

# CLAIMS RESOLUTION TRIBUNAL

---

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

## **Certified Award**

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

## **in re Accounts of Bernhard Albert Mayer**

Claim Number: 212745/ES

Award Amount: 181,680.00 Swiss Francs

This Certified Award is based upon the claim of [REDACTED] (the “Claimant”) to the accounts of Bernhard Albert Mayer (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 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 a Claim Form identifying the Account Owner as her paternal great-grandfather, Bernhard Albert Mayer, who was born on 16 March 1866 in Mainz, Germany, and was married to [REDACTED], on 26 December 1893 in Mainz, Germany. The Claimant stated that her great-grandfather was a business consultant who owned a factory for silver and precious metals in Mainz/Pforzheim, Germany. He was also the head of the Jewish community in Germany. The Claimant stated that her great-grandfather lived at Kaiserstrasse, 49 and Kaiserstrasse, 53, Mainz and she submitted documents including her great-grandparents’ application to emigrate from Germany dated 1941, which shows that he resided at this address and is signed "Bernhard Albert Israel Mayer." The Claimant stated that in 1941, her great-grandfather fled to Buenos Aires, Argentina. The Claimant stated that her great-grandfather was blind and submitted an official certificate from 22 February 1941, which confirms this. The Claimant’s great-grandfather died on 1 January 1947 in Buenos Aires.

The Claimant identified Karl Mayer as the son of the Account Owner and the Power of Attorney Holder of a Swiss account and submitted his birth certificate. The Claimant stated that Karl Mayer was born on 12 October 1895 in Mainz and died on 9 August 1976 in Buenos Aires. The Claimant indicated that she was born on 25 November 1953 in Buenos Aires. The Claimant is representing [REDACTED], her father, who was born on 2 January 1921 in Darmstadt,

Germany, together with [REDACTED], her uncle, who was born on 24 February 1923, also in Darmstadt. [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] are the sons of the Power of Attorney Holder Karl Mayer, and the grandsons of the Account Owner, Bernhard Albert Mayer.

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

The bank record consists of a printout from the Bank's database. According to this record, the Account Owner was Bernhard Albert Mayer and the Power of Attorney Holder was Karl Mayer, the Account Owner's son. The Account Owner resided at Kaiserstrasse, 49 in Mainz, Germany. The bank record indicates that the Account Owner held a custody account and a demand deposit account.

The bank record does not show when the accounts at issue were closed, or to whom they were paid. Neither do these records indicate the value of these accounts. 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 ("ICEP" or the "ICEP Investigation") did not find these accounts in the Bank's system of open accounts, and therefore presumed that they were closed. These auditors indicated that there was no evidence of activity on these accounts after 1945.

There is no evidence in the bank records that the Account Owner, the Power of Attorney Holder or their heirs closed the accounts and received the proceeds themselves.

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

#### Identification of the Account Owner

The Claimant has plausibly identified the Account Owner. Her great-grandfather and grandfather's names match the published names of the Account Owner and the Power of Attorney Holder respectively. The Claimant provided her great-grandfather's residential address and the relationship between the Account Owner and the Power of Attorney Holder, which matches unpublished information in relation to the Account Owner contained in the bank record. In support of her claim, the Claimant submitted documents including a certificate showing that her grandfather was blind, together with his application to emigrate from Germany, demonstrating that he resided at the same address that appears on the bank record, and the Power of Attorney Holder's birth certificate, dated 1941, indicating that the Account Owner was his father.

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

The Claimant has made a plausible showing that the Account Owner was a Victim of Nazi Persecution. The Claimant stated that the Account Owner was Jewish and that he was the representative of the Jewish community in Germany. The Claimant submitted her grandfather's birth certificate, dated 1941, which indicates that the Account Owner was Jewish. The Account

Owner filed an application to emigrate from Germany on 3 February 1941, which he signed "Bernhard Albert Israel Mayer." In 1938, a decree made it mandatory for Jews to insert the middle names "Israel" and "Sara" into all official documents. The Account Owner fled Germany in 1941 to Buenos Aires, Argentina.

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

The Claimant has plausibly demonstrated that she is related to the Account Owner by submitting the Account Owner's son's birth certificate and the Account Owner's grandson's birth certificate, which identify the relationship between the Claimant and the Account Owner.

#### The Issue of Who Received the Proceeds

This case raises the question of whether the Account Owner could have accessed his account after leaving Germany. The bank records indicate that the Account Owner was a German national with an address in Germany. Given the Nazi enforcement of flight taxes, the Nazi campaign to confiscate the domestic and foreign assets of its Jewish nationals, and the application of Presumptions (h) and (j) contained in Appendix A,<sup>1</sup> the CRT concludes that it is plausible that the account proceeds were not paid to the Account Owner or his heirs. Based on its precedent and the Rules Governing the Claims Resolution Process (the "Rules"), the CRT applies presumptions to assist in the determination of whether or not 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 Claimant. 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 Claimant has plausibly demonstrated that the Account Owner was her great-grandfather, and that relationship justifies an Award. Finally, the CRT has determined that it is plausible that neither the Account Owner, the Power of Attorney Holder, nor their heirs received the proceeds of the claimed accounts.

#### 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 and the average value of a demand deposit account was 2,140.00 Swiss Francs. The present value of these amounts is calculated by multiplying them by a factor of 12, in accordance with Article 37(1) of the Rules, to produce a total award amount of 181,680.00 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

---

<sup>1</sup> An expanded version of Appendix A appears on the CRT II website -- [www.crt-ii.org](http://www.crt-ii.org).

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 118,092.00 Swiss Francs.

#### Division of the Award

The Claimant is representing her father and uncle in these proceedings. According to Article 29 of the Rules, as they are the direct descendants of the Account Owner, her father and her uncle are each entitled to one half of any payment made to the Claimant.

#### **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 her claim to determine whether there are additional Swiss bank accounts to which she 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).