

Dear Sirs,

Re: 5010.2532 | Mylan N.V. - response to Attorney-General Request

By email of 27 May 2016 you informed us that you had requested the Attorney-General at the Public Attorney's Office to request an investigation into the affairs of Mylan N.V. ("Mylan"). Simultaneously, in a publication on your website you stated that "Mylan failed to present convincing arguments in support of their position that no approval is required" and: "VEB and European Investors have not sought legal redress (or started preparations in doing so, such as soliciting support from shareholders for a request with the enterprise chamber)".

In our letter to you of 11 March 2016, we expressed our concern that your conduct at that time gave away that your public campaign, despite lofty words about matters of principle, mostly serves sophisticated asset managers who can take advantage of arbitrage opportunities in their trading at the expense of Mylan shareholders and shareholders in Meda Aktiebolag (publ.) ("Meda"). We wrote that we thought that you and your organizations were better than this, but it is up to you to demonstrate to us and to the marketplace that this is indeed the case.

In response to our letter of 11 March 2016 you reached out to us and we agreed to meet to discuss the situation. In our meeting on 17 March 2016, we agreed to disagree on substantive issues, but you also promised to give prior notice if VEB and European Investors would start legal action. Again, a promise to Mylan was broken. Your after the fact email of 27 May 2016 and simultaneous publication - after two months of silence - are a further demonstration that VEB and European Investors cannot be trusted. In the past we took efforts to convince Mylan that VEB and European Investors as advocacy groups may have different views, but that a constructive dialogue is always possible and that the agreed upon ground rules will be respected. We are unhappy to conclude that we can no longer support this.

VEB and European Investors going public with the statement that "Mylan failed to present convincing arguments in support of their position that no approval is required" is difficult to reconcile with the fact that Mylan did present arguments in a letter to you which we agreed not to share with the market place at that time. Whether or not these arguments are "convincing" is better left to the shareholders of Mylan and Meda, the constituencies you claim to represent. Mylan will consider the publication of the letter after all to set the record straight.

Secondly, we have ample evidence that your statement that "VEB and European Investors have not sought legal redress (or started preparations in doing so, such as soliciting support from shareholders for a request with the enterprise chamber)" is a blatant lie. Several of Mylan's shareholders have brought to Mylan's attention that VEB and European Investors did try to rally support for a request with the enterprise chamber but failed. We consider your current move a desperate and disingenuous attempt to find standing in court to address a Mylan shareholders matter while the very same shareholders of Mylan were not interested to support you.

During my telephone conversation of just now with your mr. Coenen, I asked you to share with us the request you made to the Attorney-General. This would allow us to review and address inaccuracies, if any. You have for now refused to share the request, but promised to discuss this internally.

Yours sincerely, also on behalf of Leo Groothuis and Fons Leijten,

NautaDutilh N.V.
Paul Olden
Advocaat