

Dear Jim,

7/27/83

The transcripts in 78-0322/0420 came today. They are as inventoried on the first page of the first transcript, except that this listing gives the date 3/15/80 for what the transcript itself dates at 3/25.

There appears to be another error that can be important when you file for counsel fees and costs. I think you should ask that it be corrected. It is 1/7/81, page 3, line 9. It says, "As a result of that plaintiff has been held administratively in a number of aspects of his challenge..." Clearly this should read upheld.

I was under the impression that after you and LeHaie conferred in the jury room 3/25/82 there was another session. I have no transcript for after the 11 a.m. session that day. Are others to be provided?

I'm amazed that not once did you say that they had never searched to comply with my requests but had made their own substitution. I made this clear to Metcalfe the day Judge Oberdorfer recused himself and in many affidavits. It may be the most important point of all. The closest you come is vague and does not say this. On 3/25/82, bottom 7 and top of 8: "But the question is we also know some things that have not been provided..."

Re CIA records: in your 7/26 you ask if the attached records were provided by the Office of Security. That is my recollection and if you want me to check farther I will, but if you look at the signature on the first, #18281, name withheld, it is signed "SRS/OS." OS is Office of Security. The attachment, it says, was prepared by the signer. I have no independent recollection of the source of the Ramparts ad to which I was signatory but believe it also was from OS.

I referred you to the records Bud got because they include ordinary flatfooting. That is what the OS does and perhaps Bud's records will reflect that source.

Re the JUNE records in Mark's case: there was but a single sheet with what I got and it was the JUNE sheet. Do you know whether Mark is getting what was provided to HSCA as a result of those FBIHQ inquiries? Please be aware of the fact that insofar as Marcello and others like Garrison and Ferrie are within my requests, the time periods covered by those FBIHQ directives are quite limited and do not by any means include all that is within my litigated requests.

Are you getting the other 0322/0420 transcripts? I believe it is important to refute all misstatements by Le Haie and that this case may hinge on doing so.

I'll now read the Paisley decision and if I see anything, will add it.

Strikes me as an excellent decision. You seem to refer to the Congressional portions when you refer to influence on Mark's case, and that is without doubt so. However, it strikes me that is also an important decision with regard to the exemptions claimed, particularly 1, 3 and 5.... I think there are issues that will be important to others involved in 0322/0420. Suppose Smith holds that they can substitute records of their preference for my requests, or seeks to compel discovery against me, or dismisses or assesses a fine, if only of 1¢? Or that all my many and solicited appeals can be ignored, for all their documentation? It is not merely what he states specifically. It is also the misuse that can be anticipated.

Nothing new. Les' piece is in today's Post, as you may have seen. That I'm staying tired is no new now. I'm staying in during the hottest parts of the day, even napping to cope with it.

By the way, isn't this column useful in defending 1996 fees?

Best,

AV