

From: Clemens Jabloner clemens.jabloner@univie.ac.at
Subject: Re: Zuckerkandl
Date: October 8, 2020 at 9:31 AM
To: E. Randol Schoenberg randols@bslaw.net
Cc: Pia Maria Schönberger pia.schoelnerberger@bmkoes.gv.at



Dear Randy,
we carefully discussed whether the arguments brought up by Graf could carry a resumption of the case, which we answered in the negative.
Regards, C.J.

Am 08.10.2020 17:26, schrieb E. Randol Schoenberg:

Clemens,

Just so I understand, have you again refused to reconsider the case _de novo_, or did you review the case _de novo_ and come to the same conclusion? I presume it is the former, but I want to be certain.

Randy Schoenberg

On Oct 8, 2020, at 3:02 AM, Clemens Jabloner <clemens.jabloner@univie.ac.at> wrote:

Dear Mr. Schoenberg,

many thanks for your messages regarding the article by Professor Graf in the Austrian notaries' newspaper NZ 2020/2.

The Art Restitution Advisory Board has been able to deal in detail with the argumentation of Univ. Prof. Dr. Georg Graf and the other relevant literature. Therefore the Advisory Board still sees no reason to address the "Amalie Zuckerkandl" case any further. See also the Dr. Rechberger's replica in the matter.

Sincerely Yours, Clemens Jabloner

--

Univ.-Prof. Dr. Clemens Jabloner
Institut für Rechtsphilosophie
Universität Wien
Schenkenstraße 8-10
1010 Wien
Hans Kelsen - Institut
Tel.: 01-4277-358 25