UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

JAMES H. LESAR,

v.

Plaintiff,

Civil Action No. 77-0692

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,

Defendant

AFFIDAVIT OF JAMES H. LESAR PURSUANT TO RULE 56(f) OF THE FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE

I, James H. Lesar, first having been duly sworn, depose and say as follows:

- 1. I am the <u>pro</u> <u>se</u> plaintiff in the above entitled cause of action.
- 2. In order to effectively oppose defendant's motion for summary judgment, it is essential that I be allowed to undertake discovery to establish facts which I cannot conclusively or satisfactorily demonstrate absent such discovery.
- 3. For example, with respect to defendant's Exemption 1 claim, I need to know just how disclosure of the purportedly classified OPR and Civil Rights Division materials might damage the national security or foreign relations of the United States.

 Would disclosure damage our foreign relations with a particular country? Would "disclosure" in fact disclose anything of importance not already known? Conversely, have facts already publicly known been withheld under a claim that they are classified? Has the Department of Justice withheld materials that were made public by the Church Committee? Was any of the purportedly classified information leaked to the press or others as part of the FBI's

COINTELPRO operations? Were the classifying officers aware of, and did they consult, the work of the Church Committee before making a determination that this information was to be classified? Was Dr. King ever charged with being a spy?

- 4. The Murphy Report, a copy of which is attached to the Supplemental Affidavit of James P. Turner, was originally classified in toto. Since much of it has now been disclosed, it seems evident that there never was any basis for classifying the parts which are now public. In order to assess the comptence and credibility of those who classified the Murphy Report (and the other materials as well), I need to engage in discovery to find out what criteria were employed in reaching these unjustifiable classification determinations.
- 5. Much of the information withheld by the Defendant is purportedly exempt pursuant to Exemptions 7(C) or 7(D). The government's reliance on these provisions is notoriously unreliable. As an example, I attach a copy of a document provided to my client, Mr. Harold Weisberg, by the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice. I was able to fill in all but one of the 30 excisions in this four-page document off of the top of my head because it was all public information. Yet the Department of Justice deleted it under Exemption 7(C) and 7(D).
- 6. With respect to Exemption 7(D), I need to engage in discovery to ascertain whether the government maintains that the FBI's COINTELPRO operation against Dr. King and the SCLC was a "lawful national security intelligence investigation," and to establish whether information has been withheld under Exemption 7(D) on the premise that it was. As with Exemption 1, I need to ascertain whether, as think apparent, information has been withheld under this provision even though it is already publicly known. I wish to ascertain whether information which has appeared in the press

or on radio or T.V. has been withheld under this provision. I also need to establish through discovery the facts upon which defendant contends that the information allegedly protected by exemption 7(D) was furnished as the result of an express or implied agreement of confidentiality.

- 7. With respect to Exemption 7(E), many FBI investigative techniques and procedures are already publicly known. This is particularly true with respect to those employed by the FBI in its COINTELPRO operations. I believe that this exemption may have been unjustifiably utilized in this case to hide the details of illegal activities by FBI agents by applying this claim of exemption to techniques and procedures which are either already publicly known or supposed to have been abandoned. Discovery is essential if I am to establish this.
- 8. It may also be necessary to take discovery in order to clear up a question as to whether what is being withheld as Memphis Police Department records also includes notes which Mr. James F. Walker or other members of the Justice Department Task Force may have taken while reviewing these records. This question arises because Mr. Walker's affidavit states that he went to Memphis on October 18, 1976 for the purpose of reviewing and securing copies of relevant Memphis Police Department records. In reviewing other records, the Task Force normally took notes on matters of interest. These notes constitute the bulk of the Appendix C materials which have been provided to date. I have not been provided with any notes on the Memphis Police Department records. Inasmuch as Mr. Walker states that he did not serve a subpoena on Mr. Stanton until October 21, 1976, three days after he went to Memphis, he may have spent the intervening time reviewing and making notes on the Memphis Police Department records. Appendix

C to the Shaheen Report contains five volumes which have been described by defendant as containing Memphis Police Department documents. Yet the subpoena which Mr. Walker served on Mr. Stanton seems to apply to only some 400 to 500 pages of Memphis Police Department records. This is far less than would normally be contained in five volumes. Moreover, it is apparent that Mr. Walker must have made some notes on the Memphis Police Department records, if only to be able to specify which records he wanted to subpoena. Because any notes members of the Task Force made on Memphis Police Department records may arguably have a different legal status than the PD records themselves, I need to undertake discovery on this question, too.

JAMES H. LESAR

WASHINGTON, D.C.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 22nd day of May, 1978.

My commission expires are 14 1979

NOTARY PUBLIC IN AMD FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA UNITED STATES OVERNMENT

()

Memorandum

TO : File

DATE: August 26, I

V

MG:sbh

DJ 144-72-68

DESCRIPTION OF JUST

FROM : Monica Gallaghar

Deputy Chief, Criminal Section

Civil Rights Division

susject: Wayne Chastair, Jr.

appropriate.

On August 24, 1971, Mr. Queen and I met with Wayne Chastain, Ir., a reporter with the Mamphis Press Scimitzr, home address 810 Washington, Apartment 502, Memphis, Tennessee, telephone 901-525-6158; office telephone 526-2141. Mr. Chastain requested the meeting to furnish the following information, which he advised has mostly been previously furnished to the FBI in Memphis in 1969. At the conclusion of the interview I advised Nr. Chastain that we would carefully consider the information has furnished; together with other information available to us, and determine what if any further action would be

A. Be Vack tour blood ake Yory

Seuro Tos 1. You we don't according to the stain is
from the area of Alleere, Arkeeses and has reputedly
been engaged in illegal and/or susstimable activities
such as gummuning. He is about 40 years old, has
dark hair and eyes, and speaks some Spanish. He is
a man of some wealth, drives a cadillac, and likes
"high living." He was a college roomate of
walted halod, a Hemphis attorney.

Chastein is persyaded that there is considerable evidence that You yellood this in Memphis April 3-5, 1958, and present in "This Grill" opposite the

Larraine Motel on the afternoon of April 4 shortly before the assassination. If this is true, Chastain believes further investigation of Young blook is warranted since there is no apparent Zogical amplemention for his presence in that neighborhood at that time.

The evidence that Young look has there is as

1. Lloyd Jowels (Giles?), owner of Jim's Grill, remembers (according to Chastein who interviewed him) that on the day of the assessination at about 4:30 p.m. a man entered Jim's Grill and ordered sausage and eggs. This was sufficiently unusual as to be noteworthy because at that hour of the day most people come to Jim's to drink and the cooking Grill is closed down. Also, this man the cooking Grill is closed down. Also, this man the cooking Grill is closed down. Also, this man the cooking Grill. During the time the man max in Jim's Jim's Grill. During the time the man max in Jim's new work three times to the telephone but never he wont three times to the telephone but never made a call. He left about 5:00 p.m.

On later being interviewed by the police about the presence of any suspicious individuals, Jowels described the sausage-and eggs man and Jowels described the sausage-and eggs man and was allegedly told to call the police if he returned. In fact the man returned for breakfast turned. In fact the man returned for breakfast the next day (4/3) carrying a suitcase. Jowels the next day (4/3) carrying a suitcase. Jowels the next day (4/3) carrying a suitcase. Jowels called the police who picked him up as he left the called the police who picked him up as he left the called the spoint was never asked by the police to identify Jowels was never asked by the police to identify I owels was never asked by the police a short time after he was released by the police a short time after he was picked up, elthough other individuals were being held as suspects in the King matter.

Chastain said he exhibited to Jowels a "trug shot" of Yourghlood and that Jowels positively identified him as the sausage-and-eggs man.

2. A former weitness at Jim's Grill, identity unknown to Chastain but allegedly known to

also remembers the man and could identify a photograph of Younghlood as the individual involved.

3. Waller frafond once said that Young blood called him from Memphis the day before the King sleying, but according to Chastain he now denies that he can fix the jate accurately. In approximately he can fix the jate accurately. In approximately hay 1969 fulled told Chastain that the last time hay 1969 fulled been in Memphis was "about the time fourthead had been in Memphis was "about the time for the limit assessination." When the question of fully assessination. When the question of said "Tack" is more liberal on the naced lessue than a said "Tack" is more liberal on the naced lessue than I am.

B. Re Melavilas.

A Morphis attorney named Massell & Planafied to an intold Chastein that he had been densuited or an individual who save his name as because, saying
that was an aliza. Present as had allegadly been
errested in connection with the King slaying and
errested in connection with the King slaying and
released. He thought he would ultimately be charged
released. He thought he would ultimately be charged
and wanted Thompson to represent him. He took
end wanted Thompson number and departed. Chastein
Thompson's telephone number and departed. Chastein
Whompson's telephone number and departed. Chastein
blood. With respect to the Eug-shot, Thompson's
said that was not the Eug-shot, Thompson's
said that was not the Eug-however, with respect
to a newsclip photograph. Thompson's one be
to a newsclip photograph of Chastein that he
sure. Thompson's illegadly told Chastein that he
ferred from Paranias, speech that he spoke Spanish
in addition to English.