

CLAIMS RESOLUTION TRIBUNAL

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

Certified Award

to the Estate of Claimant [REDACTED 1]¹
and to Claimant [REDACTED 2],
also acting on behalf of [REDACTED 3], [REDACTED 4], [REDACTED 5], [REDACTED 6],
[REDACTED 7], [REDACTED 8], [REDACTED 9], [REDACTED 10],
[REDACTED 11], [REDACTED 12], and [REDACTED 13]

in re Accounts of Siegmund (Sigmund) May

Claim Numbers: 211276/HS;² 217569/HS³

Award Amount: 242,750.00 Swiss Francs

¹ Claimant [REDACTED 1] (“Claimant [REDACTED 1]”) passed away on 23 March 2003. Therefore, this Award is to her Estate.

² Claimant [REDACTED 1] submitted additional claims to the published accounts of Hermann May and [REDACTED 2], which are registered under the Claim Numbers 211275 and 211277, respectively. The CRT will treat Claimant [REDACTED 1]’s claim to Hermann May’s accounts in a separate decision. On 30 August 2002, the Court approved an award to Claimant [REDACTED 1] for the joint account of Siegmund (Sigmund) May and [REDACTED 2]. As for [REDACTED 2], the CRT notes that, on the February 2001 published list of accounts determined by the Independent Committee of Eminent Persons (“ICEP”) to be probably or possibly those of Victims of Nazi Persecution (the “ICEP List”), [REDACTED 2] is indicated as having eight accounts. However, upon careful review, the CRT has concluded that the Bank’s records evidence the existence of only one account which [REDACTED 2] owned jointly with Siegmund May, and which has been awarded to Claimant [REDACTED 1], as mentioned above. Claimant [REDACTED 1] also submitted claims to the accounts of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], which are registered under the Claim Numbers 211278 and 211279, respectively. The CRT did not locate an account belonging to either of Claimant [REDACTED 1]’s relatives, [REDACTED] or [REDACTED], in the Account History Database prepared pursuant to the investigation carried out by ICEP (the ICEP Investigation), which identified accounts probably or possibly belonging to Victims of Nazi Persecution, as defined in the Rules Governing the Claims Resolution Process, as amended (the Rules). The CRT will carry out further research on Claimant [REDACTED 1]’s claims to determine whether an award may be made based upon the information provided by Claimant [REDACTED 1] or upon information from other sources.

³ Claimant [REDACTED 2] (“Claimant May”) submitted additional claims to the published accounts of Hermann May and Emma May, which are registered under the Claim Numbers 217567 and 217568, respectively. The CRT will treat Claimant May’s claims to these accounts in separate decisions. Additionally, the CRT notes that represented party [REDACTED 12] submitted a claim to the published accounts of her paternal grandfather, [REDACTED], which was registered under the Claim Number 210169. Furthermore, [REDACTED 12]’s mother, represented party [REDACTED 10], submitted an Initial Questionnaire to the Court in 1999, numbered SPA-0024-069, likewise asserting that [REDACTED], her father-in-law, owned a Swiss bank account. On 24 April 2003, the Court approved an award for the accounts of [REDACTED] to: [REDACTED 12], [REDACTED 10], [REDACTED 11], [REDACTED 13], and [REDACTED 9].

This Certified Award is based upon the claims of [REDACTED 1], née Niedermann (“Claimant [REDACTED 1]”), and [REDACTED 2] (“Claimant [REDACTED 2]”) (together, the “Claimants”) to the published accounts of Siegmund (Sigmund) May (the “Account Owner”) at the [REDACTED] (the “Bank”).⁴

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 Claimants

Claimant [REDACTED 1] submitted a Claim Form identifying the Account Owner as her maternal uncle, Siegmund (Sigmund) May, who was born in 1886 in Gerolzhofen, Germany. Claimant [REDACTED 1] indicated that Siegmund May’s parents, [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], née [REDACTED], had nine children: [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], Siegmund May, [REDACTED], and [REDACTED], née [REDACTED] (Claimant [REDACTED 1]’s mother). Claimant [REDACTED 1] stated that her uncle, Siegmund May, who was Jewish, was never married and had no children. Claimant [REDACTED 1] indicated that her uncle was a retired wholesale merchant and that he resided in Frankfurt am Main, Germany. Claimant [REDACTED 1] further indicated that her uncle fled Germany in approximately 1933, via Luxembourg and Belgium, and moved to Amsterdam, the Netherlands, where he lived on Michelangelostraat. Finally, Claimant [REDACTED 1] stated that her uncle probably died in a concentration camp during the Second World War. Claimant [REDACTED 1] submitted her own birth certificate, indicating that she was born in Griesheim, a town 35 kilometers south of Frankfurt am Main, on 10 December 1914, that her mother was Jewish, and that her mother’s maiden name was [REDACTED]. Claimant [REDACTED 1] previously submitted an Initial Questionnaire (“IQ”) with the Court in 1999, asserting that her uncle, Siegmund May, owned a Swiss bank account.

Claimant [REDACTED 2] submitted a Claim Form identifying the Account Owner as his paternal uncle, Siegmund (Sigmund) May, who was born on 27 April 1879 in Camberg/Taunus,

⁴ As mentioned above (note 2, *supra*), Claimant [REDACTED 1] was previously awarded a joint account belonging to her uncles, [REDACTED 2] and Siegmund (Sigmund) May who resided in Frankfurt am Main and Amsterdam. However, the auditors who carried out the ICEP Investigation did not conclude that the Account Owner whose accounts are at issue in this Award is the same person who held the joint account with [REDACTED 2]. Therefore, since both Claimant [REDACTED 1] and Claimant [REDACTED 2] have plausibly identified the Account Owner whose accounts are at issue in this Award, the accounts shall be divided equally between Claimant [REDACTED 1] and Claimant [REDACTED 2] (including the parties Claimant [REDACTED 2] represents). The CRT additionally notes that, on the ICEP List, Siegmund (Sigmund) May is indicated as having 20 accounts. Upon careful review, the CRT has concluded that the Bank’s records evidence the existence of only six accounts, five of which are addressed in this Award, and a sixth, held jointly by Siegmund (Sigmund) and [REDACTED 2], which was awarded previously to Claimant [REDACTED 1].

Germany, a town 45 kilometers northwest of Frankfurt am Main, Germany. Claimant [REDACTED 2] indicated that Siegmund May's parents, [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], née [REDACTED], had five children: [REDACTED], [REDACTED] (Claimant [REDACTED 2]'s father), Siegmund May, [REDACTED], née [REDACTED], and [REDACTED]. Claimant [REDACTED 2] stated that Siegmund May, who was Jewish and never married or had children, resided at Scheffelstrasse 11 in Frankfurt am Main with his sister and brother-in-law, [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. Claimant [REDACTED 2] indicated that from 1927 to 1931 Siegmund May was a partner in the firm *L. Bauer*, located at Kaiserstrasse 70 in Frankfurt am Main, and that in 1934 he opened his own firm at Kaiserstrasse 68 in Frankfurt am Main. Claimant [REDACTED 2] added that his uncle took frequent trips to Switzerland, and that he resided there for approximately six months, possibly between 1937 and 1938. Claimant [REDACTED 2] added that his uncle deposited substantial sums in Swiss banks in order to obtain permission to reside in Switzerland, but that he returned abruptly to Germany in approximately 1938, possibly due to threats against his family by the German government and the imposition of additional Swiss residence requirements. Additionally, according to the information submitted by Claimant [REDACTED 2] and represented party [REDACTED 12], née [REDACTED] (who is the daughter of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]), Siegmund May, his sisters [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], and [REDACTED]'s husband [REDACTED] fled from Germany to Amsterdam, the Netherlands, in the late 1930s and resided temporarily at Hotel Hiegentlich on Nieuwe Hoogstraat.

Claimant [REDACTED 2] further indicated that his uncle was imprisoned by the Nazis in the Westerbork camp in The Netherlands, and that he was deported from there to the camp at Auschwitz in September 1943, where he perished. Claimant [REDACTED 2] and represented party [REDACTED 12] further indicated that Siegmund May's sister, [REDACTED], died in Auschwitz, and that Siegmund May's brother-in-law, [REDACTED], died in the Bergen-Belsen concentration camp.

Claimant [REDACTED 2] submitted a declaration from the Red Cross, dated 31 July 1946 in Amsterdam, indicating that Siegmund May, who was born on 27 April 1879, and [REDACTED] were deported to Auschwitz in September 1943, where they are presumed to have perished from exhaustion, sickness, or gassing. Claimant [REDACTED 2] also submitted several documents, dated in 1965 in Frankfurt am Main and Wiesbaden, Germany, related to compensation from the German authorities for Siegmund May's lost income and restitution of the Nazi-imposed "atonement tax" (*Judenvermögensabgabe*). These documents indicate that Siegmund May was born in Camberg, Germany, that he formerly resided in Frankfurt am Main, and that he perished in the Holocaust. Further, these German compensation documents indicate that Siegmund May's heirs are the children of Siegmund May's late sister, [REDACTED]: [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], née [REDACTED]; and the wife and children of Siegmund May's late brother, [REDACTED]: [REDACTED], née [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED 7], and Claimant [REDACTED 2]. Additionally, Claimant [REDACTED 2] submitted correspondence with the Swiss Bankers Association ("SBA") related to his 1997 claim for Siegmund May's accounts, including a letter from the SBA, dated 25 July 1997 in Zurich, indicating that the SBA

had not located any dormant Swiss bank accounts belonging to Siegmund May. Finally, Claimant [REDACTED 2] submitted his own birth certificate, indicating that he was born on 29 June 1919 in Camberg and that his father was [REDACTED].

In addition to his SBA 1997 claim, Claimant [REDACTED 2] previously submitted an IQ with the Court in 1999, asserting that he and the parties he represents are entitled to a Swiss bank account owned by his uncle, Siegmund May. Furthermore, represented party [REDACTED 10], née [REDACTED], submitted an IQ with the Court in 1999 in which she stated that Siegmund May may have deposited money in Switzerland on behalf of her father-in-law, [REDACTED].⁵

Claimant [REDACTED 2] indicated that his brother, [REDACTED], passed away on 23 June 1980. Claimant [REDACTED 2] further indicated that [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], who are the children of Siegmund May's sister, [REDACTED], passed away on 31 January 1993 and 19 January 2000, respectively. In these proceedings Claimant [REDACTED 2] represents the following parties:

- [REDACTED]'s wife, [REDACTED 3], née [REDACTED], who was born on 3 June 1923 in Frankfurt am Main; and their children: [REDACTED 4], who was born on 9 December 1946 in Galveston, Texas, the United States; [REDACTED 5], née [REDACTED], who was born on 27 July 1949 in Galveston; and [REDACTED 6], who was born on 25 December 1951 in Galveston.
- Claimant [REDACTED 2]'s brother, [REDACTED 7], who was born on 17 February 1926 in Camberg.
- [REDACTED]'s husband, [REDACTED 8], who was born on 19 June 1911 in Salonika, Greece; and their daughter, [REDACTED 9], who was born on 28 March 1946 in Paris, France.
- [REDACTED]'s wife, [REDACTED 10], née [REDACTED], who was born on 20 February 1923 in Hamburg, Germany; and their children: [REDACTED 11], who was born on 20 May 1949 in Buenos Aires, Argentina; [REDACTED 12], née [REDACTED], who was born on 29 October 1946 in Buenos Aires; and [REDACTED 13], who was born on 1 June 1952 in Buenos Aires.

Information Available in the Bank's Records

The Bank's records consist of two customer cards and a list of custody account owners. The name Siegmund (or Sigmund) May and the city Frankfurt am Main appear on both customer cards. The auditors who carried out the investigation of this bank to identify accounts of Victims

⁵ See note 3, *supra*.

of Nazi Persecution pursuant to instructions of the Independent Committee of Eminent Persons (“ICEP” or the “ICEP Investigation”) did not indicate whether both of these cards refer to the same person.

However, one customer card indicates that “Siegmond” May owned custody account number L6439, which was closed on 20 October 1931, while the other customer card indicates that “Sigmund” May owned custody account number L6439, but that it was closed on 18 March 1937. Further, the list of bank customers indicates that “Siegmond” May owned custody account 6439 as of at least 1935.⁶

The Bank’s records indicate that the Account Owner held four demand deposit accounts, one of which was denominated in United States Dollars (“US\$”), as well as custody account L6439, and that the Bank was instructed not to correspond with the Account Owner. Additionally, these records indicate that one of the demand deposit accounts was closed on 12 January 1933, two of the demand deposit accounts, including the account denominated in US\$, were closed on 1 June 1933, and the fourth demand deposit account was closed on 14 July 1933. As discussed earlier, the Bank’s records also indicate that custody account L6439 was closed on 20 October 1931, that it was subsequently reopened under the same number, and that it was closed again on 18 March 1937. The amounts in the accounts on their dates of closure are unknown. There is no evidence in the Bank’s records that the Account Owner or his heirs closed the accounts and received the proceeds themselves.

The CRT’s Analysis

Joinder of Claims

According to Article 37(1) of the Rules Governing the Claims Resolution Process, as amended (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 two claims of the Claimants in one proceeding.

Identification of the Account Owner

The Claimants have plausibly identified the Account Owner

Claimant [REDACTED 1]’s uncle’s name matches the published name of the Account Owner. Claimant [REDACTED 1] identified her uncle’s city of residence, which matches unpublished information about the Account Owner contained in the Bank’s records. The CRT notes that

⁶ Considering that the account owner name and custody account number are same on the customer cards and the customer list, aside from the variation in the spelling of the first name on one of the cards, and that the same city of residence appears on both customer cards, the CRT determines that the customer cards and the customer list refer to the same person.

Claimant [REDACTED 1] filed an IQ with the Court in 1999 asserting her entitlement to a Swiss bank account owned by her uncle, prior to the publication in February 2001 of the list of accounts determined by ICEP to be probably or possibly those of Victims of Nazi Persecution (the "ICEP List"). This indicates that Claimant [REDACTED 1] has based her present claim not simply on the fact that an individual identified on the ICEP List as owning a Swiss bank account bears the same name as her relative, but rather on a direct family relationship that was known to her before the publication of the ICEP List. It also indicates that Claimant [REDACTED 1] had reason to believe that her relative owned a Swiss bank account prior to the publication of the ICEP List. This supports the credibility of the information provided by Claimant [REDACTED 1].

Claimant [REDACTED 2]'s uncle's name matches the published name of the Account Owner. Claimant [REDACTED 2] identified his uncle's city of residence, which matches unpublished information about the Account Owner contained in the Bank's records. In support of his claim, Claimant [REDACTED 2] submitted a declaration from the Red Cross and documents related to compensation from the German authorities, providing independent verification that the person who is claimed to be the Account Owner had the same name, and in the case of the German compensation documents, resided in the same city recorded in the Bank's records as the name and residence of the Account Owner. The CRT notes that Claimant [REDACTED 2] filed a claim with the SBA in 1997 and that he and represented party [REDACTED 10] submitted IQs with the Court in 1999 asserting that Siegmund May owned a Swiss bank account, prior to the publication in February 2001 of the ICEP List. This indicates that Claimant [REDACTED 2] and the parties he represents have based their present claim not simply on the fact that an individual identified on the ICEP List as owning a Swiss bank account bears the same name as their relative, but rather on a direct family relationship that was known to them before the publication of the ICEP List. It also indicates that Claimant [REDACTED 2] and the parties he represents had reason to believe that their relative owned a Swiss bank account prior to the publication of the ICEP List. This supports the credibility of the information provided by Claimant [REDACTED 2] and the parties he represents.

Additionally, the CRT notes that a database containing the names of victims of Nazi persecution includes two people named Siegmund (Sigmund) May who resided in Amsterdam, one of them on Nieuwe Hoogstraat and the other on Michelangelostraat, which matches the information about the Account Owner provided by the Claimants. Furthermore, the victim database includes a person named Sigmund May who was born in 1886 in Gerolzhofen and resided in Frankfurt am Main, which matches the information about the Account Owner provided by Claimant [REDACTED 1]. The database is a compilation of names from various sources, including the Yad Vashem Memorial of Israel.

The CRT notes that Claimant [REDACTED 1]'s relative and Claimant [REDACTED 2]'s relative are not the same person. However, given that the Claimants have identified all published and unpublished information about the Account Owner that is available in the Bank's records; that the information provided by each claimant supports and in no way contradicts any

information available in the Bank's records; that there is no additional information in the Bank's records which would provide a basis for the CRT to make any further determinations as to the identity of the Account Owner; and that the other claim to this account was disconfirmed because that claimant provided a different city of residence than the city of residence of the Account Owner and a date of death for that claimant's relative that is earlier than the opening date of one of the Account Owner's accounts, the CRT finds that Claimant [REDACTED 1] and Claimant [REDACTED 2] have each plausibly identified the Account Owner.

Status of the Account Owner as a Victim of Nazi Persecution

The Claimants have made a plausible showing that the Account Owner was a Victim of Nazi Persecution. Claimant [REDACTED 1] stated that her uncle, who was Jewish, fled from Germany to Amsterdam in 1933 and that he was probably deported to a concentration camp. Claimant [REDACTED 2] indicated that his uncle, who was Jewish, fled from Germany to Amsterdam in the late 1930s, that he was imprisoned in Westerbork, and provided a document from the Red Cross indicating that he perished in Auschwitz. Claimant [REDACTED 2] and represented party [REDACTED 12] further indicated that Siegmund May's sister, [REDACTED], died in Auschwitz, and that Siegmund May's brother-in-law, [REDACTED], died at the Bergen-Belsen concentration camp. As noted above persons named Siegmund (Sigmund) May were included in the CRT's database of victims.

The Claimants' Relationship to the Account Owner

Claimant [REDACTED 1] has plausibly demonstrated that she is related to the Account Owner by submitting specific information demonstrating that the Account Owner was her maternal uncle. The CRT notes that Claimant [REDACTED 1] identified unpublished information about the Account Owner contained in the Bank's records. Additionally, Claimant [REDACTED 1] submitted her own birth certificate, showing that her maternal relatives had the same surname as the Account Owner and that they resided near Frankfurt am Main, which is listed in the Bank's record as the Account Owner's residence. There is no information to indicate that the Account Owner has other surviving heirs.

Claimant [REDACTED 2] has plausibly demonstrated that he and the parties he represents are related to the Account Owner by submitting specific information and documents indicating that the Account Owner was their uncle or great-uncle. Claimant [REDACTED 2] submitted documents related to German compensation claims, naming the Account Owner's heirs; and Claimant [REDACTED 2]'s own birth certificate showing that his paternal relatives had the same surname as the Account Owner and that they resided near Frankfurt am Main, which is listed in the Bank's record as the Account Owner's residence.

There is no information to indicate that the Account Owner has other surviving heirs.

The Issue of Who Received the Proceeds

The Bank's records indicate that one of the Account Owner's demand deposit accounts was closed on 12 January 1933, that the Account Owner's remaining three demand deposit accounts were closed in June and July 1933, and that the Account Owner's custody account was closed in March 1937.

As for the three demand deposit accounts that were closed in June and July 1933, given that soon after Hitler became chancellor of Germany on 30 January 1933, the Nazi regime embarked on a campaign to seize the domestic and foreign assets of the Jewish population through the enforcement of discriminatory tax and other confiscatory measures, including confiscation of assets held in Swiss banks; that there is no evidence that the Account Owner fled Germany prior to 1933; that the Account Owner would not have been able to repatriate these three accounts to Germany without losing ultimate control over their proceeds; that there is no record of the payment of these three accounts to the Account Owner; that the Account Owner's heirs would not have been able to obtain information about his accounts after the Second World War from the Bank due to the Swiss banks' practice of withholding or misstating account information in their responses to inquiries by account owners and their heirs because of the banks' concern regarding double liability; and given the application of Presumptions (a), (h) and (j), as provided in Article 28 of the Rules (see Appendix A) and Appendix C,⁷ the CRT concludes that it is plausible that the proceeds of these three demand deposit accounts were not paid to the Account Owner or his 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.

With regard to the remaining demand deposit account, however, given that it was closed before 30 January 1933, the CRT concludes that the Account Owner had free access to this account on the date of its closure. Therefore, the CRT determines that the Account Owner closed this account himself and received the proceeds.

As for the custody account, it was closed in March 1937, at which time, according to information provided by both Claimants, the Account Owner may have been in the Netherlands, which was then outside Nazi-dominated territory. However, given that the Bank's records do not indicate to whom the custody account was closed; that the Account Owner fled his country of origin due to Nazi persecution and may have had relatives remaining in his country of origin, and that he may therefore have yielded to Nazi pressure to turn over his accounts to ensure their safety; that the Account Owner's heirs would not have been able to obtain information about his accounts after the Second World War from the Bank, even for the stated purpose of obtaining indemnification from the German authorities, due to the Swiss banks' practice of withholding or misstating account information in their responses to inquiries by account owners and their heirs because of

⁷ Appendix C appears on the CRT II website -- www.crt-ii.org.

the banks' fears regarding double liability; and given the application of Presumptions (h) and (j), as provided in Article 28 of the Rules (see Appendix A), the CRT concludes that it is plausible that the proceeds of the custody account were not paid to the Account Owner or his heirs.

Basis for the Award

The CRT has determined that an Award may be made in favor of the Claimants. First, the claims are admissible in accordance with the criteria contained in Article 18 of the Rules. Second, Claimant [REDACTED 1] has plausibly demonstrated that the Account Owner was her maternal uncle and Claimant [REDACTED 2] has plausibly demonstrated that the Account Owner was his paternal uncle, and those relationships justify an Award. Third, the CRT has determined that it is plausible that neither the Account Owner nor his heirs received the proceeds of the Account Owner's custody account and three of his demand deposit accounts.

Further, the CRT notes that the Account Owner's nephews: Claimant [REDACTED 2] and [REDACTED 7]; and the Account Owner's great-nephews and great-nieces: [REDACTED 4], [REDACTED 5], [REDACTED 6], [REDACTED 7], [REDACTED 9], [REDACTED 11], [REDACTED 12], and [REDACTED 13], have a better entitlement to the Account Owner's accounts than [REDACTED 8], [REDACTED 10], and [REDACTED 3], who are related by marriage rather than blood to the Account Owner.

Amount of the Award

This Award is for three demand deposit accounts and one custody account. Pursuant to Article 29 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 current value of the account being awarded. Based on the investigation carried out pursuant to the instructions of the ICEP, in 1945 the average value of a demand deposit account was 2,140.00 Swiss Francs ("SF") and the average value of a custody account was SF 13,000.00. Thus, the total average 1945 value of these four accounts is SF 19,420.00. The current value of this amount is calculated by multiplying it by a factor of 12.5, in accordance with Article 31(1) of the Rules, to produce a total award amount of SF 242,750.00.

Division of the Award

According to Article 26 of the Rules, in cases such as this where the identity of the Account Owner cannot be precisely determined due to the limited information contained in the Bank's records, and where several unrelated claimants have established a plausible relationship to a person with the same name as the Account Owner, the Award may provide for a pro rata share of the full amount in the account to each claimant or group of claimants who would otherwise be entitled under the Rules. In this case, each Claimant has established a plausible relationship to a person with the same name as the Account Owner who resided in the same city as the Account Owner.

Accordingly, Claimant [REDACTED 1] is entitled to one half of the total Award amount and Claimant [REDACTED 2] and the parties he represents are entitled to share in one half of the total Award amount. Claimant [REDACTED 2] represents [REDACTED 3], [REDACTED 4], [REDACTED 5], [REDACTED 6], [REDACTED 7], [REDACTED 8], [REDACTED 9], [REDACTED 10], [REDACTED 11], [REDACTED 12], and [REDACTED 13].

According to Article 23(1)(d) of the Rules, if neither the Account Owner's spouse nor any descendants of the Account Owner have submitted a claim, the award shall be in favor of any descendants of the Account Owner's parents who have submitted a claim, in equal shares by representation. Accordingly, as the children of the Account Owner's brother ([REDACTED]), Claimant [REDACTED 2] and [REDACTED 7] are each entitled to one-twelfth of the total Award amount. Further, as the children of [REDACTED]'s other child ([REDACTED]), [REDACTED 4], [REDACTED 5], and [REDACTED 6] are each entitled to one-thirty-sixth of the total award amount. As discussed earlier, [REDACTED]'s wife, [REDACTED 3], is not entitled since she is not a blood relative of the Account Owner.

Additionally, as the grand-daughter of the Account Owner's sister ([REDACTED]) and the only child of the latter's daughter ([REDACTED]), [REDACTED 9] is entitled to one-eighth of the total Award amount. As discussed earlier, [REDACTED]'s husband, [REDACTED 8], is not entitled since he is not a blood relative of the Account Owner.

Finally, as the children of [REDACTED]'s other child ([REDACTED]), [REDACTED 11], [REDACTED 12], and [REDACTED 13] are each entitled to one-twenty-fourth of the total Award amount. As discussed earlier, [REDACTED]'s wife, [REDACTED 10], is not entitled to share in the Award, since she is not a blood relative of the Account Owner.

Scope of the Award

The Claimants should be aware that, pursuant to Article 20 of the Rules, the CRT will carry out further research on their claims to determine whether there are additional Swiss bank accounts to which they 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
18 November 2004