

Dear Bud,

7/31/85

You must have gotten a good laugh after, perhaps, initial perplexity, when Jim told you that in my field offices case DJ has just included Weld as USA for the DC.

It is not only that crazy, it is that typical - of their carelessness in this litigation I think mostly <sup>because</sup> ~~because~~ they are before the fink Smith and know he'll tolerate anything and rubberstamp everything. It is the useful potential of this that I write you about. I believe we had a brief discussion of this when you were here, but since then there have been additional developments.

There is absolutely no doubt that I have them firmly nailed on fraud and misrepresentation and no reasonable doubt that I have them nailed also on perjury, and on relatively narrow issues. I mean by this to distinguish it from the identical situation in the case itself because I am referring to only their conduct in getting a judgement against me based on their fraudulent and false representations about what they called "discovery."

While he still represented me Mark Lynch agreed with my interpretation and approach and, in fact, was going to do it himself. However, regardless of any other reasons, and I think these do exist, he had already been in the case much longer than he had agreed. And before any of this new stuff he had agreed that their misconduct ought be actionable and said that while he could not handle it he'd be glad to help.

Jim has copies of everything I've done except what I'm correcting now so I can ~~xxx~~ make copies and file it and he'll have that when he gets back. I expect to mail tomorrow. It will not take long to read this stuff, beginning perhaps with the last, and their Opposition to which it responds, which Jim has already. My original Motion ought not take a half hour to read. It is a little longer.

If this can get any attention much good can result. It is because the FBI and DJ have ample reason to assume that there will be no attention that they dare pull this dirty stuff.

I've also done the obvious, to OPR, which is silent, and I'm doing the not so obvious and making formal complaint to the USA- i.e., Weld! I've told him that he has to get someone else who is impartial because of the personal and office involvements, too. This aspect is real man biting dog. Dirty dog at that.

It does not require much work of a reporter and I'm hoping that you will find time to get one of your friends in the press interested. There is no prospect at the Times or Post, which have had copies of all.

Meanwhile, the future will bring what it brings. I do not expect anything favorable from Smith and I suppose that I'll go up on appeal and that what will follow will then be determined. I believe that with the solidity of the fact some kind of success may not be impossible; and fraud, perjury and misrepresentation are serious charges.

I am aware that I can file a new action and in what I'm about to file I make a broad hint that I may do this in a different jurisdiction. Where I live, which would eliminate the DC appeals court. There the case would be a fraud case, under Rule 60(b). My own nonlawyer's view is that the stuff is solid enough to seek in addition money damages, and I wish it were possible for me to go see Hirschkop because, if he hasn't changed radically, he could get interest and have some fun.

So, I hope you can find to see for yourself and then will try to interest some of your reporter friends.

Best,