LexData

YOUR CASE, BENCHMARKED AGAINST RELEVANT DECISIONS

What does a court decide in a case like this?

EXAMPLE REPORT · FICTIONAL CLIENT · 10 questions

An evidence-based overview of what comparable parties asked for, what courts decided in published decisions, and what practical next steps follow.



10 questions

6143 comparable decisions

PREPARED FOR
Alex Voorbeeld (fictief)

REFERENCE DATE
2026-11-10

EDITION
Example

REPORT ID
EXAMPLE-F8DDAE4E

BEFORE YOU START

Your questions

THIS REPORT AND YOUR LAWYER

Research into published rulings: not legal advice, and not a replacement for a lawyer or mediator.

- This report does not replace a lawyer. A divorce petition to the court requires a lawyer.
- It is wise to take this report to a lawyer before you sign anything or let a deadline pass.
- You can instruct a lawyer or use a legal remedy at any moment; nothing in this report advises against it.

This report describes your situation as you told it. The other party was not heard. The report makes no findings about them.

What you get	A written research report on published Dutch rulings comparable to your situation, answering your 10 questions.
What it is not	Not legal advice, not a prediction or guarantee, not a replacement for a lawyer or mediator.

One chapter per question. Each starts with three scales, shows the rulings we read and which way each went, how those add up, and what these cases teach.

#	QUESTION	SCALES
1	**Where will the children mainly live?** Main residence with you, about 70% of the time with you.	HOW DID COMPARABLE RULINGS GO? As the other side asks — As you ask **4120 of 5442 as you ask** CLOSENESS OF MATCH Hardly comparable — Closely comparable **Close match**
2	**What happens to the house?** You keep the home, within 12 months.	HOW DID COMPARABLE RULINGS GO? As the other side asks — As you ask **37 of 149 as you ask** CLOSENESS OF MATCH Hardly comparable — Closely comparable **Close match**
3	**What counts when child support is set?** A calculation based on both incomes.	HOW DID COMPARABLE RULINGS GO? As the other side asks — As you ask Not rated (n = 3350) CLOSENESS OF MATCH Hardly comparable — Closely comparable **Close match**

4 **Partner support: what do courts take into account?**

You receive partner support.

HOW DID COMPARABLE RULINGS GO?

As the other side asks — As you ask

Not rated (n = 1267)

CLOSENESS OF MATCH

Hardly comparable — Closely comparable

Close match

5 **How much of the children's time will I have?**

About 70 of every 100 days with you

HOW DID COMPARABLE RULINGS GO?

As the other side asks — As you ask

188 of 1051 as you ask

CLOSENESS OF MATCH

Hardly comparable — Closely comparable

Close match

6 **How do courts decide what the payer can afford (draagkracht)?**

HOW DID COMPARABLE RULINGS GO?

As the other side asks — As you ask

Not rated (n = 4166)

CLOSENESS OF MATCH

Hardly comparable — Closely comparable

Close match

7 **Can a court count income that someone could earn but does not?**

HOW DID COMPARABLE RULINGS GO?

As the other side asks — As you ask

Not rated (n = 650)

CLOSENESS OF MATCH

Hardly comparable — Closely comparable

Moderate match

8 **From when does support start, and what about payments already made?**

HOW DID COMPARABLE RULINGS GO?

As the other side asks — As you ask

Not rated (n = 1713)

CLOSENESS OF MATCH

Hardly comparable — Closely comparable

Close match

9 **Can a parent move away with the children?**

HOW DID COMPARABLE RULINGS GO?

As the other side asks — As you ask

Not rated (n = 1148)

CLOSENESS OF MATCH

Hardly comparable — Closely comparable

Close match

10 **Do I get back private money I put into the home or our joint assets?**

HOW DID COMPARABLE RULINGS GO?

As the other side asks — As you ask

Not rated (n = 426)

CLOSENESS OF MATCH

Hardly comparable — Closely comparable

Moderate match

HOW TO READ THE RATINGS

Every score is a sliding scale. The dot shows where the rulings we read come out; no dot means the score does not apply here. A scale is a count of published rulings, not a chance.

How did comparable rulings go?
Of the comparable rulings counted (n), how many (k) went as you ask: the further right the dot, the more went your way. A count, not a probability or a prediction. Child and partner support amounts are not rated: they depend on too many variables.

Closeness of match
How closely the rulings behind the reading resemble your case on average (children, ages, marriage, procedure, incomes).

IMPORTANT: THIS IS RESEARCH, NOT LEGAL ADVICE

This report summarizes published decisions, gives our reading of them and offers practical suggestions. It does not predict the outcome in your case, promises no result, and does not replace your lawyer. It is wise to discuss every step with your lawyer before you file or agree to anything.

QUESTION 1 OF 10

Where will the children mainly live?

YOUR POSITION (AS YOU STATED IT)

Main residence with you, about 70% of the time with you.

OTHER SIDE'S POSITION (AS YOU DESCRIBED IT)

Main residence alternating between both, about 50% of the time with you.

Is a starting point wrong? You can tell us within 14 days of delivery and you then get a corrected version free of charge (terms, section 8).

HOW DID COMPARABLE RULINGS GO?

As the other side asks — As you ask



4120 of 5442 as you ask

CLOSENESS OF MATCH

Hardly comparable — Closely comparable



Close match

In 4120 of the 5442 comparable rulings the court decided what you ask for. The other 1322: alternating in 157 (what the other side asks), with the other parent in 1165.

Researched for this question: 5442 published rulings, up to the reference date (2026-11-10). Not researched: your own documents, the other party's position, and laws or rulings after the reference date.

How the rating was built

your way	mixed	other side's way
4120	**157**	**1165**
went your way	in between	went the other way

How did comparable rulings go?

4120 of 5442 as you ask

The dot stands at 4120 of 5442: the rulings that went your way among all counted. Mixed rulings do not count as your way.

Rulings (ECLI): ECLI:NL:RBDHA:2025:23207, ECLI:NL:RBDHA:2025:21907, ECLI:NL:RBDHA:2026:10658, ECLI:NL:RBDHA:2026:7982, ECLI:NL:RBMNE:2023:5323, ECLI:NL:RBOVE:2025:7049, ECLI:NL:RBROT:2025:15394, ECLI:NL:RBROT:2026:2278, ECLI:NL:RBDHA:2026:5413, ECLI:NL:RBZWB:2026:6579 and 5432 more counted

Rulings we read for this question

Each ruling is labelled with the way it went: your way, the other side's way, or mixed. 'Not counted' means the ruling is shown as an example. The summary of each ruling is our text, not the judge's. Only text in quotation marks is the judge's own wording.

your way

ECLI:NL:RBDHA:2025:23207

2025 · final, first instance · match 0.99

with you

Children: 2; Ages at decision: 9, 12; Marriage: 11 years

> “De ouders hebben in het ouderschapsplan onder meer afgesproken dat de kinderen hun hoofdverblijfplaats bij de moeder hebben.” feiten

your way

ECLI:NL:RBDHA:2025:21907

2025 · final, first instance · match 0.98

with you

Children: 2; Ages at decision: 9, 12

> “Zij neemt daarbij de huidige situatie, waarbij de kinderen bij de vrouw verblijven” beoordeling

other side's way ECLI:NL:OGEAA:2018:650
2018 · final, first instance · match 0.95

with the other parent
Children: 2

> “bepaalt het hoofdverblijf van de minderjarigen [MINDERJARIGE SUB 1]”

mixed ECLI:NL:OGEABES:2026:150
2026 · final, first instance · match 0.95

alternating
Children: 2

> “Nu partijen een vorm van co-ouderschap hanteren en de kinderen gemiddeld eenzelfde periode bij de man of de vrouw verblijven”

other side's way ECLI:NL:OGEAA:2019:784
2019 · final, first instance · match 0.95

with the other parent
Children: 2

> “bepaalt de woonplaats (hoofdverblijf) van de minderjarigen bij de vader”

What these cases teach

WHERE THE RULINGS THAT WENT YOUR WAY DIFFER

- No clear difference in stage, number of children or marriage length between the rulings that went your way and those that did not. The reasons are in the rulings themselves: see below.

Differences within a small set of rulings, not causes. It can help to discuss with your lawyer whether they apply to you.

LEARN FROM THE RULINGS THAT WENT THE OTHER WAY

In these comparable rulings the court decided otherwise than you ask. The reasons are in the court's own text. It can help to read them with your lawyer: what the court pointed at there is what you can prepare for now. The summary and the quote are in the list above.

other side's way ECLI:NL:OGEAA:2018:650 — with the other parent

other side's way ECLI:NL:OGEAA:2019:784 — with the other parent

other side's way ECLI:NL:RBALK:2008:BH1312
2008 · final, first instance · match 0.95

with the other parent
Children: 2

> “In augustus 2008 is de vader met zijn nieuwe partner en de minderjarigen naar Abbenes verhuisd.”

other side's way ECLI:NL:RBALK:2009:BJ2417
2009 · final, first instance · match 0.95

with the other parent
Children: 2

> “de gewone verblijfplaats van de minderjarigen [kind 1], geboren op [geboortedatum 1] in de gemeente Den Helder, en [kind 2], geboren op [geboortedatum 2] in de gemeente Den Helder, bij de vader zal worden vastgesteld.”

other side's way ECLI:NL:RBAMS:2019:809
2019 · final, first instance · match 0.95

with the other parent
Children: 2

> “Verleent een machtiging tot plaatsing van [kind 1] en [kind 2] gedurende dag en nacht bij de vader”

HOW TO KEEP YOUR POSITION STRONG

- It can help to keep doing what supports your position: a stable routine, a dated care log and factual communication.
- It can help to keep messages with the other parent short and about the children; your own conduct can be raised against you.
- It can help to prepare answers to the other side's arguments (chapter 3) before the hearing.

General preparation tips, to discuss with your lawyer. They are not drawn from the rulings.

QUESTION 2 OF 10

What happens to the house?

YOUR POSITION (AS YOU STATED IT)

You keep the home, within 12 months.

OTHER SIDE'S POSITION (AS YOU DESCRIBED IT)

The home is sold, within 6 months.

Is a starting point wrong? You can tell us within 14 days of delivery and you then get a corrected version free of charge (terms, section 8).

HOW DID COMPARABLE RULINGS GO?

As the other side asks — As you ask



37 of 149 as you ask

CLOSENESS OF MATCH

Hardly comparable — Closely comparable



Close match

In 112 of the 149 comparable rulings the court decided otherwise than you ask: sold in 43 (what the other side asks), allocated to the other side in 53, left open in 16. In 37 it decided what you ask for.

Researched for this question: 149 published rulings, up to the reference date (2026-11-10). Not researched: your own documents, the other party's position, and laws or rulings after the reference date.

How the rating was built

your way	mixed	other side's way
37	**16**	**96**
went your way	in between	went the other way

How did comparable rulings go?

37 of 149 as you ask

The dot stands at 37 of 149: the rulings that went your way among all counted. Mixed rulings do not count as your way.

Rulings (ECLI): ECLI:NL:RBLIM:2026:6845, ECLI:NL:RBOVE:2026:3197, ECLI:NL:GHAMS:2023:852, ECLI:NL:RBDHA:2025:17337, ECLI:NL:RBGEL:2026:2929, ECLI:NL:GHAMS:2024:1609, ECLI:NL:GHDHA:2025:1913, ECLI:NL:GHSHE:2023:849, ECLI:NL:RBAMS:2023:437, ECLI:NL:RBDHA:2021:7868 and 139 more counted

Rulings we read for this question

Each ruling is labelled with the way it went: your way, the other side's way, or mixed. 'Not counted' means the ruling is shown as an example. The summary of each ruling is our text, not the judge's. Only text in quotation marks is the judge's own wording.

other side's way — ECLI:NL:RBLIM:2026:6845

2026 · final, first instance · match 0.97

sold

Children: 2; Ages at decision: 7, 9

> “de echtelijke woning van partijen aan [adres] te [woonplaats] dient te worden verkocht aan een derde;” beslissing 4.5

other side's way — ECLI:NL:RBOVE:2026:3197

2026 · final, first instance · match 0.96

allocated to the other side

Children: 2; Ages at decision: 9, 11

> “Hierin staat onder andere dat de man de echtelijke woning krijgt toegedeeld.” beoordeling 6.7

your way | ECLI:NL:GHAMS:2024:3499
2024 · appeal · match 0.92

allocated to you
Children: 2; Ages at decision: 8, 12; Marriage: 14 years

> “deelt toe aan de vrouw de woning aan [A-straat] te [plaats B] , onder de voorwaarden:” feiten 3.4

---

mixed | ECLI:NL:GHARL:2024:3867
2024 · appeal · match 0.92

left open
Children: 2; Ages at decision: 9, 12; Marriage: 10 years

> “Het hof zal alle verdere beslissingen – die samenhangen met de woning, de schenkingen en de vergoedingsrechten en de verdeling van de banksaldi – aanhouden.” beoordeling 5.11

---

your way | ECLI:NL:GHAMS:2025:1914
2025 · appeal · match 0.92

allocated to you
Children: 2; Ages at decision: 9, 13; Marriage: 14 years

> “de woning inmiddels op 9 januari 2025 aan de vrouw is geleverd, waarbij zij de helft van de overwaarde aan de man heeft betaald.” beoordeling 5.9

What these cases teach

WHERE THE RULINGS THAT WENT YOUR WAY DIFFER

- No clear difference in stage, number of children or marriage length between the rulings that went your way and those that did not. The reasons are in the rulings themselves: see below.

Differences within a small set of rulings, not causes. It can help to discuss with your lawyer whether they apply to you.

LEARN FROM THE RULINGS THAT WENT THE OTHER WAY

In these comparable rulings the court decided otherwise than you ask. The reasons are in the court's own text. It can help to read them with your lawyer: what the court pointed at there is what you can prepare for now. The summary and the quote are in the list above.

other side's way | ECLI:NL:RBLIM:2026:6845 | sold

---

other side's way | ECLI:NL:RBOVE:2026:3197 | allocated to the other side

---

other side's way | ECLI:NL:GHAMS:2023:852
2023 · appeal · match 0.95

sold
Children: 2; Ages at decision: 11, 14; Marriage: 12 years

> “de vrouw haar medewerking dient te verlenen aan de verkoop en de levering van de echtelijke woning aan een derde” beoordeling 5.7

---

other side's way | ECLI:NL:RBDHA:2025:17337
2025 · final, first instance · match 0.94

allocated to the other side
Children: 2; Ages at decision: 15, 18

> “a. de woning wordt toegedeeld aan de man voor een waarde van € 473.000,-;” beslissing 1

---

other side's way | ECLI:NL:RBGEL:2026:2929
2026 · final, first instance · match 0.94

allocated to the other side
Children: 2

> “Partijen zijn het erover eens dat de woning aan de man kan worden toegedeeld tegen de getaxeerde waarde van € 425.000.” beoordeling 3.27

HOW TO IMPROVE YOUR POSITION

- It can help to show that you can finance a takeover on your own: an indicative mortgage offer or a statement from your bank.
- An independent valuation can help, so the price is not the dispute.
- It can help to propose concrete terms: a deadline, who pays the costs until the transfer, and a sale as fallback if financing fails.
- It can help to read the rulings that went the other way (listed below) with your lawyer: was financing, the price or the deadline the issue?

General preparation tips, to discuss with your lawyer. They are not drawn from the rulings.

QUESTION 3 OF 10

What counts when child support is set?

YOUR POSITION (AS YOU STATED IT)

A calculation based on both incomes.

OTHER SIDE'S POSITION (AS YOU DESCRIBED IT)

A calculation based on both incomes.

Is a starting point wrong? You can tell us within 14 days of delivery and you then get a corrected version free of charge (terms, section 8).

HOW DID COMPARABLE RULINGS GO?

As the other side asks — As you ask

Not rated (n = 3350)

CLOSENESS OF MATCH

Hardly comparable — Closely comparable

Close match

Not rated: the amount depends on many variables (incomes, earning capacity, need, care split). Below: which inputs courts used in 3350 relevant rulings.

Researched for this question: 3350 published rulings, up to the reference date (2026-11-10). Not researched: your own documents, the other party's position, and laws or rulings after the reference date.

How the rating was built

Not rated: support amounts depend on too many variables. The table counts how often the court states each calculation input.

CALCULATION INPUT	STATED BY THE COURT IN
The parties' incomes	2073 of 3350 relevant rulings
The payer's ability to pay (draagkracht)	2008 of 3350 relevant rulings
The children's need (behoefte)	2111 of 3350 relevant rulings
The care split between the parents	1191 of 3350 relevant rulings

Rulings (ECLI): ECLI:NL:RBNHO:2026:3572, ECLI:NL:RBDHA:2026:11780, ECLI:NL:RBROT:2025:15394, ECLI:NL:RBDHA:2025:10959, ECLI:NL:RBZWB:2026:2683, ECLI:NL:RBMNE:2023:2660, ECLI:NL:RBAMS:2021:2179, ECLI:NL:RBGEL:2022:7392, ECLI:NL:RBDHA:2021:4149, ECLI:NL:RBZWB:2026:5142 and 3340 more counted

Rulings we read for this question

Each ruling is labelled with the way it went: your way, the other side's way, or mixed. 'Not counted' means the ruling is shown as an example. The summary of each ruling is our text, not the judge's. Only text in quotation marks is the judge's own wording.

not counted ECLI:NL:RBNHO:2026:3572

2026 · final, first instance · match 0.94

Children: 2

> “bepaalt dat de man met ingang van 4 april 2026 bij vooruitbetaling een bijdrage in de kosten van verzorging en opvoeding van voormelde minderjarigen van € 456,- per kind per maand aan de vrouw dient te voldoen;” beslissing 3.5

not counted ECLI:NL:RBDHA:2026:11780
2026 · final, first instance · match 0.93

Children: 2; Ages at decision: 6, 9

> “bepaalt dat de man aan de vrouw, met ingang van heden, een kinderalimentatie ten behoeve van [minderjarige 1] en [minderjarige 2] (bij co-ouderschap eventueel: medeverzorgt en opvoedt) van € 388- per maand voor de twee kinderen samen zal be...” beslissing

not counted ECLI:NL:RBROT:2025:15394
2025 · final, first instance · match 0.92

Children: 2; Ages at decision: 9, 12

> “van € 230,- per maand per kind vast te stellen, met ingang van de datum indienen verzoekschrift tot echtscheiding (15 januari 2025).” beoordeling 3.5.1

not counted ECLI:NL:RBDHA:2025:10959
2025 · final, first instance · match 0.90

Children: 2; Ages at decision: 6, 9

> “een kinderalimentatie voor [de minderjarige 1] en [de minderjarige 2] van in totaal € 596,- per maand (€ 298,- per kind per maand) zal betalen” beslissing

not counted ECLI:NL:RBZWB:2026:2683
2026 · final, first instance · match 0.90

Children: 2; Ages at decision: 11, 13

> “bepaalt dat de door de man te betalen bijdrage voor de verzorging en opvoeding van de minderjarigen met ingang van 16 januari 2026 wordt vastgesteld op € 194,= per maand per kind, aan de vrouw voor de toekomst bij vooruitbetaling te voldoen...” beslissing 2

What these cases teach

HOW TO PREPARE

- It can help to gather recent pay slips and annual statements of yourself, and what you know of the other side's income.
- If the other side does not work, or works less than they could, it can help to collect what shows their earning capacity: education, work history, vacancies.
- It can help to document the care split: it changes the care discount (zorgkorting).
- You can ask your lawyer for a draft calculation of ability to pay (draagkracht) and need (behoefte) before the hearing.

General preparation tips, to discuss with your lawyer. They are not drawn from the rulings.

QUESTION 4 OF 10

Partner support: what do courts take into account?

YOUR POSITION (AS YOU STATED IT)

You receive partner support.

OTHER SIDE'S POSITION (AS YOU DESCRIBED IT)

No partner support.

Is a starting point wrong? You can tell us within 14 days of delivery and you then get a corrected version free of charge (terms, section 8).

WARNING

Partner support law changed on 1 January 2020. Only decisions from 2020 onwards are used, and decisions that apply the old law are left out. If your support was agreed or ordered before 2020, the old rules may still apply to you and these decisions may not be comparable.

HOW DID COMPARABLE RULINGS GO?

As the other side asks — As you ask

Not rated (n = 1267)

CLOSENESS OF MATCH

Hardly comparable — Closely comparable

Close match

Not rated: the amount depends on many variables (incomes, earning capacity, need, care split). Below: which inputs courts used in 1267 relevant rulings.

Researched for this question: 1267 published rulings, up to the reference date (2026-11-10). Not researched: your own documents, the other party's position, and laws or rulings after the reference date.

How the rating was built

Not rated: support amounts depend on too many variables. The table counts how often the court states each calculation input.

CALCULATION INPUT	STATED BY THE COURT IN
The parties' incomes	840 of 1267 relevant rulings
The payer's ability to pay (draagkracht)	691 of 1267 relevant rulings
The partner's need (behoefte)	646 of 1267 relevant rulings
Marriage duration	867 of 1267 relevant rulings
Duration of the support	120 of 1267 relevant rulings

Rulings (ECLI): ECLI:NL:RBDHA:2025:10959, ECLI:NL:RBZWB:2026:6624, ECLI:NL:RBAMS:2023:437, ECLI:NL:RBDHA:2026:18368, ECLI:NL:RBNHO:2025:12885, ECLI:NL:RBDHA:2021:1291, ECLI:NL:RBGEL:2022:7392, ECLI:NL:RBDHA:2026:6154, ECLI:NL:RBDHA:2021:4127, ECLI:NL:RBAMS:2025:7958 and 1257 more counted

Rulings we read for this question

Each ruling is labelled with the way it went: your way, the other side's way, or mixed. 'Not counted' means the ruling is shown as an example. The summary of each ruling is our text, not the judge's. Only text in quotation marks is the judge's own wording.

not counted ECLI:NL:RBDHA:2025:10959
2025 · final, first instance · match 0.93

Children: 2; Ages at decision: 6, 9

> “ten bedrage van € 3.900,- bruto per maand” verzoek

not counted ECLI:NL:RBZWB:2026:6624
2026 · final, first instance · match 0.93

Children: 2; Ages at decision: 13, 17

> “bepaalt, uitvoerbaar bij voorraad, dat de man vanaf de dag dat deze beschikking wordt ingeschreven in de registers van de burgerlijke stand aan de vrouw voor levensonderhoud bij vooruitbetaling moet voldoen een bedrag van € 35,= (vijfendert...” beslissing 5.7

not counted ECLI:NL:RBAMS:2023:437
2023 · final, first instance · match 0.92

Children: 2; Ages at decision: 9, 11; Marriage: 11 years

> “bepaalt dat de man € 352,-- bruto per maand dient te betalen aan de vrouw als uitkering tot levensonderhoud, met ingang van de dag van overdracht van de echtelijke woning, telkens bij vooruitbetaling te voldoen;” beslissing 4.5

not counted ECLI:NL:RBDHA:2026:18368
2026 · final, first instance · match 0.91

> “met ingang van de dag dat de beschikking van echtscheiding is ingeschreven in de registers van de burgerlijke stand tot (uiterlijk) vijf jaren na de datum van deze beschikking, een partneralimentatie van € 1.015,- per maand zal betalen” beslissing

not counted ECLI:NL:RBNHO:2025:12885
2025 · final, first instance · match 0.91

Children: 2

> “bepaalt dat de man met ingang van de datum van inschrijving van de echtscheidingsbeschikking in de registers van de burgerlijke stand bij vooruitbetaling een bijdrage in de kosten van levensonderhoud van de vrouw van € 319,- per maand aan d...” beslissing 3.5

What these cases teach

HOW TO PREPARE

- It can help to document the facts of the marriage: its duration, who cared for the children, career breaks.
- It can help to document the need: the standard of living during the marriage and your current costs.
- If earning capacity is an issue, it can help to gather education, work history and job applications.
- Partner support law changed on 1 January 2020; check with your lawyer which rules apply to you.

General preparation tips, to discuss with your lawyer. They are not drawn from the rulings.

QUESTION 5 OF 10

How much of the children's time will I have?

YOUR POSITION (AS YOU STATED IT)

About 70 of every 100 days with you

OTHER SIDE'S POSITION (AS YOU DESCRIBED IT)

About 50 of every 100 days with you

Is a starting point wrong? You can tell us within 14 days of delivery and you then get a corrected version free of charge (terms, section 8).

HOW DID COMPARABLE RULINGS GO?

As the other side asks — As you ask



188 of 1051 as you ask

CLOSENESS OF MATCH

Hardly comparable — Closely comparable



Close match

In 863 of the 1051 comparable rulings the court gave your side a share of time more than 10 points away from what you ask (70 of every 100 days). In 188 it was within 10 points.

Researched for this question: 1051 published rulings, up to the reference date (2026-11-10). Not researched: your own documents, the other party's position, and laws or rulings after the reference date.

How the rating was built

your way	mixed	other side's way
188	**566**	**297**
went your way	in between	went the other way

How did comparable rulings go?

188 of 1051 as you ask

The dot stands at 188 of 1051: the rulings that went your way among all counted. Mixed rulings do not count as your way.

Rulings (ECLI): ECLI:NL:RBDHA:2025:23207, ECLI:NL:RBDHA:2025:21907, ECLI:NL:RBDHA:2026:10658, ECLI:NL:RBDHA:2026:7982, ECLI:NL:RBMNE:2023:5323, ECLI:NL:RBOVE:2025:7049, ECLI:NL:RBROT:2025:15394, ECLI:NL:RBROT:2026:2278, ECLI:NL:RBDHA:2026:5413, ECLI:NL:RBZWB:2026:6579 and 1041 more counted

Rulings we read for this question

Each ruling is labelled with the way it went: your way, the other side's way, or mixed. 'Not counted' means the ruling is shown as an example. The summary of each ruling is our text, not the judge's. Only text in quotation marks is the judge's own wording.

mixed

ECLI:NL:RBDHA:2025:23207
2025 · final, first instance · match 0.99

50 of every 100 days with your side

Children: 2; Ages at decision: 9, 12; Marriage: 11 years

> “De ouders hebben in het ouderschapsplan onder meer afgesproken dat de kinderen hun hoofdverblijfplaats bij de moeder hebben.” feiten

mixed

ECLI:NL:RBDHA:2025:21907
2025 · final, first instance · match 0.98

95 of every 100 days with your side

Children: 2; Ages at decision: 9, 12

> “Zij neemt daarbij de huidige situatie, waarbij de kinderen bij de vrouw verblijven” beoordeling

other side's way ECLI:NL:RBDHA:2026:10658
2026 · final, first instance · match 0.98

100 of every 100 days with your side
Children: 2; Ages at decision: 9, 12

> “De kinderen verblijven op dit moment bij de moeder.” feiten

mixed ECLI:NL:RBDHA:2026:7982
2026 · final, first instance · match 0.98

85 of every 100 days with your side
Children: 2; Ages at decision: 9, 12

> “aan de vrouw zal worden toevertrouwd;” beslissing

mixed ECLI:NL:RBMNE:2023:5323
2023 · final, first instance · match 0.98

50 of every 100 days with your side
Children: 2; Ages at decision: 9, 12

> “bepaalt dat [minderjarige 1] en [minderjarige 2] met ingang van heden hun hoofdverblijfplaats hebben bij de moeder in Spanje;” beslissing 4.2

What these cases teach

WHERE THE RULINGS THAT WENT YOUR WAY DIFFER

- No clear difference in stage, number of children or marriage length between the rulings that went your way and those that did not. The reasons are in the rulings themselves: see below.

Differences within a small set of rulings, not causes. It can help to discuss with your lawyer whether they apply to you.

LEARN FROM THE RULINGS THAT WENT THE OTHER WAY

In these comparable rulings the court decided otherwise than you ask. The reasons are in the court's own text. It can help to read them with your lawyer: what the court pointed at there is what you can prepare for now. The summary and the quote are in the list above.

other side's way ECLI:NL:RBDHA:2026:10658
100 of every 100 days with your side

other side's way ECLI:NL:RBOVE:2025:7049
2025 · final, first instance · match 0.98

100 of every 100 days with your side
Children: 2; Ages at decision: 9, 12

> “De minderjarigen verblijven bij de moeder.” feiten 2.2

other side's way ECLI:NL:RBZWB:2026:6579
2026 · final, first instance · match 0.97

100 of every 100 days with your side
Children: 2; Ages at decision: 9, 12; Marriage: 9 years

> “De minderjarigen hebben hun hoofdverblijf bij de vrouw.” feiten 2.4

other side's way ECLI:NL:RBDHA:2026:4432
2026 · final, first instance · match 0.95

98 of every 100 days with your side
Children: 2; Ages at decision: 9, 13

> “De kinderen verblijven op dit moment bij de vrouw.” feiten

other side's way ECLI:NL:RBLIM:2024:240
2024 · final, first instance · match 0.95

97 of every 100 days with your side
Children: 2; Ages at decision: 8, 12

> “De vader heeft op dit moment onder begeleiding omgang met [minderjarige 2] in het kader van een BOR 3-traject dat is bepaald in de echtscheidingsprocedure.” beoordeling 5.2.7

HOW TO IMPROVE YOUR POSITION

- The share you ask is far from what courts gave in comparable cases. It may be wise to discuss with your lawyer what share to ask first and what as an alternative.
- It can help to show what makes your case different: your availability, the children's routine, how close you live.
- It can help to read the rulings listed below with your lawyer and note what the court looked at.

General preparation tips, to discuss with your lawyer. They are not drawn from the rulings.

QUESTION 6 OF 10

How do courts decide what the payer can afford (draagkracht)?

HOW DID COMPARABLE RULINGS GO?

As the other side asks — As you ask

Not rated (n = 4166)

CLOSENESS OF MATCH

Hardly comparable — Closely comparable

Close match

4166 rulings we have read discuss this in the court's quoted words. The closest ones are shown below.

Researched for this question: 4166 published rulings, up to the reference date (2026-11-10). Not researched: your own documents, the other party's position, and laws or rulings after the reference date.

How the rating was built

Not rated: for this topic no outcome is coded. These are rulings whose quoted court passages discuss it, read as examples. The number after the label shows how many we found.

Rulings (ECLI): ECLI:NL:GHAMS:2006:AW2835, ECLI:NL:GHAMS:2007:BJ5524, ECLI:NL:GHAMS:2008:630, ECLI:NL:GHAMS:2008:BD1223, ECLI:NL:GHAMS:2008:BF2485, ECLI:NL:GHAMS:2008:BG7471, ECLI:NL:GHAMS:2008:BH6451, ECLI:NL:GHAMS:2009:BK0598, ECLI:NL:GHAMS:2009:BK0601, ECLI:NL:GHAMS:2010:BL5769 and 4156 more counted

Rulings we read for this question

Each ruling is labelled with the way it went: your way, the other side's way, or mixed. 'Not counted' means the ruling is shown as an example. The summary of each ruling is our text, not the judge's. Only text in quotation marks is the judge's own wording.

not counted	ECLI:NL:RBNHO:2026:3572 2026 · final, first instance · match 0.94	“Volgens de hiervoor vermelde formule heeft de man dan een draagkracht van € 1.026,- per maand, oftewel € 513,- per kind per maand.” beoordeling 2.8.15
not counted	ECLI:NL:RBDHA:2026:11780 2026 · final, first instance · match 0.93	“De draagkracht van de man bedraagt volgens de formule € 1.084,- per maand, te weten” beoordeling
not counted	ECLI:NL:RBDHA:2025:10959 2025 · final, first instance · match 0.90	“De draagkracht van de man bedraagt dan: € 1.357,- per maand.” beoordeling
not counted	ECLI:NL:RBZWB:2026:2683 2026 · final, first instance · match 0.90	“De draagkracht van de man is dan volgens de formule € 1.192,= per maand.” beoordeling 3.18
not counted	ECLI:NL:RBMNE:2023:2660 2023 · final, first instance · match 0.89	“De draagkracht van de vrouw berekent de rechtbank op € 855,- per maand.” beoordeling 3.23

What these cases teach

HOW TO PREPARE

- It can help to collect your pay slips, annual statements and fixed costs: ability to pay is calculated from documents.
- It can help to write down the costs courts can take into account, such as housing costs, with proof.
- You can ask your lawyer for a draft ability-to-pay calculation before the hearing.

General preparation tips, to discuss with your lawyer. They are not drawn from the rulings.

QUESTION 7 OF 10

Can a court count income that someone could earn but does not?

HOW DID COMPARABLE RULINGS GO?

As the other side asks — As you ask

Not rated (n = 650)

CLOSENESS OF MATCH

Hardly comparable — Closely comparable

Moderate match

650 rulings we have read discuss this in the court's quoted words. The closest ones are shown below.

Researched for this question: 650 published rulings, up to the reference date (2026-11-10). Not researched: your own documents, the other party's position, and laws or rulings after the reference date.

How the rating was built

Not rated: for this topic no outcome is coded. These are rulings whose quoted court passages discuss it, read as examples. The number after the label shows how many we found.

Rulings (ECLI): ECLI:NL:GHAMS:2007:BC1631, ECLI:NL:GHAMS:2008:630, ECLI:NL:GHAMS:2008:BF2485, ECLI:NL:GHAMS:2008:BH6451, ECLI:NL:GHAMS:2009:BJ5366, ECLI:NL:GHAMS:2011:BR4739, ECLI:NL:GHAMS:2012:BY1459, ECLI:NL:GHAMS:2013:2073, ECLI:NL:GHAMS:2014:1713, ECLI:NL:GHAMS:2014:3152 and 640 more counted

Rulings we read for this question

Each ruling is labelled with the way it went: your way, the other side's way, or mixed. 'Not counted' means the ruling is shown as an example. The summary of each ruling is our text, not the judge's. Only text in quotation marks is the judge's own wording.

not counted ECLI:NL:RBDHA:2026:18368
2026 · final, first instance · match 0.91

“berekent de rechtbank het NBI van de vrouw op basis van haar verdiencapaciteit op € 2.904,- per maand” beoordeling

not counted ECLI:NL:RBDHA:2026:22295
2026 · final, first instance · match 0.89

“De rechtbank houdt het daarom ervoor dat de man de verdiencapaciteit heeft om een inkomen te verwerven gelijk aan zijn inkomen in 2025.” Draagkracht man

not counted ECLI:NL:RBDHA:2026:6089
2026 · final, first instance · match 0.86

“De vraag of rekening moet worden gehouden met een verdiencapaciteit aan de kant van de man bij het berekenen van een voorlopige partneralimentatie, vergt nader onderzoek waarvoor in deze voorlopige voorzieningenprocedure geen ruimte is.” Behoeftigheid

not counted ECLI:NL:RBDHA:2023:18739
2023 · final, first instance · match 0.85

“Uit deze stukken is naar het oordeel van de rechtbank genoegzaam gebleken dat de vrouw momenteel ziek is en een uitkering ontvangt, zodat de rechtbank geen reden ziet om – zoals door de man is gesteld – met een verdiencapaciteit te rekenen.” Draagkracht vrouw

not counted ECLI:NL:RBAMS:2022:3135
2022 · final, first instance · match 0.83

“Aan de zijde van de vrouw gaat de rechtbank dan ook uit van verdiencapaciteit van € 35.000,-- bruto per jaar.” beoordeling 2.5.6

What these cases teach

HOW TO PREPARE

- If you work less than you could, it can help to explain why with documents (care tasks, health, the labour market).
- If the other side works less than they could, it can help to collect what shows their capacity: education, work history, vacancies.
- The passages below show the words courts use when they count earning capacity.

General preparation tips, to discuss with your lawyer. They are not drawn from the rulings.

QUESTION 8 OF 10

From when does support start, and what about payments already made?

HOW DID COMPARABLE RULINGS GO?

As the other side asks — As you ask

Not rated (n = 1713)

CLOSENESS OF MATCH

Hardly comparable — Closely comparable

Close match

1713 rulings we have read discuss this in the court's quoted words. The closest ones are shown below.

Researched for this question: 1713 published rulings, up to the reference date (2026-11-10). Not researched: your own documents, the other party's position, and laws or rulings after the reference date.

How the rating was built

Not rated: for this topic no outcome is coded. These are rulings whose quoted court passages discuss it, read as examples. The number after the label shows how many we found.

Rulings (ECLI): ECLI:NL:GHAMS:2006:AV9177, ECLI:NL:GHAMS:2007:BB4268, ECLI:NL:GHAMS:2008:BH6288, ECLI:NL:GHAMS:2009:BI2660, ECLI:NL:GHAMS:2009:BJ5363, ECLI:NL:GHAMS:2010:BO5331, ECLI:NL:GHAMS:2011:BS8901, ECLI:NL:GHAMS:2013:4236, ECLI:NL:GHAMS:2013:4416, ECLI:NL:GHAMS:2014:3340 and 1703 more counted

Rulings we read for this question

Each ruling is labelled with the way it went: your way, the other side's way, or mixed. 'Not counted' means the ruling is shown as an example. The summary of each ruling is our text, not the judge's. Only text in quotation marks is the judge's own wording.

not counted	ECLI:NL:RBDHA:2025:10959 2025 · final, first instance · match 0.90	“Het volledige saldo van € 35.404,30 maakt onderdeel uit van het te verrekenen vermogen.” beoordeling 4
not counted	ECLI:NL:RBGEL:2022:7392 2022 · final, first instance · match 0.89	“de [bedrijf vrouw] wordt toegedeeld aan de vrouw onder verrekening van de waarde.” beslissing 6.9
not counted	ECLI:NL:RBNHO:2025:12885 2025 · final, first instance · match 0.88	“Het voorgaande leidt ertoe dat de rechtbank de verzoeken van de vrouw tot vernietiging dan wel buiten toepassing laten van de huwelijkse voorwaarden alsmede (in het verlengde hiervan) haar verzoeken tot verdeling van de algehele gemeenschap…” beoordeling 2.8.7
not counted	ECLI:NL:RBDHA:2025:20218 2025 · final, first instance · match 0.88	“De rechtbank zal 1 mei 2025 als ingangsdatum hanteren.” beoordeling
not counted	ECLI:NL:RBLIM:2026:6695 2026 · final, first instance · match 0.87	“De rechtbank ziet aanleiding als ingangsdatum voor de eventueel te wijzigen kinderbijdrage aan te sluiten bij de datum van deze beschikking.” 4.6

What these cases teach

HOW TO PREPARE

- It can help to keep proof of every payment already made (bank statements), so it can be set off.
- You can ask your lawyer from which date you ask support to start, and why.
- The passages below cover start dates and set-off.

General preparation tips, to discuss with your lawyer. They are not drawn from the rulings.

QUESTION 9 OF 10

Can a parent move away with the children?

HOW DID COMPARABLE RULINGS GO?

As the other side asks — As you ask

Not rated (n = 1148)

CLOSENESS OF MATCH

Hardly comparable — Closely comparable

Close match

1148 rulings we have read discuss this in the court's quoted words. The closest ones are shown below.

Researched for this question: 1148 published rulings, up to the reference date (2026-11-10). Not researched: your own documents, the other party's position, and laws or rulings after the reference date.

How the rating was built

Not rated: for this topic no outcome is coded. These are rulings whose quoted court passages discuss it, read as examples. The number after the label shows how many we found.

Rulings (ECLI): ECLI:NL:GHAMS:2010:BL9055, ECLI:NL:GHAMS:2010:BN4437, ECLI:NL:GHAMS:2010:BN4465, ECLI:NL:GHAMS:2011:BQ5297, ECLI:NL:GHAMS:2011:BU8155, ECLI:NL:GHAMS:2012:BY5032, ECLI:NL:GHAMS:2012:CA1479, ECLI:NL:GHAMS:2013:4760, ECLI:NL:GHAMS:2013:4981, ECLI:NL:GHAMS:2014:1223 and 1138 more counted

Rulings we read for this question

Each ruling is labelled with the way it went: your way, the other side's way, or mixed. 'Not counted' means the ruling is shown as an example. The summary of each ruling is our text, not the judge's. Only text in quotation marks is the judge's own wording.

not counted ECLI:NL:RBMNE:2023:5323
2023 · final, first instance · match 0.98

> “3.13. Waar de rechtbank wel grote zorgen over heeft, is het feit dat op beide plekken de afstand tussen de kinderen en één van beide ouders letterlijk en figuurlijk heel groot zal zijn. De ouders zijn namelijk in een patstelling beland. De...” beoordeling 3.13

not counted ECLI:NL:RBDHA:2024:20386
2024 · final, first instance · match 0.95

> “het verzoek van de moeder tot vervangende toestemming voor verhuizing met de kinderen naar [plaatsnaam 1] afwijzen.” beoordeling

not counted ECLI:NL:RBLIM:2024:240
2024 · final, first instance · match 0.95

> “beveelt de moeder uiterlijk op 1 augustus 2024 met [minderjarige 1] en [minderjarige 2] terug te verhuizen naar de regio Rotterdam” beslissing 6.1

not counted ECLI:NL:RBDHA:2026:28406
2026 · final, first instance · match 0.95

> “Gelet op deze vele verhuizingen in korte tijd acht de rechtbank het van belang dat de kinderen rust en continuïteit gaan ervaren.” niet genummerd; onder 'Inhoudelijke beoordeling'

not counted ECLI:NL:RBOVE:2026:5370
2026 · final, first instance · match 0.95

> “De rechtbank vindt in dit geval van doorslaggevend belang dat als de moeder met de kinderen naar [woonplaats 3] zou verhuizen en de zorgregeling zou worden aangepast zoals de moeder verzoekt, de rol van de vader in het leven van de kinderen...” 5.7

What these cases teach

HOW TO PREPARE

- Courts weigh the reason for the move against the children's interest and contact with the other parent: write down both.
- It can help to propose how contact with the other parent continues after a move: travel, costs, schedule.
- You can read the passages below with your lawyer.

General preparation tips, to discuss with your lawyer. They are not drawn from the rulings.

QUESTION 10 OF 10

Do I get back private money I put into the home or our joint assets?

HOW DID COMPARABLE RULINGS GO?

As the other side asks — As you ask

Not rated (n = 426)

CLOSENESS OF MATCH

Hardly comparable — Closely comparable

Moderate match

426 rulings we have read discuss this in the court's quoted words. The closest ones are shown below.

Researched for this question: 426 published rulings, up to the reference date (2026-11-10). Not researched: your own documents, the other party's position, and laws or rulings after the reference date.

How the rating was built

Not rated: for this topic no outcome is coded. These are rulings whose quoted court passages discuss it, read as examples. The number after the label shows how many we found.

Rulings (ECLI): ECLI:NL:GHAMS:2006:AV9177, ECLI:NL:GHAMS:2013:4236, ECLI:NL:GHAMS:2013:4416, ECLI:NL:GHAMS:2015:989, ECLI:NL:GHAMS:2016:1989, ECLI:NL:GHAMS:2016:1993, ECLI:NL:GHAMS:2016:4396, ECLI:NL:GHAMS:2016:5436, ECLI:NL:GHAMS:2017:4596, ECLI:NL:GHAMS:2017:551 and 416 more counted

Rulings we read for this question

Each ruling is labelled with the way it went: your way, the other side's way, or mixed. 'Not counted' means the ruling is shown as an example. The summary of each ruling is our text, not the judge's. Only text in quotation marks is the judge's own wording.

not counted	ECLI:NL:GHSHE:2024:1925 2024 · appeal · match 0.93	“Nu evenwel niet is gebleken dat de door de man verrichte betalingen zien op aflossing van de hypothecaire geldlening, bestaat er geen aanleiding tot toekenning van een vergoedingsrecht.” 5.7
not counted	ECLI:NL:GHARL:2024:3867 2024 · appeal · match 0.92	“Het hof zal alle verdere beslissingen – die samenhangen met de woning, de schenkingen en de vergoedingsrechten en de verdeling van de banksaldi – aanhouden.” beoordeling 5.11
not counted	ECLI:NL:GHAMS:2022:1102 2022 · appeal · match 0.90	“gaan over de verdeling en eventuele vergoedingsrechten of een schadevergoedingsvordering en niet over de draagplicht voor een gemeenschapsschuld” 4.8
not counted	ECLI:NL:RBGEL:2020:7165 2020 · final, first instance · match 0.88	“Op grond van het vorenstaande heeft de vrouw een vergoedingsrecht van € 52.637,50.” 2.77
not counted	ECLI:NL:GHARL:2025:3210 2025 · appeal · match 0.87	“Nu de betaling van de koopsom met eigen vermogen (uit de schenking) is gedaan in 2010 is de vergoedingsvordering ontstaan voor 2012” 5.15

What these cases teach

HOW TO PREPARE

- It can help to collect bank statements, deeds and gift or inheritance papers that show where private money came from and where it went.
- It can help to write down when the money went into the home or the marriage, with documents.
- You can read the passages below with your lawyer.

General preparation tips, to discuss with your lawyer. They are not drawn from the rulings.

From analysis to dossier, before the next decision point.

ITEM	YOUR INTAKE	NOW	BEFORE INTERIM STAGE	BEFORE FINAL STAGE
☐ **Income documents**	**held**	It can help to gather recent pay slips and tax returns of yourself, and any figures you hold for the other side.	It helps if the set is complete and ordered by period.	It can help to update this with the latest period before the hearing.
☐ **Property records**	**missing**	It can help to collect the deed, mortgage statement and any valuation.	Decide whether a valuation is needed.	It can be useful to have a current valuation and mortgage balance at hand.
☐ **Care log**	**missing**	Start a dated log of who cared for the children and when.	It helps to keep it consistent and factual.	Summarize it for counsel.
☐ **Calendar / availability**	to do	It can help to write down your work pattern and back-up care.	It helps if it matches the care log.	It can help to update this with every change.
☐ **Written communications**	**held**	It can help to keep messages about the children and money in writing.	Select the relevant exchanges by date.	You can give your lawyer a dated selection.
☐ **Third-party evidence**	**missing**	It can help to think about who can confirm the care you provide.	You can ask for short written statements.	It helps to keep them current.
☐ **Professional reports**	**missing**	It can help to note which professionals are involved.	You can ask your lawyer whether a report is useful.	It helps if any report is available in time.
☐ **Drafted requests**	**missing**	It can help to write down your requests per dispute point.	You can check them with your lawyer.	You can finalize them with your lawyer.
☐ **Questions for counsel**	to do	It can help to collect your questions (see chapter 9).	It can help to prioritize them.	Re-check them against new evidence.

1. Everything important in writing.
2. No claim without supporting evidence.
3. It helps to distinguish interim from final procedure.
4. It helps to turn logistics into a predictable plan.
5. It helps to track actual behavior, not just intentions.
6. It helps to keep communication factual and focused on the child and the issue.
7. It helps to show the other party's legitimate interests fairly.
8. Lead with your own strengths and evidence.
9. It is wise to accept a weaker outcome only once you understand its effect.
10. It helps to answer each material point with evidence.

QUESTIONS FOR COUNSEL

1. What assumptions in this analysis should be verified?
2. Which evidence is still missing?
3. Which requests need to be made now rather than later?
4. Which comparable decisions are most relevant, and why?
5. What facts could materially change the conclusion?
6. Which parts should not be relied upon without legal review?

DISCUSS THIS WITH YOUR LAWYER

What this report did not research

These topics come up in divorces regularly and can matter a great deal. This report did not research them. It is wise to discuss them with a lawyer, also if you did not mention them in the interview.

TOPIC	IN YOUR INTAKE	WHAT THIS REPORT DOES WITH IT
A foreign element (marriage, nationality or assets abroad)	not mentioned	not researched: discuss it with a lawyer
A prenuptial or partnership agreement	not mentioned	not researched: discuss it with a lawyer
Pension	not mentioned	not researched: discuss it with a lawyer
An own business or private company	not mentioned	not researched: discuss it with a lawyer
Running deadlines (proceedings, decision, order)	mentioned	not researched: discuss it with a lawyer
Domestic violence or threats	not mentioned	not researched: discuss it with a lawyer
Debts	not mentioned	not researched: discuss it with a lawyer
Life insurance	not mentioned	not researched: discuss it with a lawyer
Investment insurance or securities lease	not mentioned	not researched: discuss it with a lawyer
Latent tax claims (for example on shares)	not mentioned	not researched: discuss it with a lawyer

Deadlines: the general rules

This report calculates no end dates. It gives only the general rule; have a lawyer set the end date for your case.

- Appeal against a decision of the district court: within three months of the day of the decision (article 358 Rv). After that, appeal is no longer possible.
- There is no appeal against a decision on provisional measures (article 824 Rv); discuss with your lawyer what is possible.
- A divorce decision must be registered in the civil registry within six months after it became final; otherwise it lapses (article 1:163 BW).
- Payments that fall due periodically, such as alimony, can expire per instalment after five years.
- Pension division and set-off under a prenuptial agreement can have their own deadlines. It is wise to have your lawyer or a pension expert check which apply to you.

Pension

Pension did not come up in your intake. If it does play a role, look at these points.

- It is wise to notify every pension fund of the divorce within two years after the divorce, with the fund's form, and to check whether and how the pension is divided.
- If a covenant or prenuptial agreement says something about pension (for example conversion or waiving equalisation), read the deadlines in those documents themselves.

- Extra care is wise with a pension in own management (with an own company), a foreign pension, a value transfer, pre-pension or a waiver of equalisation.
- Payments of a paid-out pension share can expire per instalment after five years.

Tax: points to have checked

This report gives no tax advice and makes no calculations or net amounts. It is wise to have a tax adviser check these points before you sign. Marked: what came up in your intake.

☒ The end of the tax partnership

☐ Tax and health-insurance contribution on partner alimony, for the payer and the receiver

☐ A latent tax claim on shares, and a current account with an own company

☒ Gift tax on an unequal division

☒ Transfer tax when taking over the home (an exemption sometimes applies)

☒ Box 3: assets, savings and investments after the division

☐ A pension in own management

BEFORE YOU SIGN A COVENANT

- Has everything been valued, and by whom? For the home or a business: an independent appraiser, ideally chosen together. This report values nothing and calculates no alimony or pension.
- Is the pension included?
- Are all accounts in it, including deposits, investments and crypto?
- Are there recent transactions in an own business that are worth knowing about?
- When does the division take effect, and what does that mean for tax?
- Are you giving up pension, home equity or alimony? Then it is wise to know what the law would give you without an agreement; departing from it is hard to undo later.

TERMS, METHOD AND SOURCES

How we chose, read and limited the rulings.

19597 published rulings read (2000-10-11 to 2026-10-13); 14369 hold usable values. Per dispute point; partner support from 2020. Counts of individual decisions with n; no model, no averages.

Made on 2026-11-10 with software version 8c5d2e3 on data version 632f94f9e94193dd. The report is built by code from the rulings; no language model writes or changes it. Before delivery a person reads the report and the rulings it cites, and confirms that with the delivery.

Sample per dispute point

QUESTION	N
1. Where will the children mainly live?	5442
2. What happens to the house?	149
3. What counts when child support is set?	3350
4. Partner support: what do courts take into account?	1267
5. How much of the children's time will I have?	1051
6. How do courts decide what the payer can afford (draagkracht)?	4166
7. Can a court count income that someone could earn but does not?	650
8. From when does support start, and what about payments already made?	1713
9. Can a parent move away with the children?	1148
10. Do I get back private money I put into the home or our joint assets?	426

Similarity is the weighted sum of how close each component is, divided by the total weight; a component the decision lacks counts as zero. Coverage is the share of the weight that could be compared. A decision is comparable at a similarity of 0.55 and a coverage of 0.5 or more.

Glossary (Dutch legal terms)

Vovo	Voorlopige voorziening: a temporary court order that applies while the procedure runs. It can differ from the final decision.
Bodemprocedure	The main proceedings in which the court decides the dispute definitively, subject to appeal.
Hoofdverblijf	The home where a child mainly lives.
Zorgregeling	The arrangement for how care and contact time is shared between the parents.
Dwangsom	A penalty payment set by the court that becomes due if an order is not complied with.

Verdiencapaciteit	The income a person could reasonably earn, which a court may use instead of actual income.
Zorgkorting	A deduction in the child support calculation that reflects the care the paying parent provides.

LIMITS OF THIS SAMPLE

- Published decisions are a small, non-random part of all cases. Settled cases and cases that were never published are invisible.
- Every count states how many rulings it rests on.
- Some decisions are interim (voorlopige voorziening); their outcomes can differ from final decisions.
- The law and its application change over time; partner support is only compared from 2020 onwards.
- Only the rulings we read in full were examined for reasons and evidence; for the others we show counts, values and verbatim quotes.

WHAT THIS REPORT DOES NOT DO

- Source: only judgments published by the Rechtspraak (the Dutch judiciary), up to this report's reference date (2026-11-10).
- Period: the judgments read run from 2000-10-11 to 2026-10-13.
- Selection: judgments on the dispute points you named in the interview, chosen by the features of your situation; what you did not name was not researched.
- Unpublished judgments are missing. Published judgments are a small, non-random share of all cases.
- Your own documents (covenant, decision, financial papers) were not assessed, and the other party's position was not heard.
- The report does not predict how your case will end.

ABOUT THIS EDITION

This example is built for a fictional client. Counts, values and quotes come from the rulings we have read. Text marked “template text” is generic and not derived from decisions. Reasons, evidence treatment and conduct responses are marked “not yet coded”. Verbatim quotes from the decisions stay in the original Dutch.

DISCLAIMER AND LIABILITY

Using the report, with clear boundaries.

1. Research and guidance, not legal advice	This report is research on published decisions with practical guidance based on them. It is not legal advice, and no lawyer-client relationship arises. It does not replace a lawyer, mediator or other professional. [Wording to be approved by counsel.]
2. No prediction or guarantee	The scales are our count of the comparable rulings found, set against what you asked for. They predict nothing, and outcomes in other cases do not guarantee the outcome in yours.
3. Accuracy and currency	Rulings can be identified by their ECLI number. The law may have changed since a ruling was published; ask your lawyer to check for legal changes since then. [Wording to be approved by counsel.]
4. Dependence on supplied facts	Incomplete or incorrect inputs can change the analysis.
5. Liability	[Provider's approved limitation-of-liability language to be inserted.]
6. Intended use	The report is meant for the person it was prepared for. [Redistribution terms to be approved by counsel.]
7. Privacy	Your name is printed only on this report and is not used for matching. Names of children and of the other party are not collected. [Approved data handling and deletion policy to be inserted. In this phase-0 fixture nothing is stored.]
8. Governing law	[Approved legal / contractual wording to be inserted.]

QA CHECK

No names of the other party or the children · every conclusion rests on counted rulings, cited by ECLI, with the sample size stated · every advice item linked to a finding · no claim of how sure an outcome is, only counts. The report prints no free text from the intake.

BEFORE YOU SIGN ANYTHING OR START PROCEEDINGS

- It is wise not to sign a covenant, parenting plan or division, or start proceedings, based on this report alone.
- It is wise to have a lawyer or mediator read along before you agree; departing from what the law gives is hard to undo later.
- Mandatory legal representation: a petition for divorce or for ending a registered partnership is filed through a lawyer. A lawyer is also required on appeal.

PERSONAL AND CONFIDENTIAL

This report contains information from a closed family case. It is not an expert report. It is meant to be discussed with your own lawyer. It is wise not to share it with the other party, and not to use it in a joint mediation without an agreement on how documents may be used there. It is not meant to be posted online.