

# CLAIMS RESOLUTION TRIBUNAL

---

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

## **Certified Denial**

to Claimant [REDACTED]

**in re Account of Hugo Wolff  
and  
Account of Hugo Wolf  
and  
Accounts of Hedwig Wolff**

Claim Number: 211599/SB<sup>1</sup>

This Certified Denial is based on the claim of [REDACTED] (the “Claimant”) to the accounts of Hugo Wolff (Wolf) and Hedwig Wolff (Wolf). This Denial is to the published account of Hugo Wolff (“Account Owner 1”) at the [REDACTED] (“Bank 1”), to the unpublished accounts of Hugo Wolf (“Account Owner 2”) at the [REDACTED] (“Bank 2”), and to the published accounts of three individuals named Hedwig Wolff (“Account Owner 3,” “Account Owner 4,” and “Account Owner 5”) at Bank 1 and at the [REDACTED] (“Bank 3”).

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 paternal uncle, Hugo Wolff, and his wife, Hedwig Wolff, née Jakob, who were Jewish, each owned a Swiss bank account. The Claimant stated that his uncle was born on 26 May 1899, and that his wife was born on 7 January 1896. The Claimant further stated that the couple resided in Beurig, Germany, until 1941, when they moved to Trier, Germany. The Claimant concluded that his uncle and wife perished in the Izbica transit camp in 1943. The Claimant indicated that he was born on 13 August 1929 in St. Ingbert, Germany.

The Claimant submitted documents in support of his claim, including, an extract from the family history book which indicates that Hugo and Hedwig Wolf resided in Trier.

---

<sup>1</sup> In a separate decision, the CRT awarded the account of Hedwig Wolf to the Claimant. See *In re Accounts of Frau Hugo Wolf* (approved on 10 December 2004).

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

The CRT notes that the Claimant submitted a claim to an account belonging to his relatives, Hugo Wolff and Hewdwig Wolff. 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 six additional accounts to that previously awarded to the Claimant, whose owners' names match those 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 1014267

Bank 1's records indicate that Account Owner 1 was Hugo Wolff, who resided in Germany. Bank 1's records also indicate Account Owner 1's city of residence in Germany and the dates of opening and closing of the account at issue.

### Accounts 5024756 and 5033750

Bank 2's records indicate that Account Owner 2 was Hugo Wolf. Bank 2's records also indicate Account Owner 2's title, street address, and city and country of residence. Finally, Bank 2's records contain Account Owner 2's signature.

### Account 1000461

Bank 1's records indicate that Account Owner 3 was Hedwig Wolff. Bank 1's records also indicate Account Owner 3's city and country of residence, together with the date of opening of the account at issue.

### Account 1014172

Bank 1's records indicate that Account Owner 4 was Hedwig Wolff who resided in Germany. Bank 1's records also indicate Account Owner 4's occupation, city and country of residence, and the dates of opening and closing of the account at issue.

### Account 2016701

Bank 3's records indicate that Account Owner 5 was Hedwig Wolff. Bank 3's records also indicate Account Owner 5's year of birth.

## **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 Owners

As for Account 1014267, the CRT concludes that the Claimant has not identified Account Owner 1 as his relative. Although the name of his uncle 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 stated that his uncle resided in Beurig and Trier, Germany. In contrast, Bank 1's records show that Account Owner 1 resided in a city which is over 150 kilometers from Beurig and Trier. The CRT notes that the Claimant's uncle's places of residence and Account Owner 1's place of residence are small or medium sized towns, rendering it unlikely that an individual would indicate the other city of residence as their place of residence, even for the purposes of maintaining a bank account. Consequently, the CRT is unable to conclude that Account Owner 1 and the Claimant's uncle are the same person.

As for Accounts 5024756 and 5033750, the CRT concludes that the Claimant has not identified Account Owner 2 as his relative. Although the name of his uncle matches the unpublished 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 stated that his uncle resided in Germany. In contrast, Bank 2's records show that Account Owner 2 resided in another country. Consequently, the CRT is unable to conclude that Account Owner 2 and the Claimant's uncle are the same person. Moreover, it should be noted that the CRT has awarded the accounts to another claimant, who plausibly identified Account Owner 2 as his relative. All decisions are published upon release on the CRT's website at [www.crt-ii.org](http://www.crt-ii.org).

As for Account 1000461, the CRT concludes that the Claimant has not identified Account Owner 3 as his relative. Although the name of his uncle's wife matches the published name of Account Owner 3, the information provided by the Claimant differs materially from the unpublished information about Account Owner 3 available in Bank 1's records. Specifically, the Claimant stated that his uncle's wife resided in Germany. In contrast, Bank 1's records show that Account Owner 3 resided in a different country. Consequently, the CRT is unable to conclude that Account Owner 3 and the Claimant's uncle's wife are the same person.

As for Account 1014172, the CRT concludes that the Claimant has not identified Account Owner 4 as his relative. Although the name of his uncle's wife matches the published name of Account Owner 4, the information provided by the Claimant differs materially from the unpublished information about Account Owner 4 available in Bank 1's records. Specifically, the Claimant stated that his uncle's wife resided in Beurig and Trier, Germany. In contrast, Bank 1's records show that Account Owner 4 resided in another city, which is over 650 kilometers from either Beurig or Trier. Consequently, the CRT is unable to conclude that Account Owner 4 and the Claimant's uncle's wife are the same person.

As for Account 2016701, the CRT concludes that the Claimant has not identified Account Owner 5 as his relative. Although the name of his uncle's wife matches the published name of Account Owner 5, the information provided by the Claimant differs materially from the unpublished information about Account Owner 5 available in Bank 3's records. Specifically, the

Claimant stated that his uncle's wife was born in 1899. In contrast, Bank 3's records show that Account Owner 5 was born several decades later. Consequently, the CRT is unable to conclude that Account Owner 5 and the Claimant's uncle's wife 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, which 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  
8 August 2006