

Clapp affidavit on statute limitations - what the judge discussed, said, etc.
Tucker Act
Chicken Damages
personal damages

There are two statute points in the first parked paragraph: my belief that it had not run and reason to believe it had not run. Note the formulation, first could any federal official waive and if he did under which of the two acts. This does not say that he could waive under one and not under the other. You may see more in it.

The second marked part continues onto the top of page 2. It does address Tucker Act and whether or not the Williams complaint could then be amended to include such an added claim. The second page says that if at this juncture it had to be under the federal torts claims act there was the same limitation problem with it.

The next point discussed was #the issue of claims for mental suffering..."
There is no reference to any question about the claims on flocks ^{not} having run, what the affidavit swears, and none to even a suggestion that the claim to personal injury had run. Separately I've asked how this could happen when each claim is on the same form, filed, of course, as one form in each case.

What is also significant is that if I had known that the judge had held that I had tolled the statute with regard to all the flocks in all the claims there is no way I would have settled this out of court at that figure.

I do not know other than what Harvey told me of what happened in chambers. I do know he never told me what his affidavit states, that this letter does not support what his affidavit states, and that all my records are abundant proof that I would have gone to trial on the chicken damages going back to 5/60 if I had known it was possible.