

Other ticklers (to follow Lawn tickler)

With regard to other ticklers, the brief then state of the fr alleged fruit-
lessness of the supposed search for the Lawn tickler, "T his outcome is hardly
surprising since ticklers are merely duplicates of material found in FBI control (sic)
records and are toutinley destroyed within a specified period of time after an
investigation has ended!(page 26) emphasis added.) But this case has not ended. It
is an open file, so on this basis alone the ticklers would not be destroyed,
particularly because they are unique records and hold what is not in the "main" ~~files~~
case file. For example, the Long tickler. Moreover, the case record estaboiishes that
FBI ticklers a decade and a half old were provided to me in another case and are
in the FBI's own public reading room. M In addition, some ticklers in cases such as
this are so important they are transferred, intact, to central records, as the case
record also reflects, without contradiction.

All ticklers also are not duolicates of other existing records which may or may
not have been provided in any case. They contain significant notations that do not
appear on other copies, ve even if provided, as in this c ase they were not.

Affidavit, R. 148, exhibit A. This outcome is hardly surprising, since ticklers are merely duplicates of material found in FBI control records, and are routinely destroyed within a specified period of time after an investigation has ended. Id., ¶ 3. These are the only "divisional files" maintained by the Bureau.

*L. My
nibbed
shows
that per
this is
true*

Plaintiff next contends (Pl. Br. at 38-39) that the FBI should be required to reprocess records processed from FBI field offices pursuant to the August 12, 1977, stipulation between the parties. Plaintiff must be aware, however, that his request nullifies a provision of the stipulation that states:

*not duplicate
then would be*

[d]uplicates of documents already processed at headquarters will not be processed or listed on the worksheets.

(R. 44). As a result of this stipulation, which was duly signed by the district court, the FBI consistently processed and released only those field office records which were not processed at Headquarters, while also releasing from field office files "attachments that are missing from headquarters documents" and "copies of [Headquarters] documents with notations," as provided for by the stipulation.⁹ Plaintiff now requests this Court--as he requested the district court on numerous occasions--to scrap this long-standing agreement by

*not only
checkboxes to
determine*

re-evaluated at outset of proceedings

⁹ Documents bearing routine administrative markings were not processed as "documents with notations". Since all FBI field office documents have such markings, such an interpretation would have made the language of the stipulation meaningless.

*not
true.*

*ticklers
Divisional
duplicates
in subdivision
worksheets*

(5)