1	IN THE UNITED ST	TATES DISTRICT COURT
2	FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	
3	HAROLD WEISBERG,	
4	PLAINTIFF,)
5	v.	CIVIL ACTION NO. 78-322
6	WEBSTER, ET AL.,	
7	DEFENDANTS)	
8	HAROLD WEISBERG,)
9	PLAINTIFF)	
10) v.	
11	FEDERAL BUREAU OF	CIVIL ACTION NO. 78-420
12	INVESTIGATION, ET AL.,)	
13	DEFENDANTS.)	·
14		WASHINGTON, D.C.
15		OCTOBER 14, 1980
16	THE ABOVE-ENTITLED MATTER CAME ON FOR A STATUS	
17	HEARING BEFORE THE HONORABLE JOHN LEWIS SMITH, JR., UNITED	
18	STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, AT 9:30 A.M.	
19	APPEARANCES:	
20	JAMES LESAR, ESQ.	
21	FOR THE PLAINTIFF	
22	DANIEL METCALFE, ESQ. JAME'S FIDLER, FROM THE FBI	
23	FOR THE DEFENDANTS	
24	DAWN T. COPELAND	
25	OFFICIAL	COURT REPORTER

PROCEEDINGS

THE DEPUTY CLERK: CIVIL ACTION NO. 78-420. WEISBERG V. THE FBI.

CIVIL ACTION 78-322, WEISBERG V. WEBSTER.

JAMES LESAR FOR THE PLAINTIFF AND DANIEL METCALFE
AND JAMES FIDLER FOR THE DEFENDANTS.

THE COURT: GOOD MORNING.

MR. LESAR: GOOD MORNING.

MR. METCALFE: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR.

I AM DANIEL METCALFE FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE ON BEHALF OF THE DEFENDANT, FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION.

ALSO WITH ME AT COUNSEL TABLE THIS MORNING IS MR.

JAMES FIDLER OF THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION.

AS YOUR HONOR MAY RECALL, THESE TWO CONSOLIDATED

CASES ARE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT CASES WHICH PLAINTIFF

SEEKS ACCESS TO THE FBI'S RECORDS OF THE KENNEDY ASSASSINATION

AT THE DALLAS AND THE NEW ORLEANS FIELD OFFICES.

YOUR HONOR HAS BEEN VERY PATIENT WITH THIS CASE
TO ALLOW THE PROCESSING OF THE DOCUMENTS AS WELL AS THE
ADMINISTRATIVE APPEAL.

WE ARE DEALING WITH MANY, MANY THOUSANDS OF DOCUMENTS

AS YOUR HONOR MIGHT SURMISE IN THIS MATTER, IN FACT, WE HAVE

INDEX CARDS AT THE DALLAS FIELD OFFICE AND THEY AMOUNT TO

APPROXIMATELY 52,000 CARDS THEMSELVES.

WHEN WE WERE LAST BEFORE YOUR HONOR WE HAD BELIEVED

THE ADMINISTRATIVE APPEAL PROCESS WOULD BE COMPLETED BY THIS TIME.

3

4

5

6

THE PARTIES WERE IN AGREEMENT THAT THE APPROPRIATE COURSE IN THIS MATTER WAS TO ALLOW THE ADMINISTRATIVE APPEAL TO CONCLUDE AND THEN TO SEE WHERE WE WERE SO THAT WE COULD THEN LITIGATE THE CASE OR PROCEED WITH ANY MATTER PRIOR TO LITIGATION.

7 8

9

11

10

12 13

14

15

16 17

19

20

22

23

24

25

I HAVE ADVISED REGRETTABLY THAT THE ADMINISTRATIVE APPEAL PROCESS HAS NOT YET BEEN COMPLETED BUT HOWEVER I AM ADVISED BY THE DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF THE PRIVACY INFORMATION APPEALS FOR THE JUSTICE DEPARTMENT THAT THEY ARE RIGHT ON THE VERGE OF THE COMPLETION OF THAT PROCESS AND THAT IT SHOULD BE APPROXIMATELY THREE OR FOUR MORE WEEKS, BY WHICH TIME IT WOULD BE CONCLUDED AND WE WOULD KNOW WHERE WE STAND.

JUST TO BUILD INTO THAT A SAFETY FACTOR, I HAVE SUGGESTED TO MR. LESAR THAT IT MIGHT BE APPROPRIATE TO HAVE ANOTHER STATUS CALL ON THIS MATTER IN ABOUT FIVE OR SIX WEEKS AND MR. LESAR HAS ADVISED ME THAT HE WILL BE OUT OF TOWN FOR A WHILE AND THAT IT MIGHT BE APPROPRIATE TO HAVE THE NEXT STATUS CALL ON DECEMBER 2ND, AT WHICH POINT THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESS SHOULD BE COMPLETED AND WE WILL KNOW EXACTLY WHERE WE STAND.

ONE OTHER MATTER IS THAT SINCE WE WERE LAST BEFORE YOUR HONOR THE FBI HAS COMPLETED THE PROCESSING OF THE 52,000 INDEX CARDS. IT TOOK A LITTLE BIT LONGER THAN THE FBI EXPECTED

5 6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

BUT I AM ADVISED THAT THEY HAVE CONCLUDED THAT PROCESSING JOB LAST WEEK.

THEY HAVE A FEW LINGERING REFERRALS OF DIFFERENT AGENCIES THAT HAVE BEEN RECALCITRANTIN RESPONDING BUT I HAVE BEEN ADVISED THAT THEY ARE PURSUING VERY VIGOROUSLY AS WELL.

THE COURT: MR. LESAR?

MR. LESAR: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR.

YOUR HONOR, I AM IN AGREEMENT THAT WE SHOULD SET ANOTHER STATUS CALL AS SOON AS POSSIBLE AFTER THE COMPLETION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE APPEAL AND THE DATE OF DECEMBER 2ND APPEARS TO BE THE BEST FOR COUNSEL, THE PLAINTIFF AND THE DEFENDANT.

> THE COURT: THAT WOULD BE IN BOTH OF THE CASES? MR. LESAR: YES, YOUR HONOR.

THERE IS ONLY ONE OTHER MATTER THAT I WISH TO CALL THE COURT'S ATTENTION TO AND THE PROCESSING AND THE RELEASE OF THE INDEX CARDS HAS TAKEN FAR LONGER THAN WE WERE ASSURED, AND I HAVE TAKEN SOME PAINS TO TRY TO ASSURE THAT THE RELEASE WOULD BE HANDLED IN A MANNER THAT WOULD NOT ABUSE MY CLIENT BECAUSE IN THE PAST, IN ANOTHER CASE, HE HAD BEEN ABUSED BY THE RELEASE OF THE VAST VOLUME OF DOCUMENTS AT THE VERY LAST MINUTE BEFORE A STATUS CALL IN PACKAGES TOO LARGE FOR HE OR HIS WIFE TO HANDLE.

I WAS ALSO AWARE OF MY CLIENT'S SERIOUS MEDICAL PROBLEMS WHICH MAKE IT DIFFICULT FOR HIM TO WALK UP AND DOWN

MR. WEISBERG IS IN FACT AT THIS MOMENT IN THE HOSPITAL.

HE HAS BEEN IN THE HOSPITAL FOR THE LAST THREE WEEKS WITH

THE EXCEPTION OF ONE DAY DUE TO A VERY SERIOUS OPERATION,

AN ARTERIAL BYPASS OPERATION OF THE LEG.

THE COURT: I AM SORRY TO HEAR THAT.

MR. LESAR: THANK YOU.

IN JUNE, BECAUSE I BECAME CONCERNED THAT THE FBI
WAS NOT RELEASING THE INDEX CARDS ON ANY SORT OF A SCHEDULE,
I WROTE MR. METCALFE AND SAID THAT I WANTED TO PREVENT THE
DUMPING OF A LOT OF THESE INDEX CARDS ON HIM.

AT THAT POINT, 5,000 OF THE APPROXIMATELY 50,000 CARDS HAD BEEN PROCESSED AND RELEASED TO HIM ON MARCH 15TH OF THIS YEAR.

MR. METCALFE PROMPTLY RESPONDED TO MY COMPLAINT AND SAID HE HAD GOTTEN IN TOUCH WITH THE FBI AND THAT THE DOCUMENTS WOULD BE RELEASED IN ADVANCE OF THE STATUS CALL AND IT WOULD BE DONE IN REASONABLE SEGMENTS.

NO FURTHER DOCUMENTS WERE RECEIVED -- INDEX CARDS

WERE RECEIVED UNTIL AUGUST WHERE HE RECEIVED SEVERAL HUNDRED

AND AGAIN IN SEPTEMBER, SEVERAL HUNDRED MORE.

AT THAT TIME I AGAIN NOTED THAT IT WOULD NOW BE IMPOSSIBLE TO COMPLY WITH THE PROMISE THAT THEY WOULD BE RELEASED IN A REASONABLE MANNER.

AS A MATTER OF FACT, AS A RESULT OF MY PROTEST AND

> 17 18 19

20

21

15

16

22 23

24

25

APPARENTLY AS A RESULT OF THE FBI'S PREVIOUS PLANS, SOME THIRTY-FIVE TO FORTY THOUSAND CARDS WERE RELEASED IN A PERIOD OF A WEEK OR TEN DAYS IN LARGE BOXES UP IN FREDERICK, MARYLAND TO MRS. WEISBERG, WHO NOW HAS ALL OF THESE INDEX CARDS WHICH SHE CANNOT MOVE.

AGAIN -- BECAUSE OF THIS IT SEEMS TO ME, IN VIEW OF MR. WEISBERG'S PREVIOUS VEHEMENT PROTEST TO THE FBI, ABOUT THIS VERY THING, IN ANOTHER CASE, TWO YEARS AGO, YOUR HONOR, THAT THIS IS AN INTENTIONAL VIOLATION OF THE COMMITMENTS THAT WERE MADE TO US BY MR. METCALFE AND IN VIEW OF THAT, IF THERE ARE FURTHER DOCUMENTS TO BE RELEASED IN THIS CASE, WE WILL BE ASKING THE COURT TO SET A SCHEDULE FOR THE RELEASE AND THE MANNER TO BE RELEASED, SO THERE WILL BE NO QUESTION THAT THIS WILL NOT BE REPEATED.

THE COURT: NOW, MR. LESAR, WHEN YOU SAY IN ANOTHER CASE TWO YEARS AGO, DID THOSE INVOLVE THE SAME DOCUMENTS?

MR. LESAR: NO. THEY INVOLVED DIFFERENT DOCUMENTS. IN THAT CASE I HAD ENTERED INTO A STIPULATION WITH THE GOVERNMENT COUNSEL THAT THEY WOULD PROCESS THE FIELD OFFICE FILES OF THE FBI WITH RESPECT TO THE KING ASSASSINATION AND THAT THEY WOULD DO SO BY CERTAIN DATES.

THEY MET THE DATE BUT THE STIPULATION EXPLICITLY REQUIRED THAT THEY BE RELEASED IN REASONABLE SEGMENTS SO AS TO PREVENT THIS THING FROM HAPPENING AND IN THAT CASE THEY RELEASED DOCUMENTS AT THE LAST MOMENT BEFORE THEIR STIPULATED

1

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11 12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

DEADLINE IN AN ENORMOUS VOLUME AND MY CLIENT WAS OUTRAGED BY THIS AND WE DO WANT TO PUT A STOP TO IT, AND I EXPECT THAT THERE ARE GOING TO BE MORE DOCUMENTS RELEASED IN THE FUTURE.

THE COURT: MR. METCALFE?

MR. METCALFE: YOUR HONOR, IF I MAY, I WOULD JUST LIKE TO BRIEFLY RESPOND TO THE FINAL POINT MADE BY MR. LESAR.

MR. LESAR AND I HAVE BEEN COOPERATING AS BEST AS I POSSIBLY CAN IN THIS CASE TO TRY TO ACCOMMODATE WHATEVER REQUESTS HE HAS MADE ON BEHALF OF THIS CLIENT FOR THE RELEASE OF THESE LARGE VOLUMES OF INFORMATION.

WHAT HE HAS SAID IS SUBSTANTIALLY CORRECT AND HE DID CONTACT ME IN JUNE AND SUGGESTED THAT WE TRY TO STAGGER THE RELEASE AND I REQUESTED THAT THE BUREAU TRY TO STAGGER THEM IN AS MANY SMALL RELEASES AS POSSIBLE.

REGRETTABLY, AS I POINTED OUT TO HIM IN MY LETTER OF SEPTEMBER 25TH, REGRETTABLY THE BUREAU IN ITS EFFORT TO TRY TO GET THESE 52,000 INDEX CARDS TO HIM, THEY HAD A REPRODUCTION BACKLOG AND THEY HAVE NOT BEEN ABLE TO GET IT OUT AS QUICKLY OR AS STAGGEREDLY, AS IT WERE, AS THEY HAD HOPED.

THERE IS NO QUESTION BUT THAT THEY HAD HOPED TO DO BETTER BUT THEY HAD DONE THE BEST THEY POSSIBLY CAN AND THE IMPORTANT POINT IS THAT THEY HAVE PROCESSED AND RELEASED THESE CARDS.

WE WOULD HOPE TO COOPERATE WITH MR. LESAR IN THE

g

FUTURE AS BEST AS WE POSSIBLY CAN BUT I DO BELIEVE THAT THIS

HAS BEEN IN NO WAY INTENTIONAL. MR. WEISBERG HAS BEEN DEALING

WITH THE FBI FOR A LONG TIME AND THIS WAS NOT INTENTIONAL

AND WE HAVE BEEN TRYING TO DO THE BEST AS WE POSSIBLY CAN.

THE COURT: MR. LESAR?

MR. LESAR: YOUR HONOR, MR. METCALFE HAS ALWAYS
BEEN VERY PROMPT AND EFFICIENT IN RESPONDING AND HE HAS
RESPONDED TO MY COMPLAINTS ABOUT THIS. I HAVE ABSOLUTELY
NO COMPLAINT AT ALL ABOUT MY DEALINGS WITH MR. METCALFE.

THE PROBLEM IS, AS MR. METCALFE HAS NOTED, THAT

MR. WEISBERG HAS BEEN DEALING WITH THE FBI FOR A LONG TIME

AND THERE IS A CERTAIN AMOUNT OF TENSION BETWEEN THEM.

WE HAVE, IN FACT, GOTTEN DOCUMENTS THAT SHOW THAT
THERE WAS A DELIBERATE POLICY ON THE FBI'S PART IN THE PAST
ABOUT NOT RESPONDING -- TO EVEN RESPONDING TO MR. WEISBERG'S
REQUESTS AND IT IS APPARENT THAT THERE IS VEHEMENT DISLIKE
OF MR. WEISBERG IN THE FBI, AND THAT, OF COURSE, GIVES THEM
MOTIVE FOR THIS TYPE OF BEHAVIOR.

MR. METCALFE HAS PROVIDED ME WITH SOME OF THE DETAILS.

I HAVE REQUESTED THAT HE PROVIDE ME DETAILS ON THE PROCESSING

AND THE RELEASE OF THESE DOCUMENTS.

MR. WEISBERG SIMPLY DOES NOT BELIEVE THE EXPLANATION
THAT HE HAS BEEN GIVEN AS TO WHY THESE CARDS WERE NOT RELEASED
TO HIM SOONER AND IT APPEARS FROM THE FACT THAT ON AUGUST
8TH, FOR EXAMPLE, AND IT MAY EVEN BE AUGUST 10TH, BUT THEY

RELEASED A FEW HUNDRED CARDS TO HIM AT THAT TIME AND THAT
THEY HAD COMPLETED CARDS AT THAT TIME AND THERE IS NO WAY
THAT I CAN CONCEIVE OF THAT THE BACKLOG TOOK ANOTHER TWO MONTHS
BEFORE THEY RELEASED ANY SUBSTANTIAL GREATER NUMBER OF CARDS.

MR. METCALFE HAS ADVISED ME THAT THE PROCESSING

OF THE DOCUMENTS OF THE ENTIRE 52,000 CARDS WAS COMPLETED

BY SEPTEMBER 18TH. IF THAT'S THE CASE, GIVEN THE FACT THAT

IT HAS TAKEN NEARLY, I THINK, TWO YEARS TO PROCESS THE 52,000,

OBVIOUSLY THERE WERE A SUBSTANTIAL NUMBER OF CARDS THAT HAD

BEEN PROCESSED LONG PRIOR TO THAT DATE AND WERE AVAILABLE

FOR XEROXING.

THAT IS WHY WE SIMPLY DON'T BELIEVE THE EXPLANATION
THAT HAS BEEN PROFFERED.

I MIGHT ADD THAT I WOULD LIKE TO ASK THAT THE FBI PROVIDE A WRITTEN EXPLANATION FOR THE DELAY.

THE COURT: I CAN SEE THE PROBLEM BOTH WAYS IN THIS

CASE. FROM THE STANDPOINT OF THESE TWO CASES THAT HAVE BEEN

CONSOLIDATED, I THINK BOTH SIDES HAVE PROCEEDED IN GOOD FAITH.

I THINK THAT MR. METCALFE HAS FULLY COOPERATED.

WE WILL SET THAT NEXT STATUS FOR DECEMBER 2ND AT 9:30. IS THAT AGREEABLE?

MR. LESAR: YES.

MR. METCALFE: YES.

THE COURT: THERE ARE 52,000 CARDS. CAN YOU

APPROXIMATE THE NUMBER OF DOCUMENTS INVOLVED OR PAGES INVOLVED