

Dear Jim, DJ Supp, Motion to Dismiss in 75-2155

1/24/78

It is clear to me from what I find in the memo of points and authorities when I add it to what we can that we can expect some extortion of vengeance. They ~~will~~ have the power and the disposition. We want to watch for this because I think that in the end it will work against them.

They ran some risks in this. They even misquòtè Robinson's Fitzgibbon decision when they have it attached as an exhibit.

To do this they had to write the word "sole" into the Act as it relates to discretion.(3) And next (4), contrary to the decision and Act, the claim that no judicial review is available.

With this their calim they did not appeal?

They misrepresent the costs involved, trying to allocate to the costs of providing me with a copy all of the costs involved in the release. Gesell was quite kind in asking them no more than the actual cost of the xeroxing only, which is the only cost they had.

They have already helped us and accredited me anew and uniquely, saying that as "considered general policy" they have rejected all other requests for any cost remission. This means, when they offered me 40% off, that they found that I serve the public interest more than AP, UPI and all others who asked for cost waivers.

Ù think this will hurt them in the same situation in the "ing case.

There is a kind of hint in that part. They do not say they have made a deposit of it anywhere else. "ark my words, they will now do it or something like it just to hurt me. his is a way of doing it that makes them look good or puts them in a position to so represent themselves.

Meanwhile, they've kept me tied up in court so I can't write, can't put the material I have obtained together.

It really is all vindictiveness.

So don't be surprised at more of it.

If and when it happens let us then be looking not for vengeance in return but for what they will have done that can help us. I think it will exist.

astily,