

The ASM Group S.A. Statement

Acting on behalf of the company under the name the ASM Group S.A., based in Warsaw (referred hereafter as the "Company" or the "ASM Group") as the Management Board authorized to jointly represent the Company, we hereby declare as follows.

The information published by the Electronic Information Transmission System (Polish: ESPI) and on the Company's website (www.asmgroup.com) called current reports with numbers from 8 to 59/2021 and numbers 2 to 8/2022 do not constitute the Company's announcements. This information was published by persons dismissed from the Company's Management Board on April 22nd, 2021. The Management Board of the ASM Group S.A. is therefore not responsible for the accuracy and truthfulness of the content contained in the above-mentioned announcements.

Also, all financial data published after April 22nd, 2021 by persons dismissed from the Company's Management Board do not come from the Company and the Management Board of the ASM Group S.A. is not responsible for the accuracy and truthfulness of this content.

Referring to the current representation of the Company, the Company indicates that the Extraordinary General Meeting (EGM) of the Company during which the composition of the Supervisory Board of the ASM was changed took place on April 22nd, 2021. Due to the fact that, as part of voting in separate groups, at least one member of the ASM's Supervisory Board - Michał Górski - was elected pursuant to Art. 385 § 8 of the Commercial Companies Code, and upon his election, the mandates of all the current members of the ASM Supervisory Board expired prematurely, and due to the fact that, in voting in separate groups, not all the mandates of the members of the Supervisory Board of the Company were filled, by resolutions of the EGM No. 4/2021, 5/2021, 6/2021 and 7/2021, Dorota Kaska, Krzysztof Ołdak, Marcin Tulejski and Rafał Mrozowski were appointed as members of the ASM's Supervisory Board, respectively.

Then, on April 22nd, 2021, the newly constituted ASM Supervisory Board composed of Dorota Kaska, Michał Górski, Marcin Tulejski, Rafał Mrozowski and Krzysztof Ołdak dismissed Dorota Kenny, Andrzej Nowak and Jacek Pawlak from the Management Board of the Company and in their place appointed Adam Stańczak, as the President of the Management Board of the Company, and Łukasz Stańczak as a Member of the Management Board of the Company. In addition, on April 24th, 2021, the composition of the Management Board was supplemented by two additional members - Krzysztof Przybyłowski and Weronika Wagner.

The resolutions of the EGM of the ASM of April 22nd, 2021 and the Supervisory Board of the ASM of April 22nd, 2021 and April 24th, 2021 are fully effective. The application for securing the claim to establish the non-existence of these resolutions was rejected by the decision of May 21st, 2021 on XVI GC 729/21, and the District Court in Warsaw, in its written justification, even "crushed" the position of the applicants. No irregularities were found by the court. *(Therefore, moving on to the assessment of the substantiation of claims in the context of Art. 189 of the Code of Civil Procedure the Court found that the plaintiffs had not substantiated their claims. (...))* Hence, all the circumstances of this meeting presented by the plaintiffs should be considered unsupported by the collected evidence-- an excerpt from the justification of the decision of May 21st, 2021 on XVI GC 729/21). Moreover, the Court found that the plaintiffs had not even substantiated their legal interest in determining pursuant to Art. 189 of the Code

of Civil Procedure (...) *Having these considerations in mind, the claim of the plaintiffs to establish the non-existence of the resolutions of the Extraordinary General Meeting of Shareholders of April 22nd, 2021 should be considered unsubstantiated due to the lack of a legal interest in such determination. Even if it were found that the plaintiffs could effectively claim the non-existence of the appealed resolutions pursuant to Art. 189 of the Code of Civil Procedure, the action to establish the non-existence of resolutions is also unsubstantiated* – an excerpt from the justification of the decision of May 21st, 2021 on XVI GC 729/21.

Finally, the Court accused the persons entitled in this case of trying to mislead the Court: (...) *In the opinion of the Court, failure to cite in the content of the justification of the claim all the circumstances relevant to the settlement, i.e. failure to state that, as a result of the security issued, two plaintiffs were unable to exercise their voting rights from the shares they were entitled to, may constitute a violation of Art. 3 of the Code of Civil Procedure. Such behavior does not deserve legal protection*" – an excerpt from the justification of the decision of May 21st, 2021 on XVI GC 729/21.)

The decision of May 21st, 2021 is now legally binding - the District Court in Warsaw dismissed the appeals of Marcin Skrzypiec, Szymon Pikula and Tatiana Pikula against this ruling by the decision of September 7th, 2021, regarding XVI Gz 194/21.

On the other hand, the fact that the Management Board of the Company includes persons appointed on April 22nd, 2021 and on April 24th, 2021, i.e. Adam Stańczak, Łukasz Stańczak, Weronika Wagner and Krzysztof Przybyłowski, additionally results from the following circumstances:

- a. The District Court in Warsaw, uniformly in a number of proceedings with the participation of the Company, recognizes the Management Board appointed on 22.04.2021 and 24.04.2021;
- b. The Registry Court made an entry in two 100% subsidiaries of the Company (Financial Service Solutions sp. z o.o. and the ASM Sales Force Agency sp. z o.o.) i.e. made an entry of persons appointed by the Company represented by the Management Board appointed on 22.04.2021 and 24.04.2021.

Additionally, the Company explains that on May 31st, 2021 and September 22nd, 2021, attempts were made to simulate the Company's EGM. However, Adam Stańczak, acting as the President of the Management Board of the Company, each time obtained decisions on securing the most far-reaching claim, i.e. the claim for establishing non-existence of resolutions of these shareholders' meetings, withholding their effectiveness.

Finally, the Company explains that it is not possible for persons dismissed from the Management Board of the Company on April 22nd, 2021 to derive their authorization from the alleged exercise of the personal right referred to in § 9 sec. 2 of the Company's Statute. The founders of the Company, i.e. Marcin Skrzypiec and Szymon Pikula, no longer have the possibility to effectively exercise their personal rights due to, among others, that they had earlier given up all of the Company's shares.

Attachments:

- decision of May 21st, 2021 on XVI GC 729/21 with justification;
- decision of September 7th, 2021 regarding XVI Gz 194/21.

Ref. act XVI GC 729/21

RESOLUTION

On May 21, 2021

District Court in Warsaw, XVI Commercial Division
composed as follows:

Chairman: **SSO Beata Dzierżko**

after examination on May 21, 2021 in Warsaw

in closed session

cases filed by **Marcin Skrzypiec, Szymon Pikula and Tatiana Pikul**

against the ASM Group, a joint stock company based in Warsaw

for establishing non-existence of resolutions

Subject: an application for freezing order

decides:

To dismiss the application.

**JUSTIFICATION
decisions of May 21st, 2021**

The suit of April 30th, 2021, Marcin Skrzypiec, Szymon Pikula, Tatiana Pikula asked for I.:

1. establishing non-existence, pursuant to Art. 189 of the Code of Civil Procedure, of the following resolutions adopted during the Extraordinary General Meeting of Shareholders (hereinafter: "EGMS") of the ASM Group S.A. based in Warsaw (hereinafter: "the Company" or "ASM") on April 22nd, 2021:

1.1.

resolution no. 1/2021 on the election of the Extraordinary Chairman of the General Meeting of Shareholders of the ASM Group S.A. (hereinafter: "Resolution of the EGMS No 1");

1.2.

resolution no. 2/2021 on adopting the agenda (hereinafter: "Resolution of the EGMS no. 2");

1.3.

resolution no. 3/2021 on the number of members of the Supervisory Board of the ASM Group S.A. (hereinafter: "Resolution of the EGMS No. 3");

1.4.

resolution no. 4/2021 of the Group of Shareholders entitled to elect members of the Supervisory Board by voting in separate groups at the Extraordinary General Meeting of the Company under the name of the ASM Group based in Warsaw of April 22nd, 2021 on the appointment and election of a member of the Supervisory Board of the Company by voting in separate groups pursuant to Art. 385 § 2 of the Code of commercial companies in the person of Adam Stańczak and delegating a member of the Supervisory Board of the Company as part of voting in separate groups for permanent, individual performance supervisory activities and the election of the Chairman of the Shareholders' Group and the Scrutiny Committee of the Group of Shareholders (hereinafter: "Resolution of the Extraordinary General Meeting of Shareholders No. 4")

1.5.

resolution no. 5/2021 regarding the appointment of a member of the Supervisory Board of the Company in the person of Dorota Kaśka (hereinafter: "Resolution of the Extraordinary General Meeting of Shareholders No. 5");

1.6.

resolution no. 6/2021 regarding the appointment of a member of the Supervisory Board of the Company in the person of Krzysztof Ołdak (hereinafter: "Resolution of the Extraordinary General Meeting of Shareholders No. 6");

1.7.

resolution no. 7/2021 regarding the appointment of a member of the Supervisory Board of the Company in the person of Marcin Tulejski (hereinafter: "Resolution of the Extraordinary General Meeting of Shareholders No. 7");

1.8.

resolution no. 8/2021 regarding the appointment of a member of the Supervisory Board of the Company in the person of Rafał Mrozowski (hereinafter: "Resolution of the Extraordinary General Meeting of Shareholders No. 8");

1.9.

resolution no. 9/2021 on determining the amount of a separate remuneration for the members of the Supervisory Board of the ASM Group S.A. delegated to a permanent individual performing of supervisory activities (hereinafter: "Resolution No. 9") of the Extraordinary General Meeting of Shareholders;

1.10.

resolution no. 11/2021 on the determination of the entity obliged to incurring the costs of convening and holding the Extraordinary General Meeting (hereinafter: "Resolution of the Extraordinary General Meeting of Shareholders No. 10");

2. Establishing non-existence, pursuant to art. 189 of the Code of Civil Procedure, of the following resolutions of the Supervisory Board of the ASM Group S.A:

2.1.

of April 22nd, 2021 on the appointment of Adam Stańczak to the Management Board of the ASM Group based in Warsaw (hereinafter: "Resolution of the Supervisory Board No. 1");

2.2.

of April 22nd, 2021 on the appointment of Łukasz Stańczak to the Management Board of the ASM Group based in Warsaw (hereinafter: "Resolution of the Supervisory Board No. 2");

2.3.

of April 24, 2021 on the appointment of Krzysztof Przybyłowski to the Management Board of the ASM Group based in Warsaw (hereinafter: "Resolution of the Supervisory Board No. 3");

2.4.

of April 24, 2021 on the appointment of Weronika Wagner to the Management Board of the ASM Group based in Warsaw (hereinafter: "Resolution of the Supervisory Board No. 4").

Along with the suit the plaintiffs brought in point III:

1. granting freezing order for non-pecuniary claims of the plaintiffs for establishing the non-existence of the resolutions indicated in point I.1 of the petition above, through:

1.1. suspension of the execution of EGMS Resolution no. 3, EGMS Resolution no. 4, EGMS Resolution no. 5, EGMS resolution no. 6, EGMS resolution no. 7, EGMS resolution no. 8;

1.2.

suspension of registration proceedings regarding the entry of changes to the register of entrepreneurs of the National Court Register kept for the ASM on the basis of of the appealed resolutions EGMS Resolution no. 3, EGMS Resolution no. 4, EGMS Resolution no. 5, EGMS Resolution no. 6, EGMS resolution no. 7, EGMS resolution no. 8; until the case is legally resolved;

2.

granting a freezing order for non-pecuniary claims of the plaintiffs for establishing the non-existence of the resolutions indicated in point 1.2 of the petition above, through:

2.1.

suspension of the execution of Supervisory Board Resolution no. 1, Supervisory Board Resolution no. 2, Supervisory Board Resolution no. 3, Supervisory Board Resolution no. 4;

2.2.

suspension of registration proceedings regarding the entry of changes to the register entrepreneurs of the National Court Register kept for the ASM on the basis of of the appealed Resolution of the Supervisory Board no. 1, Resolution of the Supervisory Board no. 2, Resolution of the Supervisory Board no. 3, Resolution of the Supervisory Board no. 4.

In their justification, the plaintiffs indicated that Marcin Skrzypiec and Tatiana Pikula are shareholders of the defendant company, and Szymon Pikula and Marcin Skrzypiec are members of the defendant company's Supervisory Board. According to the plaintiffs' assessment, the non-existence of the resolutions adopted at the Extraordinary General Meeting of Shareholders on April 22nd 2021 and the following resolutions of the company's Supervisory Board show that legally the EGMS was not "opened or proceeded" as a result of the unlawful conduct of another shareholder - Adam Stańczak, who prevented the authorized person from opening the Extraordinary General Meeting of Shareholders in accordance with the company's Statute.

Moreover, as a result of the actions of minority shareholders - Adam Stańczak and Łukasz Stańczak, other shareholders and other persons, including members of the management board and an authorized person to open the EGMS were prevented from participating in the deliberations. The plaintiffs emphasized that the resolutions covered by the lawsuit concerned significant issues for the functioning of

the company, because first the new members of the Supervisory Board were appointed, and, as a result of subsequent resolutions of the new Supervisory Board, there was a change of the management board. These resolutions, in their opinion, are non-existent and have no legal effect. In support of the legal interest under Art. 189 of the Code of Civil Procedure the plaintiffs pointed out that a judgment establishing the non-existence of resolutions will provide them with protection in the form of removal from the circulation all the activities of the alleged supervisory board established on the basis of the appealed fake resolutions of the Extraordinary General Meeting of Shareholders and will authorize all actions taken by supervisory board of correct composition.

In justifying the legal interest, the plaintiffs stressed that the persons claiming to be the supervisory board and the management board appointed by the supervisory board make decisions the consequences of which will be irreversible and may also destabilize the company.

The court considered as follows:

The submitted request does not deserve to be accepted.

Pursuant to Art. 730 and 7301 Code of Civil Procedure statutory grounds for granting the security of the claim includes: validation of the claim, i.e. substantiation of the claim and substantiation of the legal interest in granting the freezing order. The indicated conditions must exist cumulatively, which means that even one of them is missing it makes the granting of the freezing order for the claim inadmissible.

In this process, the plaintiffs seek to secure a claim of non-existence of the resolutions adopted at the Extraordinary General Meeting of Shareholders of April 22nd, 2021 and resolutions adopted by the Supervisory Board of the defendant company on April 22nd, 2021 and April 24th, 2021. The basis of the plaintiffs' claim is therefore Art. 189 of the Code of Civil Procedure (action to establish the existence or non-existence of a legal relationship or right).

First of all, it should be pointed out that two of the plaintiffs are shareholders of the defendant company. It is clear from the documents attached to the files, including the presence list constituting an attachment to the minutes of the Extraordinary General Meeting of Shareholders of April 22nd, 2021, the shareholders of the defendant company are: the plaintiff Marcin Skrzypiec, who holds a total of 15,401,802 ordinary bearer shares, the plaintiff Tatiana Pikula, who holds a total of 15,428,616 ordinary bearer shares, Adam Stańczak, who holds a total of 14 359 355 ordinary bearer shares, representing 25.18% of the share capital of the Company and Rafał Mrozowski owning 900 shares. The EGMS of April 22nd, 2021 was attended by Adam Stańczak who owns 14 359 355 shares and Rafał Mrozowski who owns 900 shares.

In total, the General Meeting was attended by shareholders holding a total of 14,360,255 shares, which gives 25.2% of the capital share. The plaintiff, Szymon

Pikula, and the plaintiff, Marcin Skrzypiec, were members of the supervisory board of the defendant company, which results, inter alia, from the excerpt from the National Court Register of the defendant company.

Next, the content of Art. 422 § 1 of the Code of Commercial Companies and Partnerships, pursuant to which a resolution of the general meeting that is inconsistent with the statute or morality and is against the interest of the company or aimed at harming a shareholder, may be appealed against by way of an action brought against the company to repeal the resolution. Legitimacy to bring this action is granted, inter alia, in accordance with Art. 422 § 1 point 1) and point 3) of the Commercial Companies Code to the management board, supervisory board and individual members of these bodies; and to a shareholder unreasonably not allowed to participate in the general meeting. The same entities may bring an action described in art. 425 § 1 of the Code of Commercial Companies and Partnerships, which states that persons or the company's bodies listed in Art. 422 § 2 have the right to bring an action against the company for a declaration of invalidity of a resolution of the general meeting that is inconsistent with the Act. The provision of art. 189 of the Code of Civil Procedure shall not apply.

The basic division of resolutions is the division into resolutions: correctly adopted, faulty (which may be revoked - Art. 422 of the Code of Commercial Companies and Partnerships) and invalid (for which a declaration of invalidity may be demanded - art. 425 of the Code of Commercial Companies and Partnerships). The indicated dichotomous breakdown is exhaustive from the point of view of defectiveness of the adopted resolutions. Thus, the legislator introduced two modes for appealing against resolutions and there are no grounds for extending this catalog. The legislator's assumption was to comprehensively regulate the challenge and the procedure for resolutions contrary to the Act or taken incorrectly, it also applies to resolutions referred to as non-existent (*similarly, the judgment of the Court of Appeal in Warsaw of 19th of January 2016, ref. VI ACa 777/15*).

It should also be noted that in the content of Art. 425 of the Commercial Companies Code the application of Art. 189 of the Code of Civil Procedure was disabled explicitly. The District Court shares the position that prevails in the jurisprudence common courts and the Supreme Court that *cases of non-existent resolutions are a category different from illegal resolutions; they are characterized by so drastic, the extreme degree of the defectiveness that justifies considering them non-existent, a therefore not having any legal effect ab initio* (the decision of the Supreme Court, August 25th, 2016, V CSK 694/15). The content of the suit does not indicate that such a situation took place in the present case.

In the present case, the plaintiffs did not even attempt to challenge the resolutions of the Extraordinary General Meeting of Shareholders based on the grounds provided for in the Code of Commercial Companies, despite the fact that two of

them are shareholders of the defendant company, and Szymon Pikula and Marcin Skrzypiec were members of the supervisory board.

The content of the above-mentioned provisions and an exhaustive catalog of forms of appealing against resolutions undertaken at the Extraordinary General Meeting of Shareholders also applies to the legitimacy of persons submitting such a request. The regulation is intended to ensure the certainty of actions taken by entities authorized to do so by law and exclude situations in which everyone could unlimitedly challenge the resolutions adopted by the Extraordinary General Meeting of Shareholders. Action brought on the basis of art. 189 of the Code of Civil Procedure must not, however, seek to circumvent the provisions of the Commercial Companies Code relating to appealing against resolutions of capital companies, including, in particular, those regarding the active legitimacy and the time schedules for bringing an action.

Bearing in mind the above considerations, the claim of the plaintiffs for establishing the non-existence of the resolutions of the Extraordinary General Meeting of Shareholders of April 22nd, 2021 should be considered as improbable due to the lack of a legal interest in the determination.

Even if it was considered that the plaintiffs could successfully bring the claim establishing the non-existence of the appealed resolutions pursuant to Art. 189 of the Code of Civil Procedure, the action of establishing the non-existence of the resolutions is also improbable.

As for the resolutions of the supervisory board appealed also in these proceedings, it is appropriate to indicate that the provisions of the Commercial Companies Code do not provide for appealing against the resolutions of the supervisory board. At this point, however, the resolution of the Seven Judges Panel of the Supreme Court should be referred to- Civil Chamber of September 18th, 2013 (III CZP 13/13), according to which:

“resolutions of the management board, supervisory board and audit committee of the limited liability company and resolutions of the management board and supervisory board of a joint-stock company are subject to an appeal by way of an action for a determination (Civil Procedure Code Art.189) in connection with Art. 58 of the Civil Code ”. The resolution was adopted as a result of judicial discrepancies as to appealing against the resolutions including the supervisory board's.

Therefore, moving on to the assessment of the substantiation of claims in the context of Art. 189 CPC the Court found that the plaintiffs had not substantiated their claims. The plaintiffs pointed out that the person authorized to open the EGMS was Paweł Moskwa, but despite his presence at the company's headquarters on the day of the EGMS, he was not allowed to open the EGMS. Such circumstances do not arise from the content of the evidence submitted with the lawsuit. It follows from the Assembly's minutes drawn up by a notary, that Paweł Moskwa was present at the meeting, however, he arrived 8 minutes late and the EGMS was already underway at that time. Such circumstances were recorded. The opening of the

Assembly had already been made, and the Chairman of the Meeting had been already elected. After the election of the Chairman, Paweł Moskwa arrived at the Assembly. It should also be emphasized that Paweł Moskwa's role was only to open the Assembly. The plaintiffs did not explain the impact on the Assembly and the content of the adopted resolutions if the Assembly was opened by an unauthorized person.

Considering the conflict between plaintiffs and A. Stańczak, a shareholder present at the EGMS, the Court was unable to objectively determine whether Paweł Moskwa deliberately did not show up on time to prevent the opening of the Assembly. No such circumstances follow from the recording submitted to the statement of claim on a pendrive, as well as from 6 submitted photos that would testify to the violence against the plaintiffs and other people who had expressed willingness to participate in the Assembly. First of all, it is not clear from the recordings what time and day they were created. Secondly, one cannot establish who the people on these recordings are.

Moreover, the recording is inconsistent with the content of the statement of claim regarding the description of the course of events. Hence, it has not been substantiated that the persons entitled to participate in the Assembly were not allowed into this Assembly, and also that physical force and violence were used against them. It is not clear from the recordings what exactly was to take place behind closed doors, in front of which there were arguments of people recorded in these recordings. All the more so, it was not substantiated that the said Assembly was held exactly at this time. It is not even known if the people who wanted to enter the room were entitled to do so. Moreover, the recordings show a clear reluctance and conflict between the parties. It cannot be unequivocally stated that either party was aggrieved. Such circumstances were also established by the police that came to intervene. Police clearly indicated a conflict, but the parties provided contradictory information. Therefore the police patrol decided that in the absence of an agreement, the police would have consequences for everyone, not just one of the parties, at the next intervention. Hence all the circumstances of this meeting presented by the plaintiffs should be considered as unsupported in the collected evidence.

The Court's attention cannot ignore the content of the General Court's decision of April 19th, 2021, which secured the claim of Adam Stańczak to establish that Tatiana Piкуła cannot exercise voting rights from all 15,428,616 shares of the ASM Group S.A. based in Warsaw, and for a determination that Marcin Skrzypiec cannot exercise voting rights from all 15,401,802 shares of the ASM Group S.A. based in Warsaw through prohibiting Tatiana Piкуła of exercising the right to vote from all of the 15,428,616 shares and prohibiting Marcin Skrzypiec of exercising the right to vote from all 15,401,802 shares of the defendant company until the legally valid termination of the case's proceedings.

First, the wording of this provision confirms the existence of a conflict in the company. Second, it does not substantiate claims about the use of coercive

measures against plaintiffs and a person authorized to open the Assembly, because these circumstances did not have any real influence on the content of the decisions made, since the plaintiffs as shareholders were deprived of the right to vote.

In the opinion of the Court, failure to cite all the circumstances in the substantiation of the statement of claim relevant for the settlement, i.e. the failure to state that as a result of the issued security, two of the plaintiffs were not able to exercise their voting rights attached to the shares they were entitled to, may constitute a breach of Art. 3 of the Code of Civil Procedure. Such behavior does not deserve legal protection.

Above all, however, the content of the above-mentioned resolution indicates that the plaintiffs do not have legal interest in bringing this action, because they were deprived of voting rights anyway, and therefore the resolutions - even in spite of their presence - would have been adopted in the described shape. The role of Paweł Moskwa was only technical and had no influence on the content of resolutions. Additionally, as it results from the content of the protocol, the plaintiffs were not present at the Assembly, despite proper notification. It must be noted that the plaintiffs' legal interest cannot be found in the possibility of appealing against the resolutions for which they did not have the right to vote. Taking into account the plaintiffs' claims would nullify the effects of the decision of April 19th, 2021. This action cannot result in circumvention of the consequences of the freezing order from 19/04/2021, for which there is no information on its not functioning in legal transactions.

Questioning the freezing order can be made by the means of appealing in the procedure in which they were issued.

The arguments cited above also remain valid in context of the claim for establishing non-existence of resolutions of the supervisory board on appointing members of the management board. Since it was unsubstantiated that new members of the supervisory board were appointed in a defective method, there are no grounds for refusing the effectiveness of the new supervisory board's resolutions.

In this state of affairs, and with the above arguments in mind, the Court stated that the plaintiffs did not substantiate their claims covered by the lawsuit.

Given that the claim is unsubstantiated, there is no need to make an assessment of the credibility of the second condition for the provision of freezing order, i.e. the legal interest in the provision of the freezing order.

Bearing in mind the above, it was adjudicated as in the sentence.

SSO Beata Dzierżko

Ordinance

A copy of the decision with the justification should be delivered to the plaintiff's attorney.

Res. act XVI Gz 194/21 p-I

RESOLUTION

On September 7th, 2021

District Court in Warsaw, XVI Commercial Division composed of:
Chairman - **SSO Jan Wawrowski**

after examination on September 7th, 2021 in Warsaw in a closed session
case filed by **Marcin Skrzypiec, Szymon Pikula and Tatiana Pikula**
against **the ASM Group Spółka Akcyjna** based in Warsaw
for establishing non-existence of resolutions
as a result of complaints from **Marcin Skrzypiec, Szymon Pikula and Tatiana Pikula**
on the decision of May 21st, 2021, file ref. act XVI GC 729/21
decides:
dismiss both complaints.

SSO Jan Wawrowski

Ordinance:

deliver a copy of the decision to: Marcin Skrzypiec with instructions: about the request for justification and non-appealable decision and the other plaintiffs' attorney.

2021-09-07

SSO Jan Wawrowski

Ref. no. XVI Gz 194/21 p-I