IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

HAROLD WEISBERG,	
Plaintiff	
V.) Civil Action No. 75-1996
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,	,
Defendant	

OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT

OF HEARING

DATE:

September 14, 1978

PAGES:

1 - 10

GLORIA H. HORNING

Prepared for:

Official Reporter 6814 U. S. Court House Washington, D. C. 20001

PLAINTIFF

1		
2	2	
3	3	
4	- 11	
5	IN THE UNITED STATE	ES DISTRICT COURT
6	FOR THE DISTRICT	OF COLUMBIA
7	7	
8	HAROLD WEISBERG,	
	Plaintiff	
9	v.	Civil Action No. 75-1996
.0	DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,	
.1	Defendant)	
.2		Washington, D. C.
.3		Thursday, September 14, 1978
4	1	ase came on for a status call
.5	!]	
.6		COLLIN COLLEGE SCHOOL STATE
7	11	
.8		
9	JAMES LESAR, ESQ. For the Plaintiff	
20	BETSY GINSBERG, ESQ.	
21	For the Defendant	
22		
23	3	

PROCEEDINGS

2

DEPUTY CLERK: Civil Action 75-1996, Weisberg v.

3

5

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Department of Justice.

MISS GINSBERG: Good morning, Your Honor. had asked the FBI to trace all the documents that were referred by the FBI to other agencies and the FBI has produced an eightpage graph which shows the process of each document by serial number, the date that it was referred, the date that it was returned, the date it was released to plaintiff, and other kinds of information.

For 30 of the documents, the FBI could not verify exactly which date they sent them to plaintiff, so they attached Xeroxes of these 30 documents.

The graph was mailed to plaintiff two days ago. had not yet received it as of this morning. We just gave them extra Xerox copies of these.

The second item that I want to report on is the conduct of the administrative review that is going on. This has been divided into two parts. The first part deals with the general methodology, the processing, quidelines, the way referrals were handled and other kinds of matters.

The second part of the review will deal with the specific excisions in the documents and the specific complaints and questions raised by plaintiff.

The work on dealing with the first part, the general

methodology, is well under way.

6

10

11

12

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

The work on the specific excisions has not yet begun, but it is anticipated it will begin within the next couple of I cannot, at this time, give the Court any idea of when this process will be completed, except to say that work will progress as quickly as possible.

THE COURT: Let me ask you, now that the Meeropol cases are getting on fairly well, do you think that will release some of the people from it to be able to be transferred to this case?

MISS GINSBERG: I am not the best witness on that It is my understanding that, unfortunately, Meeropol question. and this one are not the only large cases.

I know, but these are the ones that are THE COURT: dated 1975 and that is what this Court is concerned about, because we don't want to keep a '75 case on our docket. tainly not into '79. And, frankly, we'd have liked to have had it gone in '76.

But it is necessary to give this case the priority its date calls for.

MISS GINSBERG: I will communicate that

THE COURT: So if you will pass that on, because since the people have been working, the ones who are presently working on the Rosenberg documents have been so helpful in getting it to the state that it is, I would certainly hope that some of those very helpful people could be spared to work on this.

*

J

MISS GINSBERG: Some of those very helpful people are still working on some Meeropol matters, unfortunately.

THE COURT: I know, but I believe they have given me an end date of November and they have met every date so far which is most unusual.

MISS GINSBERG: And I hope they continue to do so.

As I said, I personally cannot give the Court any assurances.

I will most assuredly relay the message.

THE COURT: If you will pass on the word, I will be very happy.

MISS GINSBERG: I will, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Because we want to see the end of this matter. I assume everybody does. But in particular we do and we mean to.

on is the question of two informants that Mr. Weisberg has raised. One is a person named Oliver Patterson, who apparently has gone public to some extent recently, and plaintiff and plaintiff's counsel have told us that they have a tape done by Mr. Patterson which reveals, apparently, certain kinds of information and this morning I confirmed that they will send that over to us, we will listen to it, and the two files, or such files as exist will then be reviewed with particular mind to the confidential informant exemption.

And that is all I have to say this morning.

THE COURT: Mr. Lesar?

MR. LESAR: Your Honor, I have a matter which I wish to bring to the Court's attention. Mr. Weisberg brought with him this morning a 70-page report that he had typed up and gave to me, which I had not seen before, which deals with the remainder of the last affidavit by Mr. Beckwith.

He called two matters specifically to my attention.

One matter specifically in connection with the affidavit. And it concerned us very deeply, because of the difficulty that we have and the time-consuming nature of having to respond to mis-representations in Government affidavits.

I want to graphically illustrate this by reading, first, from page 37 of Mr. Beckwith's last affidavit, the lengthy 63-page affidavit, and it deals with an item in this affidavit. He is talking about the notes that had been made on some of Mr. Weisberg's correspondence.

Mr. Weisberg had complained about certain things and the complaint, specifically about section 66, was that all of serial 4914 was withheld, no exemption was claimed. And that what had been written under the category of remarks on the work sheets had been erased.

In his affidavit, Mr. Beckwith said that in regard to plaintiff's statement that something had been erased from the remarks column, the master copy of the inventory work sheets for section 66, serial 4919 shows that nothing was ever

written in or erased from this column.

A copy of page 2 of the inventory work sheet, section 66, of which serial 4919 is listed, is attached hereto as Exhibit Z, with a b(17) notation made for this serial.

Would you hand this copy to the Court, please?

The page on top, which begins with serial 4918, is

copy Z that was attached to Mr. Beckwith's affidavit. If you

look in the remarks column, opposite 4919, it's quite clear

that nothing is written in there and nothing erased. So it

would seem that Mr. Beckwith's affidavit is correct.

However, if you turn to the next page that I have handed you, you will find that it, too, begins over on the left with serial 4918, and you have 4919. The handwriting on these sheets is entirely different, and out to the right, although this is a Xerox of a Xerox and not the original, it would appear that opposite 4919 something in fact had been written and has been erased.

Now there is another graphic example of the kind of treatment that we have been accorded, which I have some reason to believe is different than is accorded other Freedom of Information Act plaintiffs.

On page -- I think it is -- 35 of his affidavit, Mr. Beckwith responds to a complaint that Mr. Weisberg had made that serial 4849 and later serial withhold the name of the late Willie Somersett.

Mr. Weisberg stated this has been published in 1967 and '71, that there was no question of privacy and no question of secret source.

And then Mr. Beckwith went on to respond that deletions were made in this serial pursuant to b(2) and b(7)(d) to protect an informal symbol and number that would identify the informant. The release of this information into the public realm could compromise the identity of a party who had cooperated with the FBI. The fear of exposure often inhibits those who would otherwise cooperate. This consideration has been met by the traditional willingness and ability of the FBI to assure the persons interviewed that their identities would be protected. A copy of serial 4859 is attached hereto as Exhibit W.

These two volumes of documents are FBI volumes that were made available in response to a request made by another requestor, who recently provided Mr. Weisberg with his copies. They all relate to Mr. Somersett. In fact, I think these are only two of some ten volumes relating to Mr. Somersett.

The first sheet, the cover sheet is dated 6-3-76, and it says under it, "The following material has been reproduced for excising and review at FBI Headquarters by representatives of the House Select Committee on Assassinations."

And then, if you flip through it, you will find that the name of Mr. Somersett is mentioned, that there are informant file numbers given, that there is the kind of

information readily provided that has been withheld from Mr. Weisberg.

These are the sort of things that have caused this case to drag on so long.

There is one additional point that I would like to make for the record. And that is that the Government, in this case, and also in some of Mr. Weisberg's other cases, has begun using Mr. Beckwith as the primary affiant. It is our information, our understanding that Mr. Beckwith is an unindicted co-conspirator in some of the illegal activities of the FBI.

We think, in view of that, it is, first of all, beyond my belief and my comprehension as to why he would be used as an affiant, given that circumstance. But we also think that it obviously is highly inappropriate in a Freedom of Information Act case where the FBI has motivation to withhold materials and a person in that position is vulnerable to not only his own biases and prejudices but also to other pressures.

MISS GINSBERG: Your Honor, in regard to the technical questions that plaintiff's counsel has raised, as he well knows there are the kinds of things that the administrative re-review is designed to come to grips with and he can be assured that his questions will be relayed to Mr. Quin Shea's office for review.

As to the second part of Mr. Lesar's comments, I

have no information as to the kinds of things that plaintiff's counsel is raising.

However, from my personal dealings and I think from the public record, there is not one shred of evidence to suggest that Agent Beckwith has done anything but his job in the very best manner that he can do it and with good faith and according to the training and standards set by the FBI for Freedom of Information Act --

THE COURT: Let me say this: It's the same sort of affidavit we used to receive in the Meeropol case. And nothing got done until Mr. Shea took over. There was nothing coming out of that case that should have been released.

And we would like to suggest that it does not help our situation to have someone whose principal affidavits and reasons why things should not be released which really do not go to the heart, but just would appear to be obstructionist.

I would hope that we never hear from Mr. Beckwith in this case again and that, indeed, Mr. Shea's office would be in charge of same.

May we hope that that can be done?

MISS GINSBERG: Well, again, Your Honor, I will speak to the appropriate people.

THE COURT: Thank you very much.

MISS GINSBERG: Thank you.

THE COURT: We will take another look at this case

in two weeks and see where we are, because we can't keep on. MR. LESAR: What's the date, Your Honor? THE COURT: The 28th of September. MR. LESAR: Fine, Your Honor. THE COURT: At 10 o'clock. (Whereupon, at 10:20 a.m., the hearing in the above-entitled case was concluded.) REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE This record is certified by the undersigned to be the official transcript of the above-entitled hearing. OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER