

CLAIMS RESOLUTION TRIBUNAL

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

Certified Denial

to Claimant Vera Katz

in re Accounts of Fritz Braun

Claim Number: 222637/SB^{1,2}

This Certified Denial is based on the claim of Vera Katz, née Braun, (the “Claimant”) to the account of Fritz (Frigyes) Braun.^{3,4} This Denial is to the published and unpublished accounts of four individuals named Fritz Braun (“Account Owner 1”, “Account Owner 2”, “Account Owner 3” and “Account Owner 4”) at the [REDACTED] (“Bank 1”), at the [REDACTED] (“Bank 2”), and at the [REDACTED] (“Bank 3”).

All denials 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 asserting that her paternal uncle, Fritz Braun, who was born in 1896 in Paks, Hungary, owned a Swiss bank account. The Claimant stated that her uncle, who was Jewish, was a businessman and part owner of a textile business, and that he resided in Budapest, Hungary. According to the Claimant, her uncle did not possess a professional or academic title. The Claimant further stated that her uncle was deported to Auschwitz in 1944 and was never heard from again. The Claimant indicated that she was born on 14 August 1929 in Budapest, Hungary.

¹ The Claimant submitted a claim, numbered B-00078, on 23 September 1997, to the Holocaust Claims Processing Office (“HCPO”) of the New York State Banking Department. This claim was referred by the HCPO to the CRT and has been assigned Claim Number 601045.

² The Claimant submitted additional claims to the account of Andor Braun, which are registered under the Claim Numbers 217145 and 601045. The CRT will treat the claims to this account in a separate determination.

³ The CRT did not locate an account belonging to Frigyes Braun in the Account History Database prepared pursuant to the investigation of the Independent Committee of Eminent Persons (“ICEP” or “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”).

⁴ In this claim, the Claimant also claimed the account of Sigmund Braun. The CRT will treat the claim to this account in a separate determination.

Information Available in the Bank's Records

The CRT notes that the Claimant submitted a claim to an account belonging to her relative, Fritz Braun. 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 four accounts whose owners' names match that 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 1008520

Bank 1's records indicate that Account Owner 1 was Fritz Braun, who resided in Rosenheim, Germany. Bank 1's records also indicate Account Owner 1's street address.

Account 2014845

Bank 2's records indicate that Account Owner 2 was Fritz Braun. Bank 2's records also indicate Account Owner 2's city and country of residence, and year of birth.

Account 4020005

Bank 3's records indicate that Account Owner 3 was Fritz Braun, who resided in Hungary. Bank 3's records also indicate Account Owner 3's title. Furthermore, Bank 3's records indicate the existence of another person who jointly held the account at issue with account Owner 3 and this person's relationship to Account Owner 3.

Account 4020418

Bank 3's records indicate that Account Owner 4 was Fritz Braun, who resided in Vienna, Austria.

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 1008520, the CRT concludes that the Claimant has not identified Account Owner 1 as her relative. Although the name of her uncle matches the published name of Account Owner 1, the information provided by the Claimant differs materially from the published information about Account Owner 1 available in Bank 1's records. Specifically, the Claimant stated that her uncle resided in Budapest, Hungary. In contrast, Bank 1's records show

that Account Owner 1 resided in Rosenheim, Germany. Consequently, the CRT is unable to conclude that Account Owner 1 and the Claimant's uncle are the same person.

As for Account 2014845, the CRT concludes that the Claimant has not identified Account Owner 2 as her relative. Although the name of her 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 her uncle was born in 1896. In contrast, Bank 2's records show that Account Owner 2 was born in a different year. In addition, the Claimant stated that her uncle resided in Budapest, Hungary. 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.

As for Account 4020005, the CRT concludes that the Claimant has not identified Account Owner 3 as her relative. Although the name of her uncle matches the published name of Account Owner 3, the information provided by the Claimant differs from the unpublished information about Account Owner 3 available in Bank 3's records. Specifically, the Claimant stated that her uncle did not possess an academic or professional title. In contrast, Bank 3's records show that Account Owner 3 had such a title. In addition, the Claimant did not identify the person who jointly held the account at issue with Account Owner 3, and who is related to Account Owner 3. Consequently, the CRT is unable to conclude that Account Owner 3 and the Claimant's uncle are the same person.

As for Account 4020418, the CRT concludes that the Claimant has not identified Account Owner 4 as her relative. Although the name of her uncle matches the published name of Account Owner 4, the information provided by the Claimant differs materially from the published information about Account Owner 4 available in Bank 3's records. Specifically, the Claimant stated that her uncle resided in Budapest, Hungary. In contrast, Bank 3's records show that Account Owner 4 resided in Vienna, Austria. Consequently, the CRT is unable to conclude that Account Owner 4 and the Claimant's uncle are the same person. Moreover, it should be noted that the CRT has awarded the account to another claimant, who plausibly identified Account Owner 4 as their relative. All decisions are published upon release on the CRT's website at www.crt-ii.org.

The CRT has taken utmost care in matching the names of the person identified by the Claimant as a possible account owner to names of actual account owners identified in the Account History Database prepared pursuant to the ICEP Investigation, which identified accounts probably or possibly belonging to Victims of Nazi Persecution, as defined in the Rules. The CRT uses advanced name matching systems that consider variations of names, including name variations provided by Yad Vashem, Israel, to ensure that all possible name matches are identified. The CRT has reviewed this claim carefully and analyzed matches to accounts belonging to account owners with alternative spellings of Fritz Braun's surname, which include Braune.

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 or the alternative surname of the Account Owner identified above, 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 her 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
14 December 2005