IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HAROLD WEISBERG, Plaintiff, Civil Action No. 77-1997 CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY, et al., Defendants. Washington, D. C. March 22, 1978 The above-entitled matter came on for status hearing before THE HONORABLE JOHN LEWIS SMITH, JR., United States District Judge, at 9:30 a.m. APPEARANCES: On behalf of the Plaintiff: JAMES LESAR, ESQ. On behalf of the Defendants: MISS JOANN DOLAN

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

DAWN T. COPELAND OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER

### 1

## 2

## 3

# 5

7

8

10

11

13

. 14

15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

2324

### PROCEEDINGS

DEPUTY CLERK: Harold Weisberg v. CIA. Civil Action No. 77-1997.

Mr. Lesar and Miss Dolan.

THE COURT: Good morning.

MISS DOLAN: Good morning.

THE COURT: What is the situation here?

MISS DOLAN: Speaking for the Government, I consulted with both clients, the Central Intelligence Agency and the National Security Agency.

I am informed as to the National Security Agency that all of the documents were processed and denied, as it appears in the complaint and correspondence attached thereto.

The National Security Agency is planning on filling out an affidavit and on the basis of that affidavit, we will move for summary judgment in the future.

In regard to the Central Intelligence Agency, and in the processing of their documents, they divided the documents into two categories, those that pertain to James

Earl Ray and those that pertain to Martin Luther King.

The James Earl Ray documents were processed in 1977. That processing was based on a privacy waiver that was received from Mr. Ray.

The documents pertaining to Martin Luther King were not processed until the commencement of this action because

we were awaiting privacy waivers.

They are currently in the process. That processing should be completed in about 30 days at which point we would then begin to prepare for our motion for summary judgment as to the Central Intelligence Agency.

I would estimate that we could move on the motion for summary judgment within 30 days and on the Central Intelligency Agency within 60 days.

THE COURT: Should they not be combined?

MISS. DOLAN: Well, our feeling was that because they were separate documents and separate theories that it might be simpler to do them separately.

THE COURT: Mr. Lesar.

MR. LESAR: Your Honor, Jim Lesar representing Harold Weisberg, the plaintiff.

I think the nature of the case at present is -from plaintiff's point of view there is -- there is going to
have to be some discovery taken and probably a Vaughn v.
Rosen motion, and I would expect to be able to file both of
those motions within the next ten days.

I think it is going to be particularly necessary in view of the exemptions claimed by the NSA and the CIA which rely on Exemptions B-1 and B-3, ostensibly.

We will need some discovery on those matters before we can deal with the summary judgment question.

. 

THE COURT: How long will you need for discovery?

MR. LESAR: That depends upon -- well, what it really boils down to is whether or not this Court will allow us to take tape recorded depositions. There is authority for that in the Colonial Times v. Gasch case and I would submit a motion for that if the --

THE COURT: I am familiar with the authority and I have granted permission in the past, but I have found it not too satisfactory from the standpoint of counsel.

MR. LESAR: Well, I have a situation where I have very little alternative because of the lack of financial resources of my client. I will discuss it with him and see how he wishes to proceed. I may have to put that sort of motion before the Court.

THE COURT: You will have ten days to file your motion, the Vaughn v. Rosen motion.

In view of that situation, would that apply to both the CIA and the NSA?

MR. LESAR: Yes.

THE COURT: Under those circumstances both sides will have an additional 60 days to complete discovery and to file any appropriate motions.

MR. LESAR: I would mention just one other matter.

Perhaps the complaint refers to the quality of the -- the lack of quality of the xerox copies already given the plaintiff.

Of the approximately 390 pages of documents that the CIA provided about 364 were newspaper clippings and the quality of the xerox copies are extremely poor. I would like to ask the Government to do something to get us some good copies.

THE COURT: I believe I am familiar with some of those clippings.

MISS DOLAN: I consulted with the Central Intelligence Agency on that point. I think it was directed to them. There were two questions involved and one is whether we should xerox the short pages on the short letter sized paper and the long pages on the long paper, and we found — the determination was made that that is more time-consuming and more costly. I did not discuss with the client the quality of the xeroxing. I don't know if that is the quality of the records in the file or not.

THE COURT: They are quite voluminous also, are they not?

MISS DOLAN: They are voluminous and I understand there are duplications, and it may be that their quality is poor.

THE COURT: I think actually Mr. Lesar has a point and with reference to the release of date 19 August 1976, that is almost illegible.

But what they can do to improve the quality should

be done.

. 13

MISS DOLAN: I will mention that.

THE COURT: All right. That is 10 days for your motion and 60 days for all other motions and completion of discovery.

(Whereupon, the hearing was concluded.)

### CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

It is hereby certified by the undersigned reporter that the foregoing transcript is the official record of the above-entitled matter.

OFFICIAL REPORTER