

# CLAIMS RESOLUTION TRIBUNAL

---

In re Holocaust Victim Assets Litigation  
Case No. CV96-4849

## **Certified Award**

to Claimants [REDACTED 1], [REDACTED 2], [REDACTED 3], and [REDACTED 4]<sup>1</sup>

**in re Account of Dr. Albert Bloch**

Claim Numbers: 002471/LK, 002659/LK, 004552/LK, 208522/LK, 218281/LK

Award Amount: 25,680.00 Swiss Francs

This Certified Award is based upon the claim of [REDACTED 1], [REDACTED 2], [REDACTED 3], and [REDACTED 4] (together the “Claimants”) to the account of Dr. Albert Bloch (the “Account Owner”) at the [REDACTED] (the “Bank”).

All awards are published, but where a claimant has requested confidentiality, as in this case, the names of the claimants, any relatives of the claimants other than the account owner, and the bank have been redacted.

## **Information Provided by the Claimants**

The Claimants submitted Claim Forms identifying the Account Owner as Claimant [REDACTED 1]’s and [REDACTED 2]’s uncle and Claimant [REDACTED 3]’s and [REDACTED 4]’s great-uncle, Albert Jonas Bloch, who was born on 31 October 1895 in Tarnowitz, Germany, and was not married. The Claimants stated that their relative was the Director of the company *NEEP BV*, which was located at Lairessestraat 20, Amsterdam, the Netherlands. The Claimants explained that Albert Bloch, who was Jewish, fled Germany to Holland after Hitler came to power in 1933 or 1934 and fled to Surinam in 1940 after the Nazi invasion, and then returned to Holland in 1945. According to the Claimants, Albert Bloch died on 23 March 1963 in Düsseldorf, Germany. In support of their claims, the Claimants submitted documents including family trees, a letter from Albert Bloch, the beginning pages of his dissertation to become a doctor of engineering, or *Doktor-Ingenieur*, which includes a paragraph stating that he was Jewish, and his photograph. Claimants [REDACTED 1] and [REDACTED 2] indicated that they were born in Tarnowskie Gorny, Poland on 14 July 1925 and 8 June 1918,

---

<sup>1</sup> Some of the Claimants have provided their names and their relatives’ names only in Hebrew characters in the Claim Form. For the purpose of this decision, the CRT has transliterated these names into Latin characters. However, to match names provided in the Claim Form with names contained in the banks’ databases, the CRT has used a database created by Yad Vashem, Israel, which provided different variations in Latin characters for each of the names.

respectively. Claimants [REDACTED 3] and [REDACTED 4] indicated that they were born in Tel Aviv, Israel on 17 March 1951 and 16 November 1952, respectively.

### **Information Available in the Bank Record**

The bank record consists of an account opening card. According to this record, the Account Owner was Ing. (engineer) Dr. Albert Bloch from Amsterdam. The bank record indicates that the Account Owner held a demand deposit account in United States Dollars that was opened 10 June 1940 and was closed 20 June 1941. The bank record does not show to whom the account at issue was closed or the value of this account. There is no evidence in the bank record that the Account Owner or his heirs closed the account and received the proceeds themselves.

### **The CRT's Analysis**

#### Joinder of Claims

According to Article 43(1) of the Rules Governing the Claims Resolution Process (the "Rules"), claims to the same or related accounts may be joined in one proceeding at the CRT's discretion. In this case, the CRT determines it appropriate to join the claims of the Claimants in one proceeding.

#### Identification of the Account Owner

The Claimants have plausibly identified the Account Owner. Their relative's name matches the published name of the Account Owner. The Claimants identified their relative's city of residence and title as an engineer and title as a doctor, which match unpublished information about the Account Owner contained in the bank record. In support of their claims, the Claimants submitted documents, including family trees and the beginning pages of Albert Bloch's dissertation to become a *Doktor-Ingenieur*.

#### Status of the Account Owner as a Victim of Nazi Persecution

The Claimants have made a plausible showing that the Account Owner was a Victim of Nazi Persecution. The Claimants stated that the Account Owner was Jewish and fled Germany and Holland to escape Nazi persecution.

#### The Claimants' Relationships to the Account Owner

The Claimants have plausibly demonstrated that they are related to the Account Owner by submitting documents demonstrating that he was their father's and paternal grandfather's brother.

### The Issue of Who Received the Proceeds

Given that the Account Owner was in Surinam when his account was closed, and given the applicability of Presumptions (a) and (j) contained in Appendix A.<sup>2</sup>, the CRT concludes that it is therefore plausible that the account proceeds were not paid to the Account Owner or his heirs. Based on its precedent and the Rules, the CRT applies presumptions to determine whether account owners or their heirs received the proceeds of their accounts.

### Basis for the Award

The CRT has determined that an Award may be made in favor of the Claimants. First, the claim is admissible in accordance with the criteria contained in Article 23 of the Rules Governing the Claims Resolution Process (the “Rules”). Second, the Claimants have plausibly demonstrated that the Account Owner was their father’s brother or their paternal grandfather’s brother, and those relationships justify an Award. Finally, the CRT has determined that it is plausible that neither the Account Owner nor his heirs received the proceeds of the claimed account.

### Amount of the Award

The bank records indicate that the Account Owner held a demand deposit account. Pursuant to Article 35 of the Rules, when the value of an account is unknown, as is the case here, the average value of the same or a similar type of account in 1945 is used to calculate the present value of the account being awarded. Based on the ICEP Investigation, in 1945 the average value of a demand deposit account was 2,140.00 Swiss Francs. The present value of this amount is calculated by multiplying it by a factor of 12, in accordance with Article 37(1) of the Rules, to produce a total award amount of 25,680.00 Swiss Francs.

### Division of the Award

According to Article 29 of the Rules, the children of the siblings of the Account Owner have equal entitlement to the account. Accordingly, as the children of the Account Owner’s brother, Claimant [REDACTED 1] and Claimant [REDACTED 2] are each entitled to one-third (1/3) of the total award amount. As the children of the Account Owner’s brother’s children, Claimants [REDACTED 3] and [REDACTED 4] are each entitled to one-sixth (1/6) of the total award amount.

### Initial Payment

Article 37(3)(a) of the Rules provides that where the value of an award is calculated using the value presumptions provided in Article 35 of the Rules, the initial payment to the claimant shall be 65% of the Certified Award, and the claimant may receive a second payment of up to 35% of the Certified Award when so determined by the Court. In this case, however, because Claimants [REDACTED 1] and [REDACTED 2] are age 75 or older, they are entitled to receive payment of 100% of their portions of the total award amount. Accordingly, the initial payment amount is

---

<sup>2</sup> An expanded version of Appendix A appears on the CRT II website -- [www.crt-ii.org](http://www.crt-ii.org).

22,684.00 Swiss Francs, which is comprised of 100% of Claimant [REDACTED 1]'s and Claimant [REDACTED 2]'s portions of the Award (17,120.00 Swiss Francs) and 65% of Claimant [REDACTED 3]'s and Claimant [REDACTED 4]'s portions of the Award (5,564.00 Swiss Francs).

### **Scope of the Award**

The Claimants should be aware that, pursuant to Article 25 of the Rules, the CRT will carry out further research on their claim to determine whether there are additional Swiss bank accounts to which they might be entitled, including research of the Total Accounts Database (consisting of records of 4.1 million Swiss bank accounts which existed between 1933 and 1945).

### **Certification of the Award**

The CRT certifies this Award for approval by the Court and payment by the Special Masters.

Claims Resolution Tribunal

December 27, 2002

## APPENDIX A

In the absence of evidence to the contrary, the Tribunal presumes that neither the Account Owners, the Beneficial Owners, nor their heirs received the proceeds of a claimed Account in cases involving one or more of the following circumstances:<sup>1</sup>

- a) the Account was closed and the Account records show evidence of persecution, or the Account was closed (i) after the imposition of Swiss visa requirements on January 20, 1939, or (ii) after the date of occupation of the country of residence of the Account Owner or Beneficial Owner, and before 1945 or the year in which the freeze of Accounts from the country of residence of the Account Owner or Beneficial Owner was lifted (whichever is later);
- b) the Account was closed after 1955 or ten years after the freeze of Accounts from the country of residence of the Account Owner or Beneficial Owner was lifted (whichever is later);
- c) the balance of the Account was reduced by fees and charges over the period leading up to the closure of the Account and the last known balance of the Account was small;
- d) the Account had been declared in a Nazi census of Jewish assets or other Nazi documentation;
- e) a claim was made to the Account after the Second World War and was not recognized by the bank;
- f) the Account Owner or Beneficial Owner had other Accounts that are open and dormant, suspended, or closed to profits, closed by fees, or closed to Nazi authorities;
- g) the only surviving Account Owner or Beneficial Owner was a child at the time of the Second World War;
- h) the Account Owners, the Beneficial Owners, and/or their heirs would not have been able to obtain information about the Account after the Second World War from the Swiss bank due to the Swiss banks' practice of withholding or misstating account information in their responses to inquiries by Account Owners, Beneficial Owners, and heirs because of the banks' concerns regarding double liability;<sup>2</sup>
- i) the Account Owners, Beneficial Owners, or their heirs resided in a Communist country in Eastern Europe after the War; and/or
- j) there is no indication in the bank records that the Account Owners, Beneficial Owners, or their heirs received the proceeds of the Account.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> See Independent Commission of Experts Switzerland - Second World War, Switzerland, National Socialism and the Second World War: Final Report (2002) (hereinafter "Bergier Final Report"); *see also*

---

Independent Committee of Eminent Persons, Report on Dormant Accounts of Victims of Nazi Persecution in Swiss Banks (1999) (hereinafter "ICEP Report"). The CRT has also taken into account, among other things, various laws, acts, decrees, and practices used by the Nazi regime and the governments of Austria, the Sudetenland, the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia, the Free City of Danzig, Poland, the Incorporated Area of Poland, the *Generalgouvernement* of Poland, the Netherlands, Slovakia and France to confiscate Jewish assets held abroad.

<sup>2</sup> See Bergier Final Report at 443-44, 446-49; *see also* ICEP Report at 81-83.

<sup>3</sup> As described in the Bergier Final Report and the ICEP Report, the Swiss banks destroyed or failed to maintain account transactional records relating to Holocaust-era accounts. There is evidence that this destruction continued after 1996, when Swiss law prohibited destruction of bank records. Bergier Final Report at 40 (stating "[i]n the case of Union Bank of Switzerland . . . , however, documents were being disposed of even after the Federal Decree [of 13 December 1996]"). The wholesale destruction of relevant bank records occurred at a time when the Swiss banks knew that claims were being made against them and would continue to be made for monies deposited by victims of Nazi persecution who died in the Holocaust and that were (i) improperly paid to the Nazis, *see* Albers v. Credit Suisse, 188 Misc. 229, 67 N.Y.S.2d 239 (N.Y. City Ct. 1946); Bergier Final Report at 443, (ii) that were improperly paid to the Communist controlled governments of Poland and Hungary, *see* Bergier Final Report at 450-51, and possibly Romania as well, *see* Peter Hug and Marc Perrenoud, Assets in Switzerland of Victims of Nazism and the Compensation Agreements with East Bloc Countries (1997), and (iii) that were retained by Swiss Banks for their own use and profit. *See* Bergier Final Report at 446-49.

"The discussion on "unclaimed cash" persisted throughout the post-war period due to claims for restitution by survivors and heirs of the murdered victims, or restitution organizations acting on their behalf." *Id.* at 444. Nevertheless, the Swiss Banks continued to destroy records on a massive scale and to obstruct those making claims. ICEP Report, Annex 4 ¶ 5; In re Holocaust Victim Asset Litig., 105 F. Supp.2d 139, 155-56 (E.D.N.Y. 2000). Indeed, "[i]n May 1954, the legal representatives of the big banks co-ordinated their response to heirs [of account holders] so that the banks would have at their disposal a concerted mechanism for deflecting any kind of enquiry." Bergier Final Report at 446. Similarly, "the banks and their Association lobbied against legislation that would have required publication of the names of so called 'heirless assets accounts,' legislation that if enacted and implemented, would have obviated the ICEP investigation and the controversy of the last 30 years." ICEP Report at 15. Indeed, in order to thwart such legislation, the Swiss Bankers Association encouraged Swiss banks to underreport the number of accounts in a 1956 survey. "A meager result from the survey," it said, "will doubtless contribute to the resolution of this matter [the proposed legislation] in our favor." ICEP Report at 90 (quoting a letter from the Swiss Bankers Association to its board members dated June 7, 1956). "To summarize, it is apparent that the claims of surviving Holocaust victims were usually rejected under the pretext of bank secrecy . . . ", Bergier Final Report at 455, or outright deception about the existence of information, while wholesale destruction of bank records continued for over a half century. Under these circumstances, utilizing the fundamental evidentiary principles of United States law that would have applied to Deposited Assets claims had the class action lawsuits been litigated through trial, the CRT draws an adverse inference against the banks where documentary evidence was destroyed or is not provided to assist the claims administrators. *See* In re Holocaust Victim Asset Litig., 105 F. Supp.2d 139, 152 (E.D.N.Y. 2000); Reilly v. Natwest Markets Group, Inc., 181 F.3d 253, 266-68 (2d Cir. 1999); Kronisch v. United States, 150 F.3d 112, 126-28 (2d Cir. 1998).