

CLAIMS RESOLUTION TRIBUNAL

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

Certified Denial

to Claimants Yizchak Meron

Ruth Leoni Hon

and Jaacov Meron

in re Accounts of Leopold Rothschild

Claim Numbers: 210947/SB; 210948/SB; 210949/SB¹

This Certified Denial is based on the claims of Yizchak Meron, formerly Merenländer, (“Claimant Yizchak Meron”), Ruth Leoni Hon, née Merenländer (“Claimant Hon”) and Jaacov Meron, formerly Merenländer (“Claimant Jaacov Meron”) (together the “Claimants”) to the published account of Leopold Rothschild (“Account Owner 1”) at the [REDACTED] (“Bank 1”) and to the published account of Leopold Rothschild (“Account Owner 2”) at the [REDACTED] (“Bank 2”).

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 Claimants

The Claimants, who are siblings, submitted substantially similar Claim Forms asserting that their maternal grandfather, Leopold Rothschild, who was born on 18 February 1864 in Randegg, Germany, and was married to Adele Gugenheim, owned a Swiss bank account. The Claimants stated that their grandfather, who was Jewish, worked in real estate, and that he resided in Randegg until 1940, when he and his wife were deported to the concentration camp in Gurs, France. According to the Claimants, their grandfather fled in 1940 to New York City, New York, the United States. The Claimants further stated that their grandfather died on 5 May 1952 in New York City. Claimant Yizchak Meron indicated that he was born on 19 August 1923 in Frankfurt, Germany. Claimant Hon indicated that she was born on 2 November 1921 in Frankfurt. Claimant Jaacov Meron indicated that he was born on 2 May 1929 in Frankfurt.

¹ According to Article 37 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 three claims of the Claimants in one proceeding.

Information Available in the Bank's Records

The CRT notes that the Claimants submitted claims to an account belonging to their relative, Leopold Rothschild. 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 two accounts whose owners' names match that provided by the Claimants. Upon review of the bank documents, the CRT also located one additional account that was not reported by the auditors. 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.

Accounts 1000497, 1000497.1

Bank 1's records indicate that Account Owner 1 was Leopold Rothschild, who resided in Germany. Bank 1's records also indicate Account Owner 1's city of residence. Furthermore, Bank 1's records indicate the dates of opening and closing of the accounts at issue.

Account 4021514

Bank 2's records indicate that Account Owner 2 was Leopold Rothschild, who resided in New York, New York, the United States. Bank 2's records also indicate Account Owner 2's street address in New York, as well as his profession.

The CRT's Analysis

Admissibility of the Claims

The CRT has determined that the claims are admissible according to Article 18 of the Rules Governing the Claims Resolution Process, as amended (the "Rules").

Identification of the Account Owners

As for Accounts 1000497 and 1000497.1, the CRT concludes that the Claimants have not identified Account Owner 1 as their relative. Although the name of their grandfather matches the published name of Account Owner 1, the information provided by the Claimants differs from the unpublished information about Account Owner 1 available in Bank 1's records. Specifically, the Claimants stated that their grandfather resided in Randegg, Germany until 1940, when he was deported to Gurs, France, and later fled to New York City, New York, the United States. In contrast, Bank 1's records show that Account Owner 1 resided in a major German city, which is located more than 350 kilometers from Randegg, and to which the Claimants did not demonstrate any connection. The CRT notes that the Claimants' relative city of residence, Randegg, is closer to numerous different major German cities than it is to the city of residence of the Account Owner, rendering it unlikely that the Claimants' relative would indicate a different, distant metropolis as his city of residence, including for purposes of maintaining a bank account,

rather than any one of those closer cities. Consequently, the CRT is unable to conclude that Account Owner 1 and the Claimants' grandfather are the same person.

As for Account 4021514, the CRT concludes that the Claimants have not identified Account Owner 2 as their relative. Although the name of their grandfather matches the published name of Account Owner 2, the information provided by the Claimants differs materially from the unpublished information about Account Owner 2 available in Bank 2's records. Specifically, the Claimants stated that their grandfather worked in real estate. In contrast, Bank 2's records show that Account Owner 2 had a different profession. Consequently, the CRT is unable to conclude that Account Owner 2 and the Claimants' grandfather are the same person.

Right of Appeal

Pursuant to Article 30 of the Rules, the Claimant/s 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 Claimants 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 Claimants should identify the Account Identification Number that 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 Claimants should be aware that the CRT will carry out further research on their claims to determine whether an award may be made based upon the information provided by the Claimants or upon information from other sources.

Certification of the Denial

The CRT certifies this Denial for approval by the Court.

Claims Resolution Tribunal
10 August 2005