

Attach to Motion

JL- your Motion for Partial Summary Judgment in 75-1996 Re 4/29/78

Your Attachment A, paragraph 2:

"... Rosen inquired as to how Long would maintain a 'tickler system.' Long at a later time explained to Rosen how his tickler system would be formed and utilized. Long stated that he maintained the system with approximately 75 key classifications. This system was maintained in addition to the MURKIN file."

This is still another basis for another Motion for Partial Summary Judgment.

We have not received any list of "75 key classifications." And this really gets to my initial requests, quite aside from not having been provided under their substitution for my requests. Nothing about any such 75 key classifications, not in any record I can recall.

You will recall that on a number of occasions I asked the FBI representatives to check files other than whatever is in central files and they steadfastly maintained that there are no other files to check. You may recall that I asked what all these other file cabinets I saw were for, how the FBI functioned if each time anyone needed a record it had to be retrieved from central files, and why so many copies were made and central files held copies from so many different ones of these copies. John's reply was that copies were kept for a day or so and thrown away. I told John I did not believe it but was not able to get another paper from any other file. In these discussions I also asked for what a search of the Hoover files disclosed.

Now here we have proof that such separate files were kept: "This system was maintained in addition to the MURKIN file."

When you have time why not use the same form as you have here and add these to items as a separate motion for summary judgment? I gave you a copy of the file divider from Hoover's office showing that he did have a file in it.

The incomplete paragraph at the top of page two of Attachment 1 relates to the finding of a fingerprint on an Atlanta map alleged "found in Galt's vacated room ..." (my emphasis. Why not "in?")

This description is not consistent with the length of time taken to make any identification of any "my print, which is a separate issue, if in fact it is the print that was used, which I think it was not. (ID was finally made by comparison of the print or prints used with one from Ray's youth, from Los Angeles.)

This was not, as best I recall, a map found in Ray's room. I believe it was taken in a black bag job, which later was denied under oath by SA Mitt. I have a brief report on the black bag job and Mitt's false affidavit. I do not know whether you can use this now. I am merely calling it to your attention. The reason I have not told any reporter about this is lame. I believe the map was in the stereocam and that SA Roughton broke in by removing the hinges while gruer was drunk.