

CLAIMS RESOLUTION TRIBUNAL

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

Certified Denial

to Claimant Rachel Moses
represented by *Von Trott Zu Solz & Lammek Law offices.*

in re Account of Hugo Krause

Claim Number: 004309/MG¹

This Certified Denial is based on the claim of Rachel Moses, née Petzal, (the “Claimant”) to the accounts of Hugo Krause (or Samuel).² This Denial is to the published account of Hugo Krause (the “Account Owner”) at the [REDACTED] (the “Bank”).

All denials are published. Where a claimant has not requested confidentiality, as in this case, only the name of the bank has been redacted.

Information Provided by the Claimant

The Claimant submitted a Claim Form, asserting that her paternal aunt’s husband, Hugo Samuel (Krause), who was born on 7 July 1879 in Schubin, Germany (now Poland), and was married to Käth Samuel, owned a Swiss bank account. The Claimant stated that her uncle, who was Jewish, resided at Jenaerstrasse 8 in Berlin-Wilmersdorf, and that he owned a clothing store. The Claimant further stated that her uncle was deported to Riga, Latvia, where he perished in 1942. The Claimant indicated that she was born on 24 August 1924 in Arenswalde, Germany.

Information Available in the Bank’s Records

The CRT notes that the Claimant submitted a claim to an account belonging to her relative, Hugo Krause. 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 one account whose owner’s name matches that provided by the Claimant. The account is identified below by its Account Identification Number, which is a number assigned to the account by the ICEP auditors for tracking purposes.

¹ The Claimant submitted an Initial Questionnaire to the Court in 1999 and a Claim Form to the CRT. The CRT is treating the Initial Questionnaire and the Claim Form under the consolidated Claim Number 004309.

² In this claim, the Claimant also claimed the account of Arnold Petzal. The CRT will treat the claim to this account in a separate determination.

Account 1011824

The Bank's records indicate that the Account Owner was Hugo Krause, who resided in Berlin, Germany. The Bank's records also indicate the Account Owner's street address in Berlin, second city of residence, profession and a date on which the Account Owner contacted the Bank. Furthermore, the Bank's records indicate the date of opening and closing of the account at issue.

The CRT's Analysis

Admissibility of the Claim

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

The CRT concludes that the Claimant has not identified the Account Owner as her relative. Although the name of her uncle matches the published name of the Account Owner, the information provided by the Claimant differs materially from the unpublished information about the Account Owner available in the Bank's records. Specifically, the Claimant stated that her uncle died in 1942. In contrast, the Bank's records show that the Account Owner was still alive several years after the end of the Second World War. In addition, the CRT notes that the Claimant did not identify the Account Owner's profession, street address in Berlin and other city of residence. Consequently, the CRT is unable to conclude that the Account Owner and the Claimant's relative are the same person.

Right of Appeal and Request for Reconsideration

Pursuant to Article 30 of the Rules, the Claimant may appeal this decision or submit a request for reconsideration within ninety (90) days of the date of the letter accompanying this decision.

An appeal must be based upon a plausible suggestion of error regarding the CRT's conclusions set out in this decision. Any appeals which are submitted without a plausible suggestion of error shall be summarily denied. A request for reconsideration must be based on new documentary evidence not previously presented to the CRT that, if considered, would have led to a different outcome of the claim. Claimants should briefly explain the relevance of the newly submitted documents in view of the conclusions stated in the certified decision.

The Claimant should send appeals and/or requests for reconsideration in writing to the following address: Oren Wiener, Claims Resolution Tribunal, Attention: Appeals / Request for Reconsideration, P.O. Box 9564, 8036 Zurich, Switzerland. If more than one account has been treated in this decision, the Claimant should identify the account, including, where available, the Account Identification Number, that forms the basis of the appeal and/or request for reconsideration.

Scope of the Denial

The Claimant should be aware that the CRT will carry out further research on her 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
19 March 2007