

About a case of gold smuggling

Regarding the articles that we have published on the gold trafficking cases which have been very much in the press lately, **Mr. V.**, watchmaker, whom we had named in the case, we made statements, of which it results: [*que nous avions nus en cause, nous à fait des déclarations, dont il résulte*]

1. That Mr. V. went to settle in Monaco for personal reasons having nothing to do with these cases, nor with the counter-complaint filed against him by Mr. Nyad, after a decision he made a long time ago.

Mr. V., who was not aware of this counter-complaint, got in touch with the investigating [*informateur*] judge as soon as he learned about it and let him know that he was at the entire disposal of justice to provide all necessary reasons for his complaint against Mr. Nyad and to respond to the counter-complaint that the latter felt it necessary to file.

2. That Mr. Nyad was by no means “cheated.”

Mr. V. maintains that the jewel given to Mr. Nyad was on consignment and it seems that the circumstances in which Mr. Nyad left Geneva by taking this piece with him justified the intervention of the criminal justice system.

In addition, it is advisable in this respect to let the proceedings which have begun take their course.

3. That Mr. V. was not an interested party in the settlement of accounts between Mr. Nyad and Mr. H. and that this settlement did not take place under the irregular conditions that we had believed.

This settling of accounts took place in August 1948 and not on the occasion of Mr. Nyad’s return to Switzerland last December following the complaint lodged against him, a complaint entirely unrelated to the previous settlement.

4. That Mr. V. is a stranger to the Rubirosa and Chambrier cases.

We gladly acknowledge Mr. V.’s statements and we regret that the inaccurate information we provided may have provoked prejudice against him.