

# CLAIMS RESOLUTION TRIBUNAL

---

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

## **Certified Award**

to Claimant [REDACTED]  
acting on behalf of himself and [REDACTED]

## **in re Accounts of Frau Helene Mantel and Dr. Sever Mantel**

Claim Numbers: 211747/NF; 211748/NF

Award Amount: 156,000.00 Swiss Francs

This Certified Award is based upon the claims of [REDACTED] (the “Claimant”) acting on behalf of himself and [REDACTED] to the accounts of Helene and Sever Mantel (the “Account Owners”) at the Zurich branch of the [REDACTED] (the “Bank”).

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

### **Information Provided by the Claimant**

The Claimant submitted two Claim Forms identifying one of the Account Owners as his adoptive father, Sever Mantel, and his adoptive paternal grandmother, Helene Mantel. The Claimant stated that his grandmother, Helene Mantel, was born on 14 February 1875 in Tarnopol, Poland and later lived in Podwoloczyska, Poland. The Claimant’s grandmother was married to [REDACTED] on 4 April 1897. [REDACTED] died in 1929, sometime after which the Claimant’s grandmother moved to Vienna, Austria. The Claimant stated his grandmother escaped from Austria after the *Anschluss* in March 1938 and settled in Medellin, Columbia, before immigrating to the United States and residing in New York, New York, where she died in the 1960s.

The Claimant stated that his father, Sever Mantel, was born on 16 December 1903 in Podwoloczyska and was married to [REDACTED] on 8 July 1941 in Long Beach, New York, the United States. The Claimant stated that Sever Mantel lived in Podwoloczyska until moving to Vienna, where he became a Doctor of Jurisprudence of the University of Vienna in 1926. The Claimant stated that his father practiced law in Vienna from 1934 until 1938. The Claimant stated that after the *Anschluss* in March 1938, he escaped from Austria to Medellin, Columbia, before immigrating to the United States and residing in New York, New York, where he died on

16 April 1976. The Claimant stated that he is unaware of the Vienna street address of his father or grandmother. The Claimant stated that he was born in Hamburg, Germany on 7 March 1932.

### **Information Available in the Bank Records**

The bank records consist of a contract between the Bank and Frau Helene and Dr. Sever Mantel, for the establishment of a joint bank account, signed on 18 May 1931 in Zurich. According to these records, the Account Owners, Helene and Dr. Sever Mantel, gave an address of Vienna XIX, Dittesgasse 58. The bank documents show that the agreement with the Bank was for the establishment of a custody account.<sup>1</sup>

The bank records do not show when the account at issue was closed, or to whom it was paid, nor do these records indicate the value of the account. The auditors who carried out the investigation of this bank to identify accounts of Victims of Nazi Persecution pursuant to instructions of the Independent Committee of Eminent Persons (the "ICEP") did not find the account in the Bank's system of open accounts, and they therefore presumed that it was closed. These auditors indicated that there was no evidence of activity on the account after 1945. There is no evidence in the bank records that the Account Owners or their heirs closed the accounts and received the proceeds themselves.

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

#### Identification of the Account Owners

The Claimant has plausibly identified the Account Owners. The Claimant's father's and grandmother's name match the published names of the Account Owners. The Claimant identified that Sever Mantel held a Doctorate in law, which matches unpublished information in the bank records. In support of his claim, the Claimant submitted a copy of his Father's University of Vienna transcript and Doctor of Law Certificate.

Additionally, the Claimant stated that in the 1920s his father and grandmother moved to Vienna, Austria, which is consistent with them having been in that location at the time of opening an account at the Bank. In support of his claims, the Claimant submitted documents, including a family tree and a photograph of Helene Mantel.

#### Status of the Account Owners as Victims of Nazi Persecution

The Claimant has made a plausible showing that the Account Owners were Victims of Nazi Persecution. The Claimant stated that the Account Owners were Jewish and lived in Vienna,

---

<sup>1</sup> The bank records contain a joint account contract that references a "*Titeldepot*," which is a custody account. Such forms were typically used by the Bank at the time regardless of whether the account in question was in fact a custody account. Although this contract therefore does not necessarily demonstrate that the Account Owners held a custody account, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, the CRT concludes that it is plausible that they held such an account.

Austria. The Claimant stated that his father and grandmother were forced to flee Austria after the *Anschluss* in March 1938.

#### The Claimant's Relationship to the Account Owners

The Claimant has plausibly demonstrated that he is related to the Account Owners by submitting documents demonstrating that he is the adopted child of Sever Mantel. There is no information to indicate that the Account Owner has other surviving heirs.

#### The Issue of Who Received the Proceeds

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. These presumptions are contained in Appendix A.<sup>2</sup> The CRT concludes in this case that Presumptions (h) and (j) apply and it is therefore plausible that the account proceeds were not paid to the Account Owners or their heirs.

#### Basis for the Award

The CRT has determined that an Award may be made in favor of the Claimant. First, the claim is admissible in accordance with the criteria contained in Article 23 of the Rules. Second, the Claimant has plausibly demonstrated that the Account Owners were his adopted father and grandmother, and those relationships justify an Award. Finally, the CRT has determined that it is plausible that neither the Account Owners nor their heirs received the proceeds of the claimed account.

#### Amount of the Award

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 custody account was 13,000.00 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 156,000.00 Swiss Francs.

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, the CRT has used the value presumptions of Article 35 of the Rules to calculate the account values, and 65% of the total award amount is 101,400.00 Swiss Francs.

#### Division of the Award

According to Article 31 of the Rules, the CRT has determined that each of the Account Owners had an equal share of these accounts. The Claimant is representing his sister in these

---

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

proceedings. According to Article 29 of the Rules, his sister is entitled to receive one half of any payment made to the Claimant. As noted above, the accounts at issue were joint accounts.

### **Scope of the Award**

The Claimant should be aware that, pursuant to Article 25 of the Rules, the CRT will carry out further research on his claim to determine whether there are additional Swiss bank accounts to which he 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  
October 3, 2002

## APPENDIX A

In the absence of evidence to the contrary, the Tribunal presumes that neither the Account 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, and before 1945 or the year in which the freeze of Accounts from the country of residence of the Account 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 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 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 was a child at the time of the Second World War;
- h) the Account 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 and heirs because of the banks' concerns regarding double liability;<sup>2</sup>
- i) the Account 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 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).