

Dear Jim,

7/14/84

I've spent much time looking for what I think I remember that will prove another big and deliberate lie in the brief. I believed, and it may be true, that when a Hood girl was helping me and turned out to be pretty punk it might have been misfiled. One who was not here often was a good student and a lousy person. She messed much up.

They claim in the brief, in trying to say that their discovery requests, was not to shift the burden of proof. I think I remember either a pleading or a Phillips declaration stating that the discovery is necessary for them to prove a good faith search, put just about this way. I've not found that. But I've found a 5/83 memo of points and authorities that says this in a different way at several points. It may be that my recollection is of the wrong period and that it was more recent. I'll check later things tomorrow because I'm tired now. In addition to all else a couple of trips to the caller and some bending to search a lowest file drawer.

In writing Lynch today I referred in a way I think he will understand to the Stanton case. I made copies to send him but managed to omit them from the envelopes, to him and to you. I'll mail them to him if I can tomorrow. The problem was outgoing weekend mail. Reagan's efficiency means that they do not even have a skeleton working staff at the main post office for this entire zip code. I called to learn when the last outgoing mail is and the caretaker could not even tell me. So, I had no choice; I dropped everything, made up the mailings, and rushed into town. Even though it goes to Baltimore, which has the local reputation of being the post office's disaster area, Lynch did not ask for enough time, so I had to run the risk.

As of now he has not been in touch with me.

If you can give me a better notion of when DJ claimed in the King case that you use me for your own purposes I'll have a better chance of finding it. One thing I just thought of may be it: in opposing counsel fees.

I also found a place where they admit that they ignored all my appeals on the ground that they were incomprehensible. This admits that they have them. It also can make a problem if a lawyer is willing to make problems for them: they never once wrote me and asked me to explain anything they found "incomprehensible."

Where they say ~~they~~ this they also quote the "JUNE" appeal they claim was typical. As I told Lynch, my only purpose in using it was because I'd just come upon it and it reflected that I'd filed JUNE appeals. It had no other purpose, and it did serve that purpose.

I've put off what I could to be available to Lynch if and when he phoned. I've not taken Ldl grocery shopping. I will in the morning. I've not gone back to the hearing aid place although at least one is defective, that for the worse ear. (\$450 each, too!) I did have the leak in the gas tank fixed and leaves in two broken springs replaced, but I left the car at the shop early in the morning and they returned it when they closed for the day. They took me to the mall for my therapy and a neighbor brought me home, so I merely reduced the length of the therapy to be home. Ldl was here anyway, so he didn't call. I don't understand this liberal belief, that you have a client only so you don't have to confer with him or ask him what he wants to do.

This is my night for special foot care so I must get to it.

Best,