

# ***Three Dutch Court Decisions re Gambling Addiction***



**Abdel Ytsma**

**In-House Counsel of Holland Casino**



# Holland Casino: Socially Responsible Casino Operator of the Year 2008





## 3 unhappy guests

# Most Important Measures



- Admission Ban and Visit Restriction
- Visitors Registration System (VRS)
- Intervention Interviews

# Figures



|                                | <i>2007</i>   | <i>2006</i>   | <i>2005</i>   |
|--------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| <i>Intervention Interviews</i> | <b>26.049</b> | <b>19.443</b> | <b>15.183</b> |
| <i>Admission Bans</i>          | <b>5.217</b>  | <b>5.404</b>  | <b>5.194</b>  |
| <i>Visit Restrictions</i>      | <b>4.631</b>  | <b>4.127</b>  | <b>3.568</b>  |

# Responsible Gaming Policy



## Three Court Decisions



# First Lawsuit



## Court Decision in May 2006



# Second Lawsuit



## Court Decision in September 2006





# Third Lawsuit



## Court Decision in February 2007

- I. Gamblers have the **freedom of choice** to gamble in a casino and are therefore responsible for their own actions.
- II. Holland Casino may not impose an admission ban on a gambler all too lightly because this encroaches on this **freedom of choice**.
- III. There has to be a clear reason for Holland Casino to interfere with this **freedom of choice**. The mere fact that a gambler incurs losses or places high bets, is not sufficient to warrant this intervention.
- IV. Holland Casino can only intervene in the **freedom of choice** if they know that the gambler's gambling behaviour is harmful to himself or his family.

# Lessons Learned



