

89. 12, Frederick, Md. 21701

7/7/76

Mr. Gans Wilson, FOIA/RA Coordinator  
CIA  
Wash., D.C. 20505

Dear Mr. Wilson,

This relates to my July 2 response to your two letters dated June 30, 1976 and to omissions in both your letters.

I have been trying to organize files around your index identification numbers. Prior to receiving those you supplied I had begun this because the long delays in your responses made it necessary. Without having complete the establishing of separate files on each request it is apparent that your longer letter of June 30 does not include or assign your internal numbers to them all. In some instances this may be because there may not have been time. It is not an explanation for all omission.

Your shorter letter of June 30 does not assign a number to that request.

Now that you do number these things I believe that failure to identify each and assign it a number will lead to more, not less confusion. May I expect you to complete the assigning of number to those requests to which you have not and to respond to those requests themselves?

In writing you I reported the belief that one or more of these matters were before a court or could be relevant to what is before a court. This is true of P-76-143, formerly E-75-4755. Your letter does not begin to cover this matter adequately.

My records show that the Archiver informed you you would respond by last July 31. (Your June 30, 1976 letter is vague in making identification but I believe it is the same request referred to you by the Archiver.) You date my appeal at June 8, 1976. I mailed it June 1. I therefore believe it languished for some time before being recorded as received. In any event, it was an appeal to which your time for response under the law has expired. You have not responded, as of today's mail.

Have I seen both response to the appeal and response to the question I believe are more than merely proper with a case before the court and this relevant in that case.

I am not taking advantage of you, as I could easily when so long a time passes without even acknowledgement of receipt of a request. Instead I am encouraging you to be responsive, which will waste no time and will consume much less. It will also avoid violation of the law, no matter how customary that may be. One example is that as of today Mr. Briggs' competence is not even alleged, not to the court and not in correspondence to me. I questioned the competence and ask for a statement of his authority. Neither the court nor the personal records show his authority.

I asked that you isolate the question to which you were addressing yourself and in more than a month you have not with this also relevant to the court. You have thus already wasted time for both of us needlessly or deliberately.

I then notified you of requests not acknowledged and now repeat that five weeks later. That letter included a request not acknowledge in three five weeks despite your two letters of June 30. It was sent certified and you acknowledge receipt of the letter.

My lawyer hopes he will be able to state preparations in the case now before a court this week. I sincerely hope you will respond promptly to save us more wasted time and work and avoid new embarrassment to the Agency.

Sincerely,

H