

CLAIMS RESOLUTION TRIBUNAL

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

Certified Award

to Claimant [REDACTED]

in re Account of Dr. Oskar Bürger

Claim Number: 212064/MD; 300017/MD

Award Amount: 156,000.00 Swiss Francs

This Certified Award is based upon the claim of [REDACTED], née [REDACTED] (the “Claimant”) to the account of Oskar Bürger (the “Account Owner”) at the [REDACTED] (the “Bank”).

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 Claimant

The Claimant submitted two Claim Forms identifying the Account Owner as her father, Dr. Oskar Bürger, who was born on 22 February 1873 in Vienna, Austria, and was married to Frieda (Fritzi) [REDACTED] in 1913 in Vienna. The Claimant stated that Oskar and Frieda Bürger had two children: [REDACTED], who was born in 1915 in Vienna, and [REDACTED] (the Claimant), who was born in 1921 in Vienna. According to the information provided by the Claimant, her father was a gynecologist in Vienna VIII where he lived at Alserstrasse 21. The Claimant also stated that her father went to Switzerland for vacation.

The Claimant stated that her father, who was Jewish, was not allowed to practice medicine after the annexation of Austria by Nazi Germany in March 1938, and that he fled with his family to England in March 1939. The Claimant stated that Oskar Bürger died in London, England, in 1954, that Frieda Bürger died in London in 1976, and that [REDACTED], née [REDACTED], died in London in 1939. In support of her claim, the Claimant submitted documents, including her birth and baptism certificate, her mother’s death certificate, a copy of her own old passport, and copies of her school report cards.

In the telephone conversation with the CRT, the Claimant stated that his father had a close friend in Vienna named Felix Kornfeld who was a dentist and with whom the Claimant’s father later shared a house in England. The Claimant stated that she is not related to Felix Kornfeld by blood.

Information Available in the Bank Records

The bank records consist of printouts from the Bank's database of closed accounts. According to these records, the Account Owner was Dr. Oskar Bürger and the Power of Attorney Holders were Fritz (Frieda Bürger) and Felix Kornfeld. The bank records indicate that the Account Owner lived in Vienna at Alserstrasse 21, and that the Power of Attorney Holders also lived in Vienna. According to the bank records, the Account Owner held a custody account, numbered 41603, which was closed on 13 August 1938. The amount in the account on the date of its closure is unknown. There is no evidence in the bank records that the Account Owner, the Power of Attorney Holders, or their heirs closed the account and received the proceeds themselves.

Information Available from the Austrian State Archives

By decree on 26 April 1938, the Nazi Regime required Jews residing within Austria who held assets above a specified level to submit a census form registering their assets. In the records of the Austrian State Archives (Archive of the Republic, Finance), there are documents concerning the assets of Dr. Oskar Bürger and Frieda (Fritzi) Bürger, née [REDACTED], numbered 8194 and 2990, respectively. These records indicate that Oskar Bürger, a gynecologist (*Frauenarzt*), was born on 20 February 1873 and was married to Frieda Bürger, née [REDACTED], who was born on 15 January 1887. These records also show that Dr. Oskar Bürger and Frieda Bürger owned assets valued at 147,537.00 Reichsmarks and were forced to pay flight tax (Reichsfluchtsteuer) of 36,884.00 Reichsmarks (1938 value). According to these records, Dr. Oskar and Frieda Bürger lived at Alserstrasse 21 in Vienna VIII and owned real estate at Kalvarienberggasse 46 in Vienna XVII valued at 66,502.00 Reichsmarks (1938 value). While Dr. Oskar Bürger indicated in his form ownership of several securities denominated in Swiss Francs, there is no mention in these records of an account held at a Swiss bank.

The CRT's Analysis

Identification of the Account Owner

The Claimant has plausibly identified the Account Owner. Her parents' names and domicile match the published names and domicile of the Account Owner and one of the Power of Attorney Holders. Additionally, the Claimant identified the other Power of Attorney Holder as a close friend of her father. The Claimant identified her father's precise street address and title, which match unpublished information about the Account Owner contained in the bank records and in the Austrian State Archives.

Status of the Account Owner as a Victim of Nazi Persecution

The Claimant has made a plausible showing that the Account Owner was a Victim of Nazi Persecution. The Claimant stated that the Account Owner, who was Jewish, was forced to flee Austria in March 1939.

The Claimant's Relationship to the Account Owner

The Claimant has plausibly demonstrated that she is related to the Account Owner by submitting documents, including her birth certificate, demonstrating that she is the Account Owner's daughter.

The Issue of Who Received the Proceeds

Given the existence of Nazi confiscatory legislation in Austria at that time¹ and the application of Presumptions (a) and (j) contained in Appendix A, the CRT concludes that it is plausible that the account proceeds were not paid to the Account Owner, the Power of Attorney Holders, or their heirs. Based on its precedent and the Rules Governing the Claims Resolution Process (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 23 of the Rules. Second, the Claimant has plausibly demonstrated that the Account Owner was her father, and that relationship justifies an Award. Finally, the CRT has determined that it is plausible that neither the Account Owner, nor the Power of Attorney Holders, nor their heirs received the proceeds of the claimed account.

Amount of the Award

Pursuant to Article 35 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 present value of the account being awarded. Based on the investigation conducted pursuant to the instructions of the Independent Committee of Eminent Persons ("ICEP" or the "ICEP Investigation"), in 1945 the average value of a custody account was 13,000.00 Swiss Francs. The present value of this amount is calculated by multiplying it by a factor of 12, in accordance with Article 37(1) of the Rules, to produce a total award amount of 156,000.00 Swiss Francs.

Initial Payment

In this case, the Claimant is age 75 or older and is therefore entitled to receive 100% of the total award amount.

Scope of the Award

The Claimant should be aware that, pursuant to Article 25 of the Rules, the CRT will carry out further research on her claim to determine whether there are additional Swiss bank accounts to

¹ An expanded version of Appendix A appears on the CRT II website -- www.crt-ii.org.

which she 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

December 27, 2002

APPENDIX A

In the absence of evidence to the contrary, the Tribunal presumes that neither the Account Owners, the Beneficial Owners, nor their heirs received the proceeds of a claimed Account in cases involving one or more of the following circumstances:¹

- a) the Account was closed and the Account records show evidence of persecution, or the Account was closed (i) after the imposition of Swiss visa requirements on January 20, 1939, or (ii) after the date of occupation of the country of residence of the Account Owner or Beneficial Owner, and before 1945 or the year in which the freeze of Accounts from the country of residence of the Account Owner or Beneficial Owner was lifted (whichever is later);
- b) the Account was closed after 1955 or ten years after the freeze of Accounts from the country of residence of the Account Owner or Beneficial Owner was lifted (whichever is later);
- c) the balance of the Account was reduced by fees and charges over the period leading up to the closure of the Account and the last known balance of the Account was small;
- d) the Account had been declared in a Nazi census of Jewish assets or other Nazi documentation;
- e) a claim was made to the Account after the Second World War and was not recognized by the bank;
- f) the Account Owner or Beneficial Owner had other Accounts that are open and dormant, suspended, or closed to profits, closed by fees, or closed to Nazi authorities;
- g) the only surviving Account Owner or Beneficial Owner was a child at the time of the Second World War;
- h) the Account Owners, the Beneficial Owners, and/or their heirs would not have been able to obtain information about the Account after the Second World War from the Swiss bank due to the Swiss banks' practice of withholding or misstating account information in their responses to inquiries by Account Owners, Beneficial Owners, and heirs because of the banks' concerns regarding double liability;²
- i) the Account Owners, Beneficial Owners, or their heirs resided in a Communist country in Eastern Europe after the War; and/or
- j) there is no indication in the bank records that the Account Owners, Beneficial Owners, or their heirs received the proceeds of the Account.³

¹ See Independent Commission of Experts Switzerland - Second World War, Switzerland, National Socialism and the Second World War: Final Report (2002) (hereinafter "Bergier Final Report"); *see also* Independent Committee

of Eminent Persons, Report on Dormant Accounts of Victims of Nazi Persecution in Swiss Banks (1999) (hereinafter "ICEP Report"). The CRT has also taken into account, among other things, various laws, acts, decrees, and practices used by the Nazi regime and the governments of Austria, the Sudetenland, the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia, the Free City of Danzig, Poland, the Incorporated Area of Poland, the *Generalgouvernement* of Poland, the Netherlands, Slovakia and France to confiscate Jewish assets held abroad.

² See Bergier Final Report at 443-44, 446-49; *see also* ICEP Report at 81-83.

³ As described in the Bergier Final Report and the ICEP Report, the Swiss banks destroyed or failed to maintain account transactional records relating to Holocaust-era accounts. There is evidence that this destruction continued after 1996, when Swiss law prohibited destruction of bank records. Bergier Final Report at 40 (stating "[i]n the case of Union Bank of Switzerland . . . , however, documents were being disposed of even after the Federal Decree [of 13 December 1996]"). The wholesale destruction of relevant bank records occurred at a time when the Swiss banks knew that claims were being made against them and would continue to be made for monies deposited by victims of Nazi persecution who died in the Holocaust and that were (i) improperly paid to the Nazis, *see Albers v. Credit Suisse*, 188 Misc. 229, 67 N.Y.S.2d 239 (N.Y. City Ct. 1946); Bergier Final Report at 443, (ii) that were improperly paid to the Communist controlled governments of Poland and Hungary, *see* Bergier Final Report at 450 -51, and possibly Romania as well, *see* Peter Hug and Marc Perrenoud, Assets in Switzerland of Victims of Nazism and the Compensation Agreements with East Bloc Countries (1997), and (iii) that were retained by Swiss Banks for their own use and profit. *See* Bergier Final Report at 446-49.

"The discussion on "unclaimed cash" persisted throughout the post-war period due to claims for restitution by survivors and heirs of the murdered victims, or restitution organizations acting on their behalf." *Id.* at 444. Nevertheless, the Swiss Banks continued to destroy records on a massive scale and to obstruct those making claims. ICEP Report, Annex 4 ¶ 5; In re Holocaust Victim Asset Litig., 105 F. Supp.2d 139, 155-56 (E.D.N.Y. 2000). Indeed, "[i]n May 1954, the legal representatives of the big banks co-ordinated their response to heirs [of account holders] so that the banks would have at their disposal a concerted mechanism for deflecting any kind of enquiry." Bergier Final Report at 446. Similarly, "the banks and their Association lobbied against legislation that would have required publication of the names of so called 'heirless assets accounts,' legislation that if enacted and implemented, would have obviated the ICEP investigation and the controversy of the last 30 years." ICEP Report at 15. Indeed, in order to thwart such legislation, the Swiss Bankers Association encouraged Swiss banks to underreport the number of accounts in a 1956 survey. "A meager result from the survey," it said, "will doubtless contribute to the resolution of this matter [the proposed legislation] in our favor." ICEP Report at 90 (quoting a letter from the Swiss Bankers Association to its board members dated June 7, 1956). "To summarize, it is apparent that the claims of surviving Holocaust victims were usually rejected under the pretext of bank secrecy . . . ", Bergier Final Report at 455, or outright deception about the existence of information, while wholesale destruction of bank records continued for over a half century. Under these circumstances, utilizing the fundamental evidentiary principles of United States law that would have applied to Deposited Assets claims had the class action lawsuits been litigated through trial, the CRT draws an adverse inference against the banks where documentary evidence was destroyed or is not provided to assist the claims administrators. *See In re Holocaust Victim Asset Litig.*, 105 F. Supp.2d 139, 152 (E.D.N.Y. 2000); Reilly v. Natwest Markets Group, Inc., 181 F.3d 253, 266-68 (2d Cir. 1999); Kronisch v. United States, 150 F.3d 112, 126-28 (2d Cir. 1998).