

CLAIMS RESOLUTION TRIBUNAL

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

Certified Award

to Claimant [REDACTED]

in re Account of Hanka Sieradzka

Claim Number: 209983/MD

Award Amount: 156,000.00 Swiss Francs

This Certified Award is based upon the claim of [REDACTED], née [REDACTED], (the “Claimant”) to the account of [REDACTED].¹ This Award is to the account of Hanka Sieradzka (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 aunt, Hanka Sieradzka, née [REDACTED]. The Claimant stated that Hanka Sieradzka was born in Pabianice, Poland, the daughter of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], née [REDACTED]. The Claimant further stated that she married [REDACTED], and that the couple had one son. The Claimant explained that [REDACTED] originated from Lodz, Poland, but lived together with his family in Pabianice, a town near Lodz. According to the Claimant, [REDACTED] was a salesman specializing in fine wool fabrics, and he frequently traveled to Switzerland on business.

The Claimant stated that [REDACTED] and Hanka Sieradzka were Jewish, and that they were deported with their son to the Litzmannstadt ghetto (the ghetto in Lodz), where they perished in 1942. The Claimant stated that she is the only survivor of the [REDACTED] and Sieradzki families. The Claimant stated that she was born on 3 January 1925, the daughter of [REDACTED], who was Hanka Sieradzka’s brother. The Claimant stated that her paternal grandmother, [REDACTED], née [REDACTED], was also related to both [REDACTED] and Stanislaw Sieradzki. In support of her claim, the Claimant submitted her parents’ marriage certificate, and [REDACTED] certificate of residence.

¹ The CRT will treat the claim to this account in a separate decision.

The Claimant previously submitted an ATAG Ernst & Young claim form in 1998, asserting her entitlement to a Swiss bank account owned by [REDACTED].

Information Available in the Bank Records

The bank records consist of a bank customer card, and printouts from the Bank's database. According to these records, the Account Owner was Mrs. Hanka Sieradzka who used an address at Piotrkowska 213 in Lodz, Poland, and in Istanbul, Turkey. The Power of Attorney Holders were Mrs. Jadwiga Jonscherowa, Mrs. Jadwiga Weilowa, and Stanislaw Sieradzki. The bank records further indicate that the Account Owner requested the Bank to hold all correspondence, and that she planned to visit the Bank in 1938. The bank record indicates also that the Account Owner wrote to the Bank in June 1940, and requested the Bank to send all correspondence to a person named [REDACTED] in Vevey, Switzerland.

The bank record indicates that the Account Owner held a custody account that was closed on 10 June 1940. The amount in the account on the date of its closure is unknown. There is no evidence in the bank record that the Account Owner, the Power of Attorney Holder, or their heirs closed the account and received the proceeds themselves.

The CRT's Analysis

Identification of the Account Owner

The Claimant has plausibly identified the Account Owner. Her aunt's name matches the published name of the Account Owner. The Claimant stated that her aunt lived in Pabianice near Lodz, and that her husband originated from Lodz. This information is consistent with the published city of residence of the Account Owner. Furthermore, the Claimant identified Stanislaw Sieradzki, who is listed as one of the Power of Attorney Holders, as a relative of her grandmother.

The CRT notes that the Claimant filed an ATAG Ernst & Young claim form in 1998, asserting her entitlement to a Swiss bank account owned by [REDACTED], the husband of Hanka Sieradzka, prior to the publication in February 2001 of the list of accounts determined by the Independent Committee of Eminent Persons ("ICEP") to be probably or possibly those of Victims of Nazi Persecution (the "ICEP List"). This indicates that the Claimant has based her present claim not simply on the fact that an individual identified on the ICEP List as owning a Swiss bank account bears the same name as her relative, but rather on a family relationship that was known to her before the publication of the ICEP List. It also indicates that the Claimant had reason to believe that her relatives owned a Swiss bank account prior to the publication of the ICEP List. This supports the credibility of the information provided by the Claimant. The CRT further notes that Sieradzka is a unique name as it appears only once on the ICEP List. Finally, the CRT notes that there are no other claims to this account.

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, who was Jewish, was deported to the Litzmannstadt (Lodz) ghetto, where she perished in 1942.

Moreover, the CRT notes that a database containing the names of victims of Nazi persecution includes several persons named Chana or Hana Sieradzka, and indicates that they were in the Lodz ghetto, which corresponds to the information about the Account Owner provided by the Claimant. The database is a compilation of names from various sources, including the Yad Vashem Memorial of Israel.

The Claimant's Relationship to the Account Owner

The Claimant has plausibly demonstrated that she is related to the Account Owner by submitting specific biographical information demonstrating that the Account Owner was her aunt.

The Issue of Who Received the Proceeds

Given the application of Presumptions (a), (h) and (j) as provided in Article 28 of the Rules Governing the Claims Resolution Process, as amended (the "Rules") (see Appendix A), the CRT concludes that it is plausible that the account proceeds were not paid to the Account Owner, the Power of Attorney Holders, or their heirs. Based on its precedent and 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 18 of the Rules. Second, the Claimant has plausibly demonstrated that the Account Owner was her aunt, and that relationship justifies an Award. Finally, the CRT has determined that it is plausible that neither the Account Owner, nor the Power of Attorney Holders, nor their heirs received the proceeds of the claimed account.

Amount of the Award

In this case, the Account Owner held one custody account. Pursuant to Article 29 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 investigation carried out pursuant to the instructions of ICEP (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 31(1) of the Rules, to produce a total award amount of 156,000.00 Swiss Francs.

Scope of the Award

The Claimant should be aware that, pursuant to Article 20 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
April 21, 2003

**ARTICLE 28 OF THE RULES GOVERNING THE CLAIMS RESOLUTION PROCESS
(AS AMENDED)**

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:¹

- 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;²
- 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.³

¹ 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.

² See Bergier Final Report at 443-44, 446-49; see also ICEP Report at 81-83.

³ 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).