

Exhibit 32

On: 12/23/2011

Court of cassation

Civil chamber 3

Public hearing of February 25, 1971

Appeal no.: 69-12549

Published in the bulletin

REJECTION

PRES: MR. DE MONTERA, president

RPR MR. BEL, reporting judge

ADV. GEN. MR. LAGUERRE, advocate general

Plaintiff ATTORNEYS. MARTIN-MARTINIERE, attorney(s)

FRENCH REPUBLIC

IN THE NAME OF THE FRENCH PEOPLE

ON THE SINGLE GROUND: WHEREAS ASSOCIATES Y... BRING COMPLAINT AGAINST THE CHALLENGED JUDGMENT, WHICH DETERMINED THAT THE COUPLE X... WERE HOLDERS OF A FARMING LEASE ON TWO PASTURES BELONGING TO THEM, FOR HAVING MISREPRESENTED THE FACTS AND DISTORTED THE DOCUMENTS PRODUCED WITH THE RESULT THAT THE PARTIES HAD NOT ABLE TO COME TO AGREEMENT ON THE PRICE OF THE LEASE;

BUT WHEREAS, AFTER RECALLING THAT, BY THE RULING OF JUNE 18, 1968, WHICH BECAME IRREVOCABLE, THE COURT OF RURAL LEASES HAD RULED THAT THE BEGINNING OF EXECUTION OF A NON-WRITTEN LEASE MADE ON THE TWO ABOVE-MENTIONED PARCELS WAS ESTABLISHED BY COUPLE X..., THE COURT OF APPEAL, ASSESSING ITSELF THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE TESTIMONIES HEARD IN THE COURSE OF THE INVESTIGATION ORDERED BY THE COURT, DECIDED THAT THEY PROVED THE EXISTENCE OF A LEASE, WHOSE PRICE HOWEVER WAS NOT DETERMINED;

WHEREAS, THEN, IT MADE A PROPER APPLICATION OF THE PROVISIONS OF ARTICLE 1716 OF THE CIVIL CODE IN APPOINTING EXPERTS Z..., TO SET THE AMOUNT THEREOF: THUS, WITHOUT DISTORTING ANY DOCUMENTS OR COMMITTING AN ERROR OF CLASSIFICATION, THE APPEAL COURT JUDGES GAVE A LEGAL BASIS TO THEIR DECISION;

FOR THESE REASONS: REJECTS THE APPEAL BROUGHT AGAINST THE JUDGMENT DELIVERED ON APRIL 29, 1969 BY THE CAEN COURT OF APPEAL;

Publication: Bulletin of the judgments of the Court of Cassation, Civil Chamber 3, No. 135, P. 97.

Decision challenged: Caen Court of Appeal of April 29, 1969

Headings and summaries: LEASES IN GENERAL – VERBAL LEASES – PRICE – SETTING – EXPERT OPINION. MADE A PROPER APPLICATION OF ARTICLE 1716 OF THE CIVIL CODE. THE DECISION WHICH APPOINTS EXPERTS TO SET THE PRICE OF A VERBAL LEASE WHEN IT HAS BEEN IRREVOCABLY RULED BY A PREVIOUS DECISION THAT ITS EXECUTION HAD BEGUN AND THAT THE INVESTIGATION ORDERED GAVE PROOF OF ITS EXISTENCE.

Case-law precedents: CF. Court of Cassation (Social chamber) 1956-01-05, Bulletin 1956 IV No. 3 P. 2 (QUASHING)

Texts applied:

Civil code 1716