

C.A.75-1996; Compliance; Office of Professional Responsibility Non-Compliance,
Memphis Operation
EW 8/2/76

Shaheen's operation seems to have included another hunch who's name I can't recall today.

One could conjecture that having heard from one who heard Shaheen decided to be able to present the appearance of detachment to avoid the visible conflict of interest.

The Memphis work included interviews with Richmond and Redditt.

Richmond is still a cop and will probably be the same kind of fink he was.

I don't think this will be true of Redditt but I do think "professional responsibility" will consist of a version of the interview that is less than faithful.

Moreover, there is one part of the Redditt story they'll not be able to fudge entirely: the supposed Secret Service man from Washington with all that top police brass just to see that Redditt was not assassinated. Enough of this got into the papers and the true story has been published, without denial.

I believe this new work is covered by my complaint and that we are entitled to it unless the intra-agency exemption applies.

In time we should ask, especially because they are going over records called for by the Complaint. I don't know of any language in the law that limits response and compliance to an FOIA unit.

Matter of fact, if it did it would be a perfect mechanism for non-compliance on the politically sensitive materials of any kind. Merely more than to where the FOIA unit can pretend it could not and did not see them.

In time I think we should make an issue of this.

It may be what was done to protect "ilty's false swearing. There are indications that it was done with some of those 25 volumes when they were duplicated. There is no chance the MFO was not given a duplicate set if it did not already have one.

I think I know a basis for approaching this with what is in my files now and from them proving it.