

Translation of letter of Ruud Vleugel to Joma Sison, 6 March 2007 and the attached complaint addressed to the Minister of Finance and the appeal to the district court, Administrative Law Sector in Utrecht.

Dear Mr. Sison,

Attached are copies of appeal and complaint procedures filed by me.  
I shall keep you informed of further developments.

With friendly greeting,

Sgd. Ruud Vleugel

Complaint addressed to the Social Insurance Bank, 6 March 2007

Honorable College,

On behalf of Mr. J.M.C. Sison, resident of Utrecht, I hereby file an appeal against the decision of the Social Insurance Bank, based in Utrecht, on 29 January 2007, whereby the complaint against the decision of 19 June 2006, which consisted of the termination and demanding reimbursement of the allowance given to the appellant according to the General Old Age Law since 1 February 2004, was declared not grounded.

Appellant wants to bring forward the following:

1. An organ that gives out allowances cannot invoke the fact that it is not aware of the rules.
2. The aim of the Regulation 2580/2001 is to prevent that money will not go to specifically designated persons/organizations. This concerns freezing of assets, etc. That means the pertinent provision (Art. 2, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph introduction and under b of the Regulation) can only be effective in the future.
3. The payments which were carried out since 1 February 2004 have been done in accordance with the rules. It is nonsense to hold that the payments with retroactive effect have no legal basis. That also applies to the allegation that the unduly given amount must be paid back. Moreover, on the basis of that allegation, a procedure with the civil judge should be initiated.
4. The contested decision (including the decision at first instance) is therefore in violation of the law.

On behalf of the appellant I request you to nullify the above-stated contested decision.  
Costs to be determined by the court.

In expectation, signing, respectfully,

(Sgd.) R. Vleugel

Letter to the Minister of Finance 6 March 2007

Excellency,

Re: Complaint

In the name of Mr. J.M.C. Sison, resident of Utrecht, I hereby make a complaint against the decision made by the deputy Treasurer General on 29 January 2007 in your name. I enclose a copy of that decision.

In that decision there is a partial granting of the request of [my] client to make available a monthly amount from the frozen account. The complaint of [my] client is against the fact that he may avail of money that is in his savings account.

Client has an AOW-allowance which has been suspended. His monthly income from that is deposited in a special account at the SVB (which I assume), in that sense that is also a saving. He has no other income.

My request to you is to review the decision in the sense that the deposited amount at the SVB be transferred to the post bank account mentioned by you and further that the amount taken [or confiscated] by the SVB be lifted since this is an amount that is less than E 500 per month.

After all, if your motive (humanitarian interest and for primary living needs) is serious – and I still assume that – then your present gesture a so-called dead sparrow, considering that the amount in the said account is minimal and the client, as stated earlier, has no other income.

With the total or partial declaration of the complaint being grounded, I request that the costs of the legal aid be reimbursed in accordance with the applicable rules.

I await your reports (response) with interest  
I sign in expectation, respectfully and with friendly greeting,

(Sgd.) R. Vleugel