

# CLAIMS RESOLUTION TRIBUNAL

---

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

## **Certified Award**

to Claimant Walter Bloch  
also acting on behalf of Charles Bloch, Cathryn Huiman and Michael Velleman

## **in re Accounts of Richard Bloch**

Claim Number: 223156/AH

Award Amount: 53,500.00 Swiss Francs

This Certified Award is based upon the claim of Walter Bloch (the “Claimant”) to the accounts of Richard Bloch (the “Account Owner”) at the [REDACTED] (the “Bank”). On 1 July 2002, the Court approved the Award of one of the Account Owner’s three demand deposit accounts at the Bank.<sup>1</sup> The CRT did not reach a decision regarding the other two accounts, pending further consideration as to whether or not the Account Owner or his heirs received the proceeds of those accounts. This Award is the result of further consideration on whether the Account Owner received the proceeds of those two accounts.

All awards 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 identifying the Account Owner as his father, Richard Bloch, who was born on 24 April 1890 in Hartmanice, Czechoslovakia, was married to Katerina (Kate) Bloch, née Raubitschek, on 30 June 1921 in Susice, Czechoslovakia, and had two children, Anne Velleman, née Bloch, and the Claimant. The Claimant stated that his father resided and worked from 1925 to 1936 as a company director in Hamburg, Germany. The Claimant further stated that his father, who was Jewish, fled Germany for Nabrezi, Czechoslovakia in 1936 due to increasingly severe persecution of Jews. The Claimant stated that his father was the Managing Director of *I. S. Bloch Co.* in Prague until 1939. According to the Claimant, the *Gestapo* branded his father a traitor because he moved property from the Sudetenland to inner Bohemia (then still part of Czechoslovakia). The Claimant stated that, in March 1939, his father was forced to flee Prague for London, the United Kingdom. The Claimant indicated that his father died on 5 November 1980 in London, that his mother died on 4 August 1998 in Leatherhead, the United Kingdom, and that his sister died on 18 February 1998 in Amsterdam, the Netherlands. In support of his claim, the Claimant submitted documents

---

<sup>1</sup> See [In re Accounts of Richard Bloch](#) (approved on 1 July 2002), hereinafter the “July 2002 Award.”

including a family tree, a copy of his birth certificate, and the birth and death certificates of Richard and Kate Bloch and Anne Velleman, which indicate Richard Bloch's name, his residence in Hamburg, and his occupation as company director. The Claimant also submitted Kate Bloch's will, which names the Claimant as her heir, and a probate decision regarding her estate. The Claimant indicated that he was born on 23 January 1927 in Hamburg, Germany. The Claimant is representing his son, Charles Bloch, who was born on 5 March 1955 in London, and Cathryn Huiman and Michael Velleman, who are the children of his late sister, Anne Velleman, née Bloch.

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

The Bank's record consists of an opening card. According to this record, the Account Owner was Richard Bloch of Hamburg, Germany. The Bank's record indicates that the Account Owner held two demand deposit accounts. The first demand deposit account, which contained foreign currency, was opened on 1 April 1933 and was closed on 18 November 1933. The second demand deposit account was closed on 27 January 1934. The accounts were all closed unknown by whom. The amount in each account on the date of its closure is unknown.

### **The CRT's Analysis**

#### Identification of the Account Owner

In the July 2002 Award, it was determined that the Claimant had plausibly identified the Account Owner. His father's name matches the published name of the Account Owner. The Claimant identified his father's city of residence as Hamburg, Germany, which matches unpublished information about the Account Owner contained in the Bank's record. In support of his claim, the Claimant submitted documents including the Account Owner's birth and death certificates. The CRT notes that there are no other claims to these accounts.

#### Status of the Account Owner as a Victim of Nazi Persecution

In the July 2002 Award, it was determined that the Claimant had made a plausible showing that the Account Owner was a Victim of Nazi Persecution. The Claimant stated that the Account Owner was Jewish, and fled both Germany and Czechoslovakia to avoid persecution by the Nazis.

#### The Claimant's Relationship to the Account Owner

In the July 2002 Award, it was determined that the Claimant had plausibly demonstrated that he and the individuals he is representing are related to the Account Owner by submitting documents, including a family tree, demonstrating that he is the Account Owner's son, and the represented individuals are the Account Owner's grandchildren. There is no information to indicate that the Account Owner has other surviving heirs.

## The Issue of Who Received the Proceeds

In evaluating whether the Account Owner or his heirs received the proceeds of the two demand deposit accounts, the CRT took into account the facts of the closing of the Account Owner's demand deposit accounts in 1933 and 1934, and considered that: the Nazis embarked on a campaign in 1933 to seize the domestic and foreign assets of Jewish nationals in Germany through the enforcement of flight taxes and other confiscatory measures including confiscation of assets held in Swiss banks; the Account Owner's two demand deposits were closed in 1933 and 1934, the Account Owner remained in Germany until 1936, and would not have been able to repatriate his accounts to Germany without their confiscation at the time they were closed; the Account Owner and his heirs would not have been able to obtain information about his account 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 because of the Banks' concern regarding double liability; and there is no record of the payment of the Account Owner's account to him. Based on these factors, indicating a practical inability to receive the proceeds of his demand deposit account during the period in which the Account Owner lived in Germany, and given the application of relevant Presumptions (a), (h) and (j),<sup>2</sup> which establish a presumption of such a result in this context, the CRT concludes that it is plausible that the account proceeds 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.

## Basis for the Award

The CRT has determined that an Award may be made in favor of the Claimant. First, the claim is admissible in accordance with the criteria contained in Article 18 of the Rules. Second, the Claimant has plausibly demonstrated that the Account Owner was his father, and that relationship justifies an Award. Finally, the CRT has determined that it is plausible that neither the Account Owner nor his heirs received the proceeds of the accounts closed in 1933 and 1934.

## Amount of the Award

In this case, the Account Owner held two demand deposit accounts closed on 18 November 1933 and 27 January 1934. 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 Independent Committee of Eminent Persons ("ICEP" or the "ICEP Investigation"), in 1945 the average value of a demand deposit account was 2,140.00 Swiss Francs. 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 for the two demand deposit accounts of 53,500.00 Swiss Francs.

---

<sup>2</sup> These presumptions are provided for in Article 28 of the Rules Governing the Claims Resolution Process, as amended (the "Rules"), as set forth in the attached Appendix A and in Appendix C to the Rules. Appendix C appears on the CRT II website -- [www.crt-ii.org](http://www.crt-ii.org).

### Division of the Award

According to Article 23(1)(c) of the Rules, if the Account Owner's spouse has not submitted a claim, the award shall be in favor of any descendants of the Account Owner, who have submitted a claim, in equal shares by representation. In this case, the Claimant is representing his son, Charles Bloch, and Cathryn Huiman and Michael Velleman, who are the children of his late sister, Anne Velleman, née Bloch. Accordingly, the Claimant, who is the son of the Account Owner, is entitled to one-half of the total award amount; his niece and nephew, Cathryn Huiman and Michael Velleman, are entitled to the remaining one-half of the total award amount, to be divided between them in equal shares. Charles Bloch is not entitled to any share of the award.

### **Scope of the Award**

The Claimant should be aware that, pursuant to Article 20 of the Rules, the CRT will carry out further research on his claim to determine whether there are additional Swiss bank accounts to which he 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  
September 30, 2003