

# CLAIMS RESOLUTION TRIBUNAL

---

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

## **Certified Award**

to the estate of [REDACTED]  
represented by [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]<sup>1</sup>

## **in re Accounts of Martin Steiner**

Claim Numbers: 220637/MD; 220638/MD; 220639/MD

Award Amount: 191,640.00 Swiss Francs

This Certified Award is based upon the claim of [REDACTED] (the “Claimant”) to the accounts of Martin Steiner (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 his father-in-law, Martin Steiner, and the Power of Attorney Holders as his mother-in-law, Rosa Steiner, and his wife, Gabriela Steiner. The Claimant stated that Martin Steiner was married to Rosa [REDACTED] and that the couple had one child, Gabriela, also known as Gabrielle, who was born on 29 July 1909 in Innsbruck, Austria. The Claimant stated that Martin Steiner was an importer of alcoholic beverages in Innsbruck and had business connections in Switzerland. The family resided at 3 Andreas Hofferstrasse in Innsbruck. According to the Claimant, Gabriela Steiner married [REDACTED] in 1934 and the couple divorced in early 1937. The Claimant indicated that he was married to Gabriela Steiner in 1937. The Claimant stated that he was born on 27 July 1904 in Vienna, Austria, and explained that he and his wife lived in Vienna, where the Claimant worked as a dental technician at the Dental Institute of Vienna University.

The Claimant stated that his wife’s family was Jewish, and that after the annexation of Austria by Nazi Germany in March 1938, Martin Steiner was arrested and beaten by the Nazis. He never recovered from that abuse, and died in Vienna. Further, the Claimant stated that Rosa Steiner stayed in Nazi-controlled Austria and that after the Second World War she was never heard from

---

<sup>1</sup> [REDACTED] originally filed a claim to the account of his father-in-law, Martin Steiner. [REDACTED] passed away on 31 October 2002, so the Personal Representative for the Estate of [REDACTED], [REDACTED], has assumed this claim.

again. The Claimant explained that he is Jewish and that he was arrested by the Nazis, spent ten days in custody, and was released with the help of a relative who was an employee of the Turkish embassy in Vienna. According to the Claimant, he and his wife fled Austria to the United States in 1939 to escape Nazi persecution and settled in New York, New York. The Claimant indicated that Gabriela [REDACTED] Steiner died without issue on 22 May 1979.

In support of his claim, the Claimant submitted documents, including his wife's birth and death certificates, and his marriage certificate. The Claimant's representative informed the CRT in a letter dated 7 November 2002 that the Claimant died on 31 October 2002, and that [REDACTED] has been appointed the representative of the Claimant's estate.

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

The bank records consist of a bank customer card, a power of attorney form, and printouts from the Bank's database. According to these records, the Account Owner was Martin Steiner and the Power of Attorney Holders were Mrs. Rosa Steiner, the Account Owner's wife, and Miss Gabriele Steiner, the Account Owner's daughter, who resided in Innsbruck at 3 Andreas Hoffnerstrasse. The bank records indicate that Power of Attorney Holder Gabriele Steiner married in 1937 and changed her name to [REDACTED]. According to these records, the Account Owner held a custody account, numbered 33910, a demand deposit account, numbered 33910, and a passbook account, numbered 10400. The custody account was closed on 31 March 1938. The bank records do not show when the demand deposit account or the passbook account were closed, nor do the records indicate to whom the proceeds of these accounts were paid. The bank records do not indicate the value of the accounts at issue.

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 the demand deposit account or the passbook account in the Bank's system of open accounts, and they 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 Holders, or their heirs closed any of the accounts 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 three claims of the Claimant in one proceeding.

### Identification of the Account Owner

The Claimant has plausibly identified the Account Owner. His father-in-law's name matches the published name of the Account Owner, and his wife's and mother-in-law's names match the names of the published Power of Attorney Holders. The Claimant identified the street address used by his parents-in-law, which matches the unpublished address used by the Account Owner and the Power of Attorney Holders. Further, the Claimant stated that he married Gabriela Steiner in 1937, which matches the unpublished information about Power of Attorney Holder Gabriele Steiner contained in the bank documents.

### 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 arrested and beaten by the Nazis. The Claimant further stated that Power of Attorney Holder Rosa Steiner was Jewish, stayed in Nazi-controlled Austria, and was not found alive after the Second World War. Further, the Claimant stated that Power of Attorney Holder Gabriele Steiner was Jewish and fled Austria to the United States in 1939 to escape Nazi persecution.

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

The Claimant has plausibly demonstrated that he is related to the Account Owner by submitting documents, including his wife's birth certificate and his marriage certificate, demonstrating that the Account Owner was his father-in-law. There is no information to indicate that the Account Owner has other surviving heirs.

### The Issue of Who Received the Proceeds

Given the application of Presumptions (a), (h), and (j) contained in Appendix A,<sup>2</sup> 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 23 of the Rules. Second, the Claimant has plausibly demonstrated that the Account Owner was his father-in-law, 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 accounts.

---

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

### 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 average value of a demand deposit account was 2,140.00 Swiss Francs, and the average value of a passbook account was 830.00 Swiss Francs. Thus, the total average value for one of each of these types of accounts is 15,970.00 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 191,640.00 Swiss Francs.

### 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, the CRT has used the value presumptions of Article 35 of the Rules to calculate the account value, and 65% of the total award amount is 124,566.00 Swiss Francs.

### **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

23 January 2003

## 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).