

# CLAIMS RESOLUTION TRIBUNAL

---

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

## **Certified Denial**

to Claimant [REDACTED]  
represented by [REDACTED]

**Claimed Account Owner: Lajos Schwarz**

Claim Number: 223059/WT

This Certified Denial is based on the claim of [REDACTED], née [REDACTED] (the “Claimant”) to a Swiss bank account potentially owned by her father’s business partner, Lajos Schwarz (the “Account Owner”).

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 indicating that Lajos Schwarz, who was the business partner of the Claimant’s father, [REDACTED], opened an account on behalf of their chemical engineering company, *Sötét and Janász*, which was located in Budapest, Hungary. The Claimant indicated that Lajos Schwarz, who was Jewish, deposited all of the assets belonging to the company *Sötét and Janász* into a bank account in Switzerland under the name “Lajos Schwarz, Business Partner” (*Geschäftspartner*). The Claimant indicated that Lajos Schwarz fled Hungary during the Second World War and that he died in approximately 1943.

## **The CRT’s Investigation**

The CRT matched the name of Lajos Schwarz to the names of all account owners and power of attorney holders in the Account History Database and identified accounts belonging to individuals or over which individuals held power of attorney. In doing so, the CRT used advanced name matching systems and computer programs, and considered variations of names, including name variations provided by Yad Vashem, The Holocaust Martyrs’ and Heroes’ Remembrance Authority, in Jerusalem, Israel, to ensure that all possible name matches were identified. However, a close review of the relevant bank records indicated that the information contained therein was inconsistent with the information the Claimant provided regarding the Claimed Account Owner. Accordingly, the CRT was unable to conclude that any of these accounts belonged to the Claimed Account Owner.

## **The CRT's Analysis**

### Identification of the Account Owner/ Power of Attorney Holder

The list below contains names of account owners/power of attorney holders that match the name of the Claimed Account Owner and the reasons why the CRT has concluded that the Claimed Account Owner and an account owner/power of attorney holder are not the same person. If an account owner's place of residence was published, that place of residence is also listed.

*Name: Lajos Schwarz*

*Account Identification Number: 5029346*

*Specifically, the Claimant stated that Lajos Schwarz was the business partner of the Claimant's father, and that he opened an account on behalf of their chemical engineering company, Sötét and Janász, under the name "Lajos Schwarz, Business Partner" (Geschäftspartner). In contrast, the bank's records do not refer to any company, business partner, or any other individual. There is no evidence in the bank's records that anyone other than the account owner owned an interest in the account. The CRT also notes that the Claimant did not identify an individual who held power of attorney over the account, even though the power of attorney holder was closely related to the account owner. Finally, the CRT notes that even if the Claimant had correctly identified the account owner as her father's business partner, there is no evidence in the records that the account was held on behalf of her father. Thus, absent evidence that the account was owned by a relative of the Claimant, the Claimant would not be entitled to the account.*

### 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.

**Certification of the Denial**

The CRT certifies this Denial for approval by the Court.

Claims Resolution Tribunal  
30 August 2010