
"Newspaper of the North", May 4, 1994

"Preventing new mistakes Altink case "

AMSTERDAM / Holthe - It is desirable that another prosecutor than Mr. LAJ Dun renewed the preliminary investigation leads to an artist Cor van L [REDACTED] from Holthe who was discredited in 1991 after alleged Altink **counterfeits emerged in the market..**

Lawyer

LDH Hamer, Counsel gallery owner Renée Smithuis from Heiloo and Groninger art dealer Cees Hofsteenge, finds that the officer seriously at fault last time. "On false grounds, the case was then cut short. There have been a lot of failures. "Now that the Court has found errors and ordered a re-trial investigation should avoid new mistakes, says Hammer. And therefore, the prosecution would be wise to another to draw the matter: "The investigation must now still be carried out once properly."

As reported yesterday, the court determined that there should be a new court to investigate the suspicious Altink and Van L [REDACTED] involvement. A late report from a handwriting expert who examined the signatures on some attributed to the Groninger Ploeg painter Altink (1885-1971) paintings, a new light could be shed on the matter, the Court finds. This report states that a number of signatures probably not put Altink by itself. The public prosecutor at the time that report was not included in his final judgment. He appeared it archived the case against Van L [REDACTED] in March 1993, while the report only in June.

According to counsel Hamer is that "the slickest Miss', besides a number of retailer essential flaws:" The court has rightly observed that the public prosecutor has failed. "Gallery Holding Reneé Smithuis from Heiloo, which complains same last year went to the Court after the prosecution had concluded that there was insufficient evidence to prosecute Van L [REDACTED] now has nevertheless had her way. They wanted a new study.

Smithuis was the one renowned auction houses such as Sotheby's, Christies and Glerum alerted in 1991 about the false Altink. She was also an art dealer and connoisseur Altink Cees Hofsteenge Groningen, upset about the dismissal. Their reputation would be affected. Both were summoned during the preliminary inquiry as "expert witnesses" to see Cor van L [REDACTED] seized Altink cloths. Their verdict was unanimous: 'false'. The dismissal is given the impression according to the duo that their judgment was bad. "That the blame landed in the wrong party. The judgment of the prosecution was no good, "said lawyer Hamer.

The Court considers that the reputation and expertise of Smithuis and Hofsteenge discussion it has been through the whole affair. In addition, the Court considers that the case had considerable attention in the press, the stakeholders mentioned by name. Furthermore, the court considers the case, because it involved the interests of the art market and auction essence "of considerable weight. Cees Hofsteenge responds reticent on the decision of the court: "If the case is now once again becomes clear."