

## Van Loenen: Disgusting and arrogant

Holthe - Art dealer Cor van Loenen Holthe find out how gallery owner R. Smithuis from Heiloo still trying to get her gram for falsifying Altink paintings "disgusting and arrogant. As reported she demands the court early reopening of the investigation against Van Loenen, which some years back distortions of Groningen Ploeg Painter Altink (1885-1971) would have circulated. Gallery owner C. Hofsteenge Groningen supports her action.

The duo finds the then conducted laboratory research, under which the case was dismissed in 1992, insufficient. The much talked about art dealer asks about the 'expertise', the two actually have. Furthermore, Van Loenen Groningen gallery owner has' just let tensioning Smithuis for the trolley.

Hofsteenge, including the author of a book about painters Squad, talk Van Loenen 'just along with others. "He or very anecdotal book about the Groningen painter team, but that does not mean he understands. For example, I never heard him say a sensible word on a picturesque work of the Groningen Ploeg. That he also dares to sign the letter of Smithuis .....

The art dealer from Holthe find it incomprehensible that gallery owner Smithuis are still not satisfied that no distortion can be blamed him. According to van Loenen there is an examination of the Forensic Laboratory in 1992, indicating that the suspected counterfeit Altink-cloths are not-dated, and that there is not an erroneous J. Altink is signed. On this basis, and after statements by some experts, when justice has waived prosecution by the art dealer in Holthe.

Van Loenen received compensation last year, because he had been wrongly five days in custody. He got into trouble after some well-known auction houses such as Sotheby's and Christies took some Van Loenen introduced Altink cloths from the auction because it would be false. Ms. Smithuis brought the case to rolling, Sotheby's did eventually return.

Gallery Holding Smithuis Groningen and her colleagues Hofsteenge found to be reopened the case against Van Loenen because it is the most important studies that 'false' concludes

or 'real' must lead, not be implemented. Neither the right experts are examined as witnesses, according to the pair.

So Mrs. Smithuis attaches no importance to the opinion of art expert R. Snape of the Amsterdam auction house Sotheby's, where two false Altink would have appeared in 1992. "I can then another ten working mention his catalogs which were false and yet auctioned normal. One can still divine impossible to speak about an expert. There are people who watch the never learn, "writes Ms. Smithuis in her complaint to the Court.

Van Loenen, next week before the Court by the action of Mrs. Smithuis and Hofsteenge to appear, find the 'arrogant' Ms Smithuis to attract the expertise of arts expert Snape of Sotbeby in doubt. Director J. van Schaik of Sotheby's called the accusations of Snape 'very enigmatic "and also incorrect. "Snape was never summoned as an expert witness. He was just the only one who dared Altink Forgeries at that time to report to judicial authorities. Ms. Smithuis so Snape had actually to praise heaven. But instead, she gives him a kick after. Crazy, because there was an excellent relationship between her and Snape, "says Van Schaik.

Sotheby's to Mrs Smithuis, who is on vacation as soon as possible to ask for clarification. The accusation that Snape over the past period at least ten fake paintings would have auctioned Van Schaik rejects. "If so, Snape could not run a successful department."