UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

HAROLD WEISBERG, Plaintiff, v. U. S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Defendant	Civil Action No. 75-1996

NOTICE OF FILING OF ATTACHED EXHIBITS

Comes now the plaintiff and gives notice of the filing of the attached correspondence relating to his requests for information pertaining to the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.:

1. March 24, 1969, letter from Mr. Harold Weisberg to FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover.

2. March 31, 1969, letter from Mr. Harold Weisberg to Mr. Carl Belcher, Criminal Division, Department of Justice.

3. June 2, 1969, letter from Mr. Harold Weisberg to Attorney General John Mitchell. For the convenience of the Court and government counsel, a re-typed copy of this letter which was used in a previous FOIA lawsuit is [redacted] attached.

4. August 20, 1970, letter from Mr. Harold Weisberg to Attorney General John Mitchell.

5. May 16, 1970, letter from Mr. Weisberg to Deputy Attorney

hereto is one which was reprinted in the appendix to plaintiff's brief to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia in Weisberg v. Department of Justice, Case No. 71-1026.

Respectfully submitted,

James H. Lesar

JAMES H. LESAR
1231 Fourth Street, S. W.
Washington, D. C. 20024

Attorney for Plaintiff

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have this 30th day of September, 1976, hand-delivered a copy of the foregoing Notice of Filing of Attached Exhibits, together with the attachments, to the office of Assistant United States Attorney John Dugan, Room 3419, United States Courthouse, Washington, D. C. 20001.

James H. Lesar

JAMES H. LESAR

3 Requests

March 24, 1969

Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director
Federal Bureau of Investigation
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Hoover,

In his just published book, "The Strange Case of James Earl Ray", Clay Blair, Jr., expresses his gratitude for the information and assistance given him by your bureau.

I have written a book including the Ray case, and I would like to be able to include any information that might be missing.

Therefore, I write to ask for what has been given Mr. Blair and perhaps other writers and any other data you might properly give me.

Now that there has been a court proceeding, I hope some of what might earlier have been considered secret is no longer. I am particularly interested in that evidence that establishes or tends to establish that Ray was the assassin, such things as the ballistics proof. Because there are so many contrary indications, I would also appreciate proof that he harbored racial animosities. And with the existing indications of the involvement of more than one person, for example, evidences that while Ray was in California someone acting for him was in Alabama, I would particularly like to know what persuaded your bureau that he was entirely alone. Ray and members of his family say he was not alone, as I interpret their statements.

Your bureau has also released some pictures. I would appreciate copies. Possibly you have pictures you may not properly give me, those taken by photographers at the scene of the crimes. I would like references to those taken as close as possible to the moment of the crime and at its scene.

My purpose in seeking this information is to make my work as complete and accurate as possible. Because what was earlier available persuades that Ray was not alone and probably was not the assassin, I am quite anxious to have all the available proofs that there was no conspiracyand that he was the assassin.

Thank you for any help you may provide.

Sincerely yours,

JL

2 requests

March 31, 1969

Mr. Carl Belcher
Criminal Division
Department of Justice
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Belcher,

In writing you, there is a request I forgot.

I would like to get a set of the evidence, including affidavits, entered into evidence in the Ray extredition hearing in London.

From the papers, I gather this material is in the public domain.

Also, I should like to read the transcript. Would you please tell me what is necessary to arrange this?

If the various press statements by the Attorney General and others in the Department of Justice were prepared releases or if the texts are available, I would also appreciate a set of them.

I hope this presents no problem to any of you. Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg

June 2, 1969

Attorney General John Mitchell
Department of Justice
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Mitchell,

After I twice wrote you beginning three months ago, I got a non-responsive reply, for you, in the name of your Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Criminal Division, from his Chief of the General Crimes Section. Without my ever having gotten any kind of honest of meaningful answer to any inquiry of your Department, under any administration, this one began with the bald statement "that further exchange of correspondence between yourself and the Department of Justice on this matter will serve no useful purpose."

At this point, after five unanswered letters subsequent to my receipt of this accurate forecast that you would never respond, letters in which I askef for access to what I am entitled to under the law it is your obligation to enforce, it looks very much as if the Department of Justice is more afraid that correspondence would serve a useful purpose, a purpose it fears.

As I wrote earlier, I do understand that busy executives must delegate to those under them what they cannot attend personally, as they must also depend upon others for the information they have. This in no way diminishes the responsibility of those in charge. The Attorney General still serves the Department of Justice. It is, I believe, your responsibility to see that the laws are observed, by you and by your Department, as it is to see that citizens making proper inquiries get proper response within a reasonable time.

When a citizen asks his Department of Justice for access to court records and cannot get an answer, things have passed a deplorable state in a country such as ours. I have made this request; you have not responded. Practically, this means you have refused me. I believe you cannot.

After you or your office referred my first two letters to Mr. Belcher I thereafter wrote him. Because he has not once responded, in any way, I again address you. I have two purposes. To the degree I can, I want to be certain that you know the situation, for the responsibility is yours, and, if necessary, I want to invoke the laws that entitle me to that which I seek. I prefer not to have to resort to this, as I would hope you would, too.

I made specific requests for specific information in letters to your Department between March 30 and April 23. If I am refused

me with the forms and instructions I will need to seek to obtain this information under the "Freedom of Information" law. It is my intention to invoke the provisions of this law, if necessary. May I call to your attention that I have, in the past, asked the Government for the means of utilizing this law without ever having been so equipped? I do not think this was the intent of Congress in enacting the law.

Among those documents I have sought unsuccessfully is a memorandum of transfer of the President Kennedy autopsy material, as set forth and described in earlier correspondence in your files. Respectfully I call to your attention the fact that this document is one of the working papers of the special panel convened by your predecessor and by it was so inventoried. I believe this removes it from any executive authority to withhold it and I herewith renew my request for it.

Under the previous administration, when I asked for access to the improperly-withheld David W. Ferrie material, I was told by Mr. Vinson that a review was under way. I have since asked the results of this review and have had no response. I renew the question, renew the request for this material, and would like the necessary instructions and forms for application under the above-cited law should I again be denied. May I, in this connection, call to your attention to the seeming impropriety and the inconsistency in the government claiming in court, to a litigant, that he has not exhausted his administrative remedies while the same government denies another access to his administrative remedies?

While I am unwilling to believe it, when I was informed that agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation were defaming me, I did call this report to your attention, believing, as I do, that there should be at least a pro forma denial of it. Aside from Mr. Belcher's assurances "that such conduct would be in complete disregard of Departmental and Bureau policy" and his statement that a copy of my letter was sent "to the Director of the Bureau for consideration" I have heard nothing. When that Bureau promises to send me a copy of its press release and doesn't, and when that Director fails to respond to a written request for a press release, perhaps I should not be surprised at the absence of a for-the-record denial. However, I would prefer to think the Attorney General of the United States would not be content for the matter to rest here.

I have often requested a copy of the spectrographic analysis of the bullets and fragments of bullets alleged to have been used in the murder of President John F. Kennedy. My written request to the Director has never been answered. I hereby renew this request,

asking, if I am denied, for a statement of the reason or reasons and the instructions and forms for invocation of the Freedom of Information law. With regard to the Warren Commission file identified as CD47:7, I make the same requests, as I do with CD1269.

Among those unanswered requests referred to above is the evidence presented in court in England. I would now like to broaden that to introduce that used in Memphis, directly and indirectly, in the case of James Earl Ray.

When I make requests of the National Archives, there now is a delay of not less than two months before there is any kind of response, when there is one. I believe this, in itself, clouds the purposes and integrity of the government. Your own Department does not respond at all. I do hope you will correct this, that you will agree that when a citizen and more, a writer, makes proper inquiry of the Government, response should be as prompt as possible.

Sincerely

Harold Weisberg

August 20, 1970

Honorable John N. Mitchell
Attorney General of the United States
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Mitchell:

Were I to swear falsely under oath or to deceive, misrepresent and attempt to misinform or mislead a judge in federal court, your department could and would prosecute me. Are these things no less reprehensible, is perjury no less a crime, when committed by attorneys for your department?

On three different occasions, your department has filed motions claiming Civil Action No. 710-70 is moot because, in the words of the most recent one, filed last Friday in response to an order issued by Chief Judge Howard H. Curren of the Federal District Court for the District of Columbia, "plaintiff has been given access to the papers requested in this public information suit and therefore this case is moot". Now, under this law, I am entitled to and asked and paid for copies of items in this file which, as of this writing, despite the direct order of Judge Curren, have not been given me. Nor does such a case become moot on the mere promise of the showing of documents to a plaintiff.

Appended to this motion were several documents. One is the affidavit of your attorney, David J. Anderson. Paragraph 2 concludes with reference to your May 6, 1970, letter, "A true copy of this letter is attached hereto and is Exhibit 1 and made part hereof."

Exhibit 1 is not a "true copy". It is an edited copy, the editing being accomplished by masking that is visible in the copying. Is not the Chief Judge of the Federal District Court for the District of Columbia entitled to the intelligence removed from your copy of this letter, especially when, under oath, it is described to him as "a true copy"? If this alteration has been performed on all departmental copies of this letter, I will be happy to supply what has been removed. (Exhibit 3, also described as "a true copy", is edited in the same fashion.)

Paragraph 4 is designed to misrepresent and to deceive. It states that I did two things for the first time in a letter of June 2, "wrote to an official of the Department requesting notification that he (I) had been given access to all the papers (included in this action and

What that letter actually said is that I had earlier supplied your department with a list of the papers from that file I had requested and paid for and had not been given. The unnamed official is the assistant to the Deputy Attorney General, who is the official who had delivered the copies to me and to whom I had given payment. That paragraph actually reads,

> On checking these papers against the list, I find the first and last items missing. The first is the file cover, the last a simple letter informing me that, in fact, I have been given access to the entire file that is the subject of this action.

This deliberate misrepresentation was also made by Mr. Anderson, to Judge Curran, on August 12, when Mr. Anderson represented these as new and additional requests made by me, whereas they are the initial requests, delivered in writing when I examined the file, in May, to Deputy Assistant Attorney General Carl Hardley. Despite his and other subsequent false representations, Mr. Hardley, then and there, in the presence of my attorney, told me he would deny me these two items, which is quite contrary to the misrepresentation in this affidavit, the motion of which it is part, and to his own letters, which, to his knowledge, contain such gross falsehoods they cannot be accidental and, in fact, are independently established as falsehoods by other of his letters alone.

Paragraph 7 begins, "On August 11, 1970, affiant advised plaintiff's attorney that a copy of said file cover had been located and would be supplied to plaintiff." It is a misrepresentation and a deception to allege that no such file cover or copy of such file cover had been "located" earlier. Plaintiff placed the file cover itself in the hands of Carl Hardley when returning the file to him. Prior to August 11, 1970, the department had cut off most of a Xerox of this identical file cover, taped the remains together with Scotch tape, and sent it to me, misrepresented as the entire thing. Repeatedly, the department made other attempts to deceive the Court and me about this file cover, including representation that it does not exist.

The remainder of paragraph 7 is, in my opinion, openly perjurious and intended to deceive the Court, which had just ordered that what it falsely alleges was done be done. Had it been done, it is obvious Mr. Anderson would have informed Judge Curran that it had been done. This sentence reads, "A copy of said file cover was delivered to plaintiff on August 12, 1970."

I note the one truthful thing in this sentence, its failure to describe <u>that</u> copy as a "true" copy, for it was not.

It was <u>not</u> delivered to me. It was shown to me and was taken with him by Mr. Anderson. He did not dare "deliver" it, nor did he dare give it to the judge to give me, for he knew it was an unfaithful copy, the unfaithfulness being of a non-accidental character, given

The perjurious nature of this affidavit is further disclosed by Carl Eardley's letter of August 17, 1970, which is subsequent to the date of the alleged August 11 "delivery" and to that of the August 14 affidavit. This letter, which is otherwise false in its own right, in an effort to disguise this perjury, begins, "Pursuant to your discussion with David J. Anderson of this office, we are forwarding copies of the file cover which you requested." Had this letter been written under oath, it also would have been perjurious, for on what is directly involved and is most material it is false. It states, "You will recall that the blurred portions were also blurred on the original." The blurred portion, as the most casual examination will disclose, is not blurred on the original.

If not perjurious, Paragraph 8 is clearly designed to misrepresent and to deceive the Court. It begins, "In the August 11 conversation between affiant and plaintiff's attorney, the latter indicated that plaintiff desired a copy of one of the photographs which were among the documents referred to in paragraphs 2 and 3 above." It was not in this alleged conversation of August 11 but in the written request I made in May that this photograph was requested. At that time I requested other photographs also. When I was, two weeks later, informed that the supplying of these photographs would require an additional three weeks, I reduced this request for photographs to the single one. This is amply recorded in correspondence not supplied to the court by you and is reflected in the list of those things of which I requested copies.

Here again the misrepresentation was also perpetrated in court, to the judge's face, when Mr. Anderson told him that this request and that for the cover of the file were made later by me.

The intent to deceive never ended. Here are more examples:

In Mr. Eardley's June 26 letter, he says of this file cover, the very one I personally showed him in his secretary's office, the very one he then said he would not copy and provide, "... the papers examined by Mr. Weisberg were contained in a plain unmarked file folder. We are therefore unaware of what file folder Mr. Weisberg has in mind."

But under date of July 30, Mr. Eardley wrote, "I am enclosing a copy of the only accordian file cover which we have been able to locate ...", the one he held in his hand in May.

Paragraph 5 does not accurately reflect Mr. Eardley's letter of June 26, 1970, to which it refers as "advising him (meaning my attorney) that plaintiff had been given access to all documents which were the subject of this action". What that letter actually says is less, only what, with this history of deception, deliberate falsehood and misrepresentation, is unacceptable. Mr. Eardley wrote, "I have been assured by individuals in this department who have examined our file

What I requested is precisely what Mr. Bardley had told me would not be provided and was not provided, in response to my written May request or Judge Curran's August 12 order. In May, I also asked Mr. Bardley that, since he had no personal knowledge, this letter be written by whichever person has custody of the file in question. Reference by Mr. Bardley to "file" in the singular when the department has more than a single file (although it began by denying it had any), especially with the history of inaccuracy that taints every communication, particularly those of Mr. Bardley himself, the "assurance" of his June 26 letter is, at best, meaningless. My dissatisfaction is not diminished by its evasiveness nor by his earlier statement that this proper request would be refused.

Moreover, I believe your department is in contempt of court. On August 12, Judge Curran ordered that what had been withheld from me be delivered within one week. With respect to the photograph, the copying of which the judge said would take but minutes, Mr. Anderson told the judge it had just been given Mr. Anderson the previous afternoon by the Deputy Attorney General. Not only was it and the true and legible copy of the file cover not delivered to me within this time, but the intent to be in contempt is amply and openly recorded in the conclusion of Mr. Bardley's letter of August 17:

> We have delivered the photograph which Mr. Weisburg (sic) requested to the Deputy Attorney General's office to have it reproduced. It will be forwarded to you shortly.

Thus, it is clear that the department is unconcerned by the order of Judge Curran, which was that this be accomplished promptly, in any event, within one week. The shuffling of the photograph is but another device to stall. The letter was not delivered until after one week had passed.

In addition, if this language is otherwise accurate, it represents less than I asked for and am entitled to. If the Department is going to make a copy of whatever version of this photograph it elects, and there are several different copies in this one file alone, it will be making a copy that, whether or not by intent, will be less clear than possible. The department has the negative from which this photograph was printed. The needless making of a negative from the print will reduce clarity. I would prefer one I expected that the print I paid for be made directly from the original negative, which the department has and which is normal.

Now, were I in contempt, your department would take action against me and I would be punished. How one punishes a government department I do not know. I do know that punishment can be administered to individuals, for contempt as for perjury. I believe it is no less than proper to ask and expect that the Department of Justice see to it that justice is done, that those guilty of perjury and contempt, even if its employees, be treated like all other citizens and also be pun-

Your department has violated the law for a year and a half, by whatever expedient appealed to it, beginning with the ignoring of my proper requests, followed by the most blatant lies, now culminating in open contempt of a judge and his order. One of the consequences has been to put me to considerable cost, in actual out-of-pocket expenses, in wasted time, and in the delaying of my writing. Aside from frustrating the law, which I believe cannot be other than purposeful, these things are and were intended. They are improper and wrong. I believe the government should hold itself to account for these measurable damages.

This suit was caused by these wrongful things by your department. So you can better understand, Mr. Richard Kleindienst caused it initially by false statements and misrepresentations, first, that you had no such papers when you, in fact, had duplicate sets; then by insisting these were required to be withheld, under the misquoted law. Next, you, personally, failed to respond to the prescribed appeal, which I had already delayed in order to give Mr. Kleindienst a chance to reconsider the inconceivable things he had committed to paper. Long after this appeal was moot, you ruled that I would be given access to what the law requires be made available to me. After you so ruled, your department stalled by one self-demeaning device after another, and ultimately still denied me three parts of my request.

My unnecessary travels to Washington required by these acts total not less than about 1800 miles of driving and about $55.00 in parking charges. Aside from the time required by so much unnecessary letter writing, I estimate that not fewer than 15 days were so wasted for me. I think it only fair that you return these costs to me, mileage at the going departmental rate and the days at the rates prevailing on the Washington Post for one of my experience. Determination of the damage by delaying my book is of a more subjective nature. To this I believe it is only fair that reasonable counsel fees be added.

The law under which this action is brought has no provision for the repayment of damages. Others, I have no doubt, do. Rather than consider invoking them at this point, I suggest to you that a proper gesture and a means of beginning to restore integrity to your department in this matter would be seeing to it that these damages are alleviated.

Yours truly,

Harold Weisberg

[EXHIBIT D]

5/16/70

Mr. Richard Kleindienst
Deputy Attorney General
Department of Justice
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Kleindienst,

Your Department has engaged in a systematic effort to vitiate the clear intent of Congress and the law on "Freedom of Information" to the point that inquiries properly

made are ignored. Seeking of you what is my right and your obligation to respond to has been converted into a futility. Even so simple a request for forms *you* require for citizens to use the law is blatantly ignored. Moreover, when I asked for copies of your instructions two days ago at two different offices of your Department, not only was I not given any, but in the proper office they even declined to take my name and address so they could mail these instructions to me. I have, in the past, addressed a number of requests to the Attorney General. He has, on not one occasion, made response. I have asked of your office that when my requests were rejected, as I anticipated they would be, the record indicating this is automatic when not ignored, it be in the name of the Attorney General so that the organized mechanism for delaying me would not be put into play again. In every case, this has *not* been done. I have three times addressed appeals from decisions to the Attorney General only to have them also ignored. I regard this record as one in which your Department has effectively surrendered any rights to insist upon compliance with those rules you employ only to frustrate my proper requests and, in the event it becomes necessary, am prepared to test this in court.

I would prefer that this not become necessary, that you change your ways, start making response, eliminate the deception and falsehood from them—in short, recognize that Congress passes laws and Presidents sign them so that they will be obeyed, most of all by that Department in whose care the sancity and integrity of the law is vested. Or, the Department from which we have been hearing so much about what it calls "law and order". Like charity, I suggest that should begin at home.

Herewith I enclose three completed DJ-118 forms. In each of these three cases my most recent requests have been made some time ago. In not one of them has there been response.

Two of them are conspicuously flagrant, and I single them out for explanation. My first request for the spectrographic analysis of the bullet, fragments of bullet and objects said to have been struck by either when the President was assassinated and Governor Connally injured is dated in May, 1966. There has never been response to it or its subsequent repetition. I addressed a request for the same public, non-secret information to the Attorney General 40 days ago. My first request of your Department for those documents relating to the late William Ferrie of New Orleans was made under the previous administration, and my most recent, still unanswered, was addressed to your office two months ago.

Because the record does not encourage belief you will provide what I seek without recourse to the courts, I feel it would be unwise for me to disclose everything I can. But because I want voluntary compliance with the law and because despite your best contrary efforts, I do not want to have this result in embarrassment for you or the government, I do suggest some of them.

With regard to the spectrographic analysis, if you are not aware of it, not then having been in your present position, I think you should know that if it does not agree in the most minute detail with the interpretation put upon it by the Warren Commission, their Report is a fiction. It was, in ways I do not explain, "considered by" that Commission. These words are from the executive order of the Attorney General of October 31, 1966. Moreover, it was, to all practical purposes, made public and published in different form, repeatedly, by the Commission. Most recently, this was done by former Dallas Chief of Police Jesse Curry, in a book bearing his name. When I asked for it of the National Archives, in person, the day this executive order was reported in the press, in my presence a representative of your Department told the National Archives it had been transferred there pursuant to this order. When we checked the file he cited, we found it was but a

paraphrase. To the best of my knowledge, there has been no response to the report made to him that this was not the analysis itself. This analysis involved no secret processes, no informants whose identities need be hidden, no defamations of the innocent, and does not in any way fall under the right to withhold embodied in any of the guidelines for withholding.

Your Department, through Mr. Vinson, told me the various documents relating to David Ferrie were being reviewed with the intent of seeing whether they would be made available. I never heard further from him. The National Archives told me it had no knowledge of any such review. Obviously, it is impossible for me to provide you with an identification of each and every such suppressed document, but to the degree I can, it is already in your files. In fairness to you, for I do not seek scandal but I do seek information I believe is properly mine, I want you to know that I have some of what is said to be withheld and it cannot possibly be withheld properly. As I have already explained, what might tend to reflect upon the innocent has already been made public, rather extensively, by the men involved and by their attorney, in a book and its serialization. Ferrie himself is dead, was unmarried, and his sexual tastes are public knowledge in a variety of ways, including but not limited to public reporting of criminal charges against him for them and in his contesting of these charges and his subsequent loss of employment because of them.

With regard to the photograph identified as FBI Exhibit 60 requested in my letter of April 22, 1970, addressed to the Attorney General, I provide this information and request:

This is a picture of President Kennedy's shirt. The shirt itself is withheld from examination and study and any taking of pictures of it is prevented on the seemingly proper ground that neither the government nor his estate want

any undignified or sensational use of it. I have explored this thoroughly with the National Archives and the representative of the estate, verbally and in extensive correspondence. However, there is no use to which the the available pictures can be put that is of any other nature, for they show nothing but his blood. This is not what I want to study or, perhaps, to show (my chief purpose *is* study). FBI Exhibit 60 is available at the National Archives and it has been published by the Warren Commission and by others. However, someone in your Department has gone to some trouble to see to it that the photograph at the National Archives is entirely useless for any serious study or to assure that it can be used only for no other than undignified or sensational purposes. Instead of a photographic print there is a photograph of the printed page. Now FBI Exhibit 60 is not lithographic but is photographic in nature. With the screen built-in for printing, any enlargement is effectively precluded. My interest is the only non-sensational one. It is restricted to the tabs of the shirt through which a bullet is alleged to have passed. I do not, really, want the entire picture, and I would much prefer the largest clear enlargement you can have made of just this very small area of the shirt. My purpose is as simple as it is obvious. It is entirely restricted to a study of the damage to the shirt by the alleged bullet. I would much prefer an enlargement of this very small area of the shirt, which would eliminate all the gore, to a standard 8x10 glossy print of the exhibit itself. If you will not do this, as I hope you will, then I will accept the clearest possible photograph of the original negative of FBI Exhibit 60. However, because I am confident the Department would prefer no suggestion that it is withholding evidence relating to the murder of a President, I do hope you will provide me with the enlargement instead, showing only the damage. It will be obvious, I hope, that there is no undignified use of such an enlargement of the original negative that is remotely possible, even if I were intending to publish it, which I am not.

The law, as you know better than I, imposes no burden upon me to make any explanation of what I seek under it. I hope you will understand that I have taken this time, gone to this trouble, in a sincere effort to put you in a position to understand that my purposes are serious, scholarly, proper and entirely within the intent of Congress and covered by the law. If you will reflect but a moment, perhaps you will also understand that, at possible cost to myself, I have sought to put you in a position to save yourself and the Department embarrassment if you do as you have in the past.

On the other hand, I will no longer accept the standard Departmental whipping from pillar to post. One of these requests to which your Department has never responded is *four years old*. The request embodied in my Civil Action 718-70 was a year old at the time you acceded to the perfectly proper request but only after I filed the action and you could no longer delay trial. If I have not heard from you within two weeks that you will comply with these requests, or if I get a rejection in any name other than that of the Attorney General. I will proceed with further civil actions. I would much prefer to avoid this. Most sincerely, I hope you would also.

Sincerely,

HAROLD WEISBERG