

CLAIMS RESOLUTION TRIBUNAL

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

Certified Denial

to Claimant [REDACTED]
represented by Elon Jarden

**in re Account of Margarethe Deutsch
and
Account of Ladislaus Deutsch**

Claim Number: 150084/AE

This Certified Denial is based on the claim of [REDACTED], (the “Claimant”) to the published account of Aladar Jordan.¹ This Denial is to the published account of Margarethe Deutsch (“Account Owner 1”) at the [REDACTED] (“Bank 1”), and to the published account of Ladislaus (Ladislav) Deutsch (“Account Owner 2”) at the [REDACTED] (“Bank 2”).

All denials 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 asserting that his maternal aunt, Margarethe (Margarete) Deutsch, and his maternal uncle, Ladislaus (Ladislav) Deutsch, who were married, owned a Swiss bank account. The Claimant indicated that his aunt was born on 21 March 1896 in Vienna, Austria, and that his uncle was born on 22 August 1894 in Senice, Austria-Hungary (later Czechoslovakia, now Slovakia). In a telephone conversation with the CRT on 16 August 2005, the Claimant indicated that his aunt and uncle resided in Senice until the 1920s when they moved to Hodonin, Czechoslovakia (now the Czech Republic), and that they owned the *Marisha-Chocolate Company*, which was also located in Hodonin. The Claimant indicated that his aunt and uncle, who were Jewish, resided in Hodonin during the Second World War. The Claimant indicated that his aunt and uncle perished at the concentration camp in Auschwitz. The Claimant indicated that he was born on 20 April 1915 in Senice. The Claimant submitted documents in support of his application, including: (1) a copy of his birth certificate; (2) copies of documents issued by the Ministry of the Interior of the State of Israel; (3) and a copy of a document issued by the district court of Aachen, Germany.

¹ In this claim, the Claimant claimed the account of Aladar Jordan. In a separate decision, the CRT awarded this account to the Claimant. See *In re Account of Aladar Jordan* (approved on 9 March 2005).

Information Available in the Bank's Records

The CRT notes that the Claimant submitted claims to an account belonging to his relatives, Margarethe (Margarete) Deutsch and Ladislaus (Ladislav) Deutsch. The auditors who carried out the investigation to identify accounts of Victims of Nazi Persecution pursuant to instructions of the Independent Committee of Eminent Persons ("ICEP" or the "ICEP Investigation") reported two accounts whose owners' names match that provided by the Claimant. Each account is identified below by its Account Identification Number, which is a number assigned to the account by the ICEP auditors for tracking purposes.

Account 1000477

Bank 1's records indicate that Account Owner 1 was Margarethe Deutsch. Bank 1's records further indicate Account Owner 1's city and country of residence. Furthermore, Bank 1's records indicate the dates of opening and closing of the account at issue.

Account 5029514

Bank 2's records indicate that Account Owner 2 was Ladislaus Deutsch. Bank 2's records further indicate Account Owner 2's city and country of residence as well as his street address. Bank 2's records also include a power of attorney form signed by Account Owner 2 and the power of attorney holder, who bore the same last name as Account Owner 2. Furthermore, Bank 2's records indicate the power of attorney holder's city and country of residence and the power of attorney holder's street address.

The CRT's Analysis

Admissibility of the Claims

The CRT has determined that the claim is admissible according to Article 18 of the Rules Governing the Claims Resolution Process, as amended (the "Rules").

Identification of the Account Owner

As for Account 1000477, the CRT concludes that the Claimant has not identified Account Owner 1 as his relative. Although the name of his aunt matches the published name of Account Owner 1, the information provided by the Claimant differs materially from the unpublished information about Account Owner 1 available in Bank 1's records. Specifically, the Claimant indicated that his aunt resided in Czechoslovakia. In contrast, Bank 1's records indicate that Account Owner 1 resided in different country that was not identified by the Claimant as his aunt's place of residence, and to which the Claimant did not establish any connection. Consequently, the CRT is unable to conclude that Account Owner 1 and the Claimant's aunt are the same person.

As for Account 5029514, the CRT concludes that the Claimant has not identified Account Owner 2 as his relative. Although the name of his uncle matches the published name of Account Owner 2, the information provided by the Claimant differs materially from the unpublished information about Account Owner 2 available in Bank 2's records. Specifically, the Claimant indicated that his uncle resided in Czechoslovakia. In contrast, Bank 2's records indicate that Account Owner 2 resided in a different country, which was not identified by the Claimant as her uncle's place of residence, and to which the Claimant did not establish any connection. Moreover, the Claimant did not identify the power of attorney holder listed in Bank 2's records, although this individual bears the same last name as Account Owner 2. Consequently, the CRT is unable to conclude that Account Owner 2 and the Claimant's uncle are the same person.

Right of Appeal

Pursuant to Article 30 of the Rules, the Claimant may appeal this Denial to the Court through the Special Masters within ninety (90) days of the date of the letter accompanying this decision. Appeals should be delivered to the following address: Office of Special Master Michael Bradfield, 51 Louisiana Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20001 USA.

The Claimant should send appeals in writing to the above address and should include all reasons for the appeal. If more than one account has been denied in this Certified Denial, the Claimant should identify the Account Identification Number that forms the basis of the appeal. Appeals submitted without either a plausible suggestion of error or relevant new evidence may be summarily denied.

Scope of the Denial

The Claimant should be aware that the CRT will carry out further research on his claim to determine whether an award may be made based upon the information provided by the Claimant or upon information from other sources.

Certification of the Denial

The CRT certifies this Denial for approval by the Court.

Claims Resolution Tribunal
21 September 2005