Dear Jin, re Mark's case for the 6 pix and in 78-0322, 100-10461-1A328 5/29/82
In the course of trying to catch up with what the student filing assistant left untouched, I've just cone across the enclosed, which were attached to the Hall $3 / 16 / 82$, to which these do not pertain.

The copy of the $\mathrm{FD}-340$ provided to me is unnecessamily unclear. $L_{i l}$ will make the best copy of it she can。You may want to ask hillips for a copy that you can read and if you get it, I'd like it.

It says on the morksheet that I got this page ss a result of appeal review of 3-82. I don't know how that coincides with liask's complaint. or requests

If this is one of the 6 withheld pages, then $i t$ would appear that either there are only 5 pix or, because of the refe ence to an "album," there are nore than 5 if more than one appears on each page of the album.

The lower clasuilication revie: st mps can't be inade out at all, but the xing throuch it is visible. The upjer one states that classification was extended 8/29/80, or ofter ny case was before the judge.

The FO gives its source as FBIHQ。
I can't make out the second digit of the serial number, 5?29. If you can get jt íron Thillips it will take less checking by me to locate ito
as you can see, the entire $H D-340$ was never properly subjedt to classification of withholding $Y e$ it continued to be withheld after reviev and when this was before the Court.

Odd that of all the meny metters still ignored so long after my apoeals all of a sudden the FiI cones up with thi and then makes an unclear copy.

I'm sending copies to ${ }^{\text {bitark }}$




