

Dear "in,

1/18/83

The McGehee decisions is indeed interesting and helpful.

In addition to the things you mentioned, I found special interest because of possible applicability in some of our cases. And it certainly would be valuable if we can ever get around to filing our entirely unprecedented catalogue of CIA's FOIA horrors!

Page 9, the finding with regard to failure to search "under closely related headings," especially pertinent in the field office cases, right now.

Page 28, "...an agency seeking to shield documents from the public could transfer the documents ~~for~~ for safekeeping..." exactly what I have alleged in these cases and is undenied.

Page 29, where it says that the "agency", in my case FBIHQ, "receiving the documents could likewise resist disclosure" claiming the records were not theirs. They have actually told me to sue FBIHQ, which has failed to act on appeals.

Page 31 says that any agency receiving a request "must take responsibility for processing the request." (All cases!)(Plus the CIA, with requests going back to ~~1971~~ 1971 and many beginning in 1975, none copied with or even searched.

Page 34, "the inconvenience to requesters of being compelled to assert their rights in two or more independent administrative fora and the long delays resulting from the superimposition of two or more processing sequences." What this might not do to the FBI's game of buckpassing, especially between FBIHQ and the field offices.

And, of course, the decision that the agency stonewallings update the request to the time they have to begin processing. (In fact, this has been the DJ practise. They have provided me with 1982 records in response to a 1977 request that was stonewalled for so many years.)

Best,