

Comment on CA 75-1996 interrogatories

1. Add (g) to determine whether a specific bullet or remnant tore or struck an object; and  
(h) to determine whether a specific bullet or fragment thereof could not have struck another object.
- 2-4 On my first reading I asked if you want to ask for the results. I used just the word "Results." I think with respect to 2 I meant were they recorded and if so how, what use was made, etc.
- 3 I think we do want results and perhaps this would be a good point to get in comparisons. Ask if not normal or indeed necessary.
5. Eliminate possibility of ambiguity by "first?" Do we want to know if these are originals or taken for CMS by this? Whether they were used by Frazier? Do you want to add "printed" or do you want to substitute this for "developed?"
- 6-7 Do we want copies of these pix? On 7 I'd be specific in asking if pictures were taken with the aid of a comparison microscope and how many bullets were compared with Q64. Perhaps here, if not elsewhere, there should be something on the purposes of test firing so many other rifles, I think 7, when it was presumed that this rifle was the cause of death by firing the fatal shot.
8. Maybe part of the above fits better here. Don't we with each of these want the results? I'd consider them included in our request and complaint. I mean results. I'd also add "and comparisons, if any, with any other bullet, fragment of bullet or photograph of either.  
  
Here a caution: they could have used a comparison microscope and NOT taken pictures to avoid having them around to incriminate, like Frazier. I think somewhere, where you deem appropriate, it should be included.
- 9 I don't understand this. All photos are some kind and degree of blowup when the object is so small. Maybe this is how you intended addressing comparison-microscope photos. If so they can claim not to understand. Unless you have a purpose I do not detect I'd eliminate this and include the comparison-microscope pictures above. Important on this: records other than pictures, too.
- 10 I'd say such testing as NAA and spectro and I'd begin by asking if in this case there were performed in accord with commonly accepted practices, which include identification and measurement of each element, particularly trace elements. Make this as a statement and then ask the question. We have enough scientific literature to back this up as a statement. Not tabulation of results here. Tabulation of elements and the measurements of each. Then ask with respect to all of the objects struck by the fatal bullet in all of its components, including the shell and the powder remaining in the empty shell recovered in the rifle. This will include King's jacket, shirt, tie and the jacket material as well as the core. If you do not understand this we should discuss it. It is an important clue/factor because there is no doubt that the clothing can be connected with Q64 and they haven't done it. The reason can't be because they didn't want to. The most obvious of the possible explanations is that they wanted to avoid attention to other tests which would be destructive of the case. Some of the blabbing in 75-226 proves they can make definitive tests with gunpowder residues, in the shells. Here also I think "complete" is too general. I'd say by normal full testing or standards or something that eliminates the invitation to evade by a subjective answer. And Frazier isn't there any more. Ask for all tabulations and specify that some but not all were supplied.
11. Include spectro and "are or could be identical or ~~substantially~~ close to identical or not possibly identical in composition." Perhaps also is the intent to prepare

an expert witness to testify in a criminal proceeding, to give definitive statements and be prepared to produce proofs of them, particularly on cross examination?

12. What are these results? Can they be interpreted as exculpatory? This question of exculpatory interpretation should be included in the ballistics part.
- 13 I'd make broader, not just bullet but specimens. This would include clothing, etc. And "Were these the practices in this case? If not, why not?" Is there more than usual speed in exceptional crimes?
- 16 The gave some, so we know they were made. The question should be were we given all
- 17 means both windowill and rifle barrel-both. Not just photos, studies and photos. Or examinations. I'd catch all in this because they provided no comparisons and Frasier swore to them. Why were they not provided? Was the dent or dents- and there were more than one but the Memphis cops fixed on one - compared with common objects like hammers by this or any other means to determining if the dent(s) fit the imprint of a hammer? The point is not only what Frasier alleged and Beasley narrated but they knew it was impossible and a hammer, with little doubt, made the mark(s)
18. If there allegedly were no other suspects and the rifle was found immediately, why was it necessary to test fire so many other rifles? Were other arrests made in this case? If only Ray was a suspect, why? Were any arrests made, by any authority, prior to Ray's identification?
19. Begin by referring to news accounts of cigarettes and ashed ending found in the car. Then ask the question and for the results, where sent and why.
- 20 Add or by any others, sketches and prior to Ray's own arrest the basis for each.
- 21-4 Any other source. Like cops, citizens. ~~sketches and sketches~~ Other news agencies or publications of any element of the media.
- 26 Can you include efforts to lean, as by asking those who then had such responsibilities?
- 27 Don't limit to "agent" or FBI. Include other employees and DJ. Same with 28,29. In each case was either given any copies of records or permitted to make copies or notes?  
If you feel you can get away with it, ask if the FBI knows whether or not these purposes also were accomplished indirectly, without the FBI or any of its personnel figuring in it. If so, was any action taken? Would it normally have been? Would there normally have been an investigation, punishment, etc?

In nothing in the foregoing is there idle speculation. They have lied about the scene of the crime and I have the proof. They did make arrests, at least one in Mexico. Did a non-suspect get arrested? Frank did flash FBI reports, McMillan had bank records, etc. I don't know how to suggest addressing it, if you want to here, but the standard practice is to ask the wrong person. Perhaps a final question on have all those who could reasonably be expected to have knowledge been consulted? Have duplicate files or other records been? I think it is possible that this kind of toying with this kind of judge might turn her on, even to the extent of demanding the immediate presence of those with first-person knowledge. But before trial I don't want to disclose the other pictures I know they have. I have seen them and have notes on each, even identification numbers from the film. Not thanks to Bud, though.