

CLAIMS RESOLUTION TRIBUNAL

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

Certified Award

to Claimant Henry David

in re Account of Leo Davidsohn

Claim Number: 213595/EZ

Award Amount: 240,360.00 Swiss Francs

This Certified Award is based upon the claim of Henry David (the “Claimant”) to the account of Leo Davidsohn (the “Account Owner”) at the Zurich branch of the [REDACTED] (the “Bank”).

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 and an Initial Questionnaire identifying the Account Owner as his mother’s uncle, Leo Davidsohn, who was born on 20 December 1866, and was married to Lucy Davidsohn, née Bauchwitz, the Claimant’s grandmother’s sister. The Claimant stated that his relative, who was Jewish, was a retired widower who lived at Kurfürstendamm 185 in Berlin, Germany. The Claimant submitted a translation of his family history, in which the Claimant’s father noted that Leo Davidsohn generously supported the family during the 1930s. The Claimant stated that Leo Davidsohn was transported on 14 July 1942 from Berlin to Theresienstadt concentration camp, where he was murdered on 12 August 1942. The Claimant further stated that Lucy and Leo Davidsohn had no children. The Claimant stated that his mother, Ilse David, née Gerson, had a close relationship with Leo Davidsohn, and that she lived with him for several years before her marriage to the Claimant’s father, Ferdinand David.

Information Available in the Bank Records

The bank records consist of printouts from the Bank’s database. According to these records, the sole Account Owner was Leo Davidsohn who lived at Wielandstrasse 23, Berlin, Germany, and held an account of an unknown type. These records indicate that the account was still open on 31 January 1946, and had a balance of 20,000.00 Swiss Francs. The bank records do not show if or when the account at issue was closed, or to whom it was paid. The auditors who carried out the investigation of this bank to identify accounts of Victims of Nazi Persecution pursuant to

instructions of the Independent Committee of Eminent Persons (“ICEP”) did not find this account in the Bank’s system of open accounts, and they therefore presumed that it was closed. There is no evidence in the bank records that the Account Owner or his heirs closed the account and received the proceeds themselves.

The CRT’s Analysis

Identification of the Account Owner

The Claimant has plausibly identified the Account Owner. His relative’s name matches the published name of the Account Owner. While the Claimant identified Leo Davidsohn’s street address as Kurfürstendamm 185, Berlin, Germany, the bank records indicate that the Account Owner lived at Wielandstrasse 23 in Berlin. Research conducted by the CRT indicates that Kurfürstendamm intersects Wielandstrasse at Wielandstrasse 23 and Kurfürstendamm 185. The CRT therefore concludes that the information about the Account Owner’s place of residence provided by the Claimant matches the unpublished information about the place of residence contained in the bank records.

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 was Jewish and was murdered in the Theresienstadt concentration camp.

Moreover, the CRT notes that a database containing the names of victims of Nazi persecution includes a person named Leo Davidsohn, and indicates that he was born in December 1866 and perished in Theresienstadt concentration camp, which matches the information about the Account Owner provided by the Claimant. The database is a compilation of names from various sources, including the Yad Vashem Memorial of Israel.

The Claimant’s Relationship to the Account Owner

The Claimant has plausibly demonstrated that he is related to the Account Owner by submitting the family tree and family history written by the Claimant’s father, demonstrating that the Account Owner was the Claimant’s mother’s uncle. There is no information to indicate that the Account Owner has other surviving heirs.

The Issue of Who Received the Proceeds

Based on its precedent and the Rules Governing the Claims Resolution Process (the “Rules”), the CRT applies presumptions to determine whether Account Owners or their heirs received the proceeds of their accounts. These presumptions are contained in Appendix A.¹ The CRT concludes in this case that one or more of these presumptions applies and it is therefore plausible that the account proceeds were not paid to the Account Owner or his heirs.

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

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 his mother's uncle, 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 claimed account.

Amount of the Award

The Bank records indicate that the value of the account as of 31 January 1946 was 20,000.00 Swiss Francs. In accordance with Article 37(1) of Rules, this amount is increased by an adjustment of 30.00 Swiss Francs, which reflects standardized bank fees charged to the account between 1945 and 1946. Consequently, the adjusted balance of the account at issue is 20,030.00 Swiss Francs. The present value of that balance is determined by multiplying the adjusted balance by a factor of 12, in accordance with Article 37(1) of the Rules, to produce a total award amount of 240,360.00 Swiss Francs.

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 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

APPENDIX A

In the absence of evidence to the contrary, the Tribunal presumes that neither the Account 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, and before 1945 or the year in which the freeze of Accounts from the country of residence of the Account 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 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 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 was a child at the time of the Second World War;
- h) the Account 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 and heirs because of the banks' concerns regarding double liability;²
- i) the Account 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 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. "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 does not exist 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).