Dear Jim, You and C.U. v Fed. Res. Bd. 6/29/76

I think I understood this decision well enough to ask you to find time you do not have to file for yourself. We've talked about this often. Give up some reading, some clipping, and file a suit that will not require such time for the Complaint, if it is disputed, and will give you a ball in time. Plusses to which you are entitled.

Consider adding to virtually all the grafts of the decision several others in terms of national usefulness:

I should have begun by recommending 2052-73, which is a 1974 decision and if there is a two-year statute without much time.

It is the first you handled by yourself and under this decision a case prior to the amended law is legit.

There are political reasons why anyone but a dumdum running the government would not want your sequest to go to court. This is the year of our Ford, for one thing. I'd not say that. I'd say this was a non-profit, pro bono case in which the public information obtained was made completely available and quoted and cited more than just millions of times. You can attach the Post and SP copy, Anson's book, New Times, you name it.

But I'd be sure to include an indication of the importance of the transcript in a representative society and

as forerunner of the Congressional intelligence investigations. Here you have an abundance of juicy quotes.

Rhoads lied. He represented the government and forced the case to trial without need or cause.

Under path he later admitted the lie.

I'm sure than by any reasonable standard you spent more than \$5,000 hours of time on this case.

Ask for it.

Blease.