civil Procedure. Seizure of evidence, possibility, legal basis, Art. 843a in conjunction with Art. 730 of the Dutch Code of Civil Procedure, analogous application of Art. 1019a (1) and (3), 1019b (3) and (4), and 1019c of the Dutch Code of Civil Procedure. No fishing expeditions. Principles of proportionality and subsidiarity. Implementation measures to be determined by the judge, manner of seizure and manner of inspection, guarantees of confidentiality; court custody, Art. 709 of the Dutch Code of Civil Procedure; provision of security, Art. 701 of the Dutch Code of Civil Procedure; granting access to the bailiff, Art. 444-444b of the Dutch Code of Civil Procedure, duty of seized party to cooperate.
Law references	Dutch Code of Civil Procedure (applies in case of digital litigation) Dutch Code of Civil Procedure (applies in case of digital litigation) 392 Dutch Code of Civil Procedure (applies in case of digital litigation) 730 Dutch Code of Civil Procedure (applies in case of digital litigation) 843a Dutch Code of Civil Procedure (applies in case of digital litigation) 1019a Dutch Code of Civil Procedure (applies in case of digital litigation) 1019c
Sources	Rechtspraak.nl NJB 2013/2022 RvdW 2013/1059 IER 2014/9 with annotation by F.W.E. Eijsvogels JWB 2013/442 NJ 2014/455 with annotation by H.B. Krans JOR 2013/330 with annotation by E. Loesberg, LL.M.

Judgment

09/13/2013
First Chamber
No. 12/05529
EV/LZ

Supreme Court of the Netherlands

Ruling

In the matter of:

[Petitioner],
domiciled at [place of domicile],
PLAINTIFF in the first instance,
did not appear in the preliminary proceedings,

versus

1. [Respondent 1],
residing at [residence address],

2. [Respondent 2],
residing at [residence address],

DEFENDANTS in the first instance,

did not appear in the preliminary proceedings.

The parties will also be referred to hereinafter as [Petitioner] and [Respondents]

3.5 Because the legislature, as is apparent from the citation quoted above in 3.4.1, obviously gives preference to waiting for developments in practice, the Supreme Court will partially carry out the necessary deliberations and choices itself. They extend to surrounding the seizure of evidence, which is deemed permissible, with adequate and effective guarantees, and preventing arbitrary interference and abuse, and ensuring that any harmful consequences thereof for the counterparty or the third party where the seizure occurs remain within reasonable limits. The rules to be stated below leave the judge in interim injunction proceedings the space to apply them in a manner which does justice to the purport just stated.

3.6.1 Also in view of considerations above, it must be assumed that Articles 730 and 843a of the Dutch Code of Civil Procedure offer a sufficient basis for imposing a seizure of evidence, also in non-intellectual property cases; Articles 1019a (1) and (3), 1019b (3) and (4), and 1019c of the Dutch Code of Civil Procedure are to be applied analogously insofar as necessary. This means that the seizure of evidence can only occur under the conditions set forth in Art. 843a of the Dutch Code of Civil Procedure and thus also that they can only relate to "documents" within the meaning of that provision (which, incidentally, can include digital files, with the understanding that the possibility exists that copies are made thereof on site under the supervision of the bailiff, which copies are then seized). It can, if necessary, also relate to the objects in which, or the data carriers on which these documents are located.

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.