1	IN THE UNITED STATES 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. ) CIVIL ACTION NO. 78-420
11	FEDERAL BUREAU OF ) INVESTIGATION, ET AL., )
12	DEFENDANTS )
13	
	WASHINGTON, D.C.
14	WASHINGTON, D.C.  DECEMBER 10. 1981
	DECEMBER 10, 1981
14	DECEMBER 10, 1981  THE ABOVE-ENTITLED MATTER CAME ON FOR A STATUS
14 15	THE ABOVE-ENTITLED MATTER CAME ON FOR A STATUS HEARING BEFORE THE HONORABLE JOHN LEWIS SMITH, JR., UNITED
14 15 16	DECEMBER 10, 1981  THE ABOVE-ENTITLED MATTER CAME ON FOR A STATUS
14 15 16 17	THE ABOVE-ENTITLED MATTER CAME ON FOR A STATUS  HEARING BEFORE THE HONORABLE JOHN LEWIS SMITH, JR., UNITED  STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, AT 9:30 A.M.
14 15 16 17	THE ABOVE-ENTITLED MATTER CAME ON FOR A STATUS  HEARING BEFORE THE HONORABLE JOHN LEWIS SMITH, JR., UNITED  STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, AT 9:30 A.M.  APPEARANCES:
14 15 16 17 18	DECEMBER 10, 1981  THE ABOVE-ENTITLED MATTER CAME ON FOR A STATUS  HEARING BEFORE THE HONORABLE JOHN LEWIS SMITH, JR., UNITED  STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, AT 9:30 A.M.  APPEARANCES:  JAMES H. LESAR, ESQ.
14 15 16 17 18 19	DECEMBER 10, 1981  THE ABOVE-ENTITLED MATTER CAME ON FOR A STATUS  HEARING BEFORE THE HONORABLE JOHN LEWIS SMITH, JR., UNITED  STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, AT 9:30 A.M.  APPEARANCES:  JAMES H. LESAR, ESQ. FOR THE PLAINTIFF  HENRY LA HAIE, ESQ.
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	DECEMBER 10, 1981  THE ABOVE-ENTITLED MATTER CAME ON FOR A STATUS  HEARING BEFORE THE HONORABLE JOHN LEWIS SMITH, JR., UNITED  STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, AT 9:30 A.M.  APPEARANCES:  JAMES H. LESAR, ESQ. FOR THE PLAINTIFF  HENRY LA HAIE, ESQ. JAMES FIDLER, ESQ. FOR THE DEFENDANTS
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	DECEMBER 10, 1981  THE ABOVE-ENTITLED MATTER CAME ON FOR A STATUS  HEARING BEFORE THE HONORABLE JOHN LEWIS SMITH, JR., UNITED  STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, AT 9:30 A.M.  APPEARANCES:  JAMES H. LESAR, ESQ. FOR THE PLAINTIFF  HENRY LA HAIE, ESQ. JAMES FIDLER, ESQ.

F

## 2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

## PROCEEDINGS

THE DEPUTY CLERK: CIVIL ACTION NO. 78-322, WEISBERG V. WEBSTER.

CIVIL ACTION 78-420, WEISBERG V. THE FBI.

FOR THE PLAINTIFF, JAMES LESAR AND FOR THE DEFENDANT, HENRY LA HAIE AND JAMES FIDLER.

THE COURT: GOOD MORNING.

MR. LESAR: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: WHAT IS THE SITUATION HERE?

MR. LESAR: WELL, YOUR HONOR, AS THE COURT MAY RECALL, IT HAS BEEN -- JAMES H. LESAR FOR THE PLAINTIFF HAROLD WEISBERG.

AS YOUR HONOR MAY RECALL, THERE WAS A SCHEDULE FOR REPROCESSING OF DOCUMENTS THAT WAS SET ABOUT TEN MONTHS AGO, AND I BELIEVE THAT BY THE 1ST OF DECEMBER THE FBI WAS TO HAVE COMPLETED THAT.

IT IS MY UNDERSTANDING THAT IT IS NOT QUITE COMPLETE AND PERHAPS MR. LA HAIE CAN GIVE SOME INDICATION OF JUST HOW MUCH LONGER THAT WILL TAKE.

MR. LA HAIE: HENRY LA HAIE FOR THE DEFENDANT.

THE PROCESSING ADMINISTRATIVELY, YOUR HONOR, HAS BEEN COMPLETED BY THE FBI.

HOWEVER, THERE WERE SEVERAL DOCUMENTS THAT WERE REFERRED TO OTHER AGENCIES IN LIGHT OF THE FACT THAT THEY WERE THOSE AGENCIES' DOCUMENTS AND SEVERAL OF THOSE AGENCIES HAVE NOT YET COMPLETELY PROCESSED THE DOCUMENTS.

I HAVE BEEN IN TOUCH WITH REPRESENTATIVES FROM ALL OF THOSE AGENCIES AND THERE ARE EIGHT IN TOTAL AND ALL HAVE INDICATED TO ME THAT THEY WILL BE PROCESSED SHORTLY OR HAVE BEEN PROCESSED AND ARE IN THE MAIL.

THE COURT: WHAT DOES SHORTLY MEAN?

MR. LA HAIE: MOST, I WOULD SAY, BY THE END OF THIS WEEK OR EARLY NEXT WEEK. THERE WAS ONLY ONE AGENCY, THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE, THEY INDICATED THAT THEY WOULD PROBABLY NEED 30 MORE DAYS BECAUSE QUITE A BIT OF THEIR INFORMATION IN THOSE DOCUMENTS COMES FROM THE CIA AND CONSEQUENTLY THEY HAVE TO CONSULT WITH THE CIA WITH RESPECT TO THAT INFORMATION, MOST OF WHICH IS CLASSIFIED INFORMATION, AND THAT'S WHY THAT AGENCY HAS INDICATED IT WILL TAKE A BIT LONGER THAN THE OTHER AGENCIES INVOLVED.

THE COURT: MR. LESAR, I ASSUME THAT YOU ARE SUGGESTING ANOTHER SHORT CONTINUANCE?

MR. LESAR: WELL, I THINK PERHAPS A LITTLE MORE THAN SHORT FOR ANOTHER REASON THAT WAS NOT TOUCHED ON.

MR. METCALFE AND I HAVE BEEN WORKING OUT SOME OF
THE ISSUES IN THE CASE OTHER THAN THE REPROCESSING, AND I
THINK IN JUNE HE WAS PROMOTED AND WENT TO A NEW POSITION AND
THAT PROCESS SORT OF BROKE DOWN AT THAT POINT, AND THERE ARE
SOME ISSUES THAT I HAVE TAKEN UP WITH HIM THAT HAVE NOT BEEN
RESOLVED.

IN ADDITION, I FEEL THAT I AM GOING TO HAVE TO GO
THROUGH AND MAKE A REVIEW OF THE RECORDS AND MR. WEISBERG'S
VOLUMINOUS CORRESPONDENCE AND TAKE UP SOME NEW ISSUES WITH
THE DEPARTMENT, AND SEE IF WE CAN GET THEM RESOLVED IN THE
SAME MANNER THAT A NUMBER OF ISSUES HAVE BEEN RESOLVED
BETWEEN COUNSEL FOR THE PARTIES.

THE COURT: AS WE DISCUSSED PREVIOUSLY, THIS COMPLAINT GOES BACK TO FEBRUARY OF 1978 AND IT IS CERTAINLY TIME, IN MY OPINION, THAT IT SHOULD BE RESOLVED.

I REALIZE THE PROBLEM YOU ARE CONFRONTED WITH AS FAR AS THE OTHER AGENCIES ARE CONCERNED BUT HOW MUCH OF A CONTINUANCE DO YOU THINK IS REQUIRED?

MR. LESAR: WELL, I WOULD LIKE ABOUT FOUR MONTHS

TO PRESENT THE ISSUES TO THE DEPARTMENT AND IF THERE'S NO

AGREEMENT BETWEEN US, THEN TO PLACE THEM IN FRONT OF THE COURT.

MR. LA HAIE: WE HAVE NO OBJECTION TO THAT, YOUR HONOR.

WE WANT TO EXPEDITE THIS IN LIGHT OF ITS FOUR-YEAR
HISTORY AND THE COURT SHOULD BE AWARE, HOWEVER, THAT 51,000

DOCUMENTS HAVE BEEN RELEASED TO MR. WEISBERG AND THOSE INCLUDE
50,000 INDEX CARDS, AND THAT'S 100,000 ALONE.

JUST IN THE LAST NINE MONTHS, I THINK, I HAVE A

TOTAL OF 6,000 NEW DOCUMENTS THAT HAVE BEEN RELEASED ADMINI
STRATIVELY FROM THE ADMINISTRATIVE APPEAL SO THERE ARE QUITE

A FEW DOCUMENTS INVOLVED.