

Mr. Richard K. Huff, co-director
OIP
Department of Justice
Washington, D.C. 20530

4/22/85

Dear Mr. Huff,

I don't know whether having a paralegal respond to communications addressed to you personally is putting of the dog, intended as a putdown or is merely one of your newer stonewalling devices but it does succeed in wasting my time and the government's money and it does stonewall and it again results in assigning a new bottom-of-the-stack number to an ignored appeal now close to a decade old.

But I do commend your titling a woman paralegal as a "specialist." No chauvinist piggery there!

And if you must use form letters, the date of your receipt, given the condition of inside-Department mail, is not helpful, particularly not when the incoming communication bears the date of meaning to the writer.

I take it that your 4/18/85 by Ms. Childs refers to my 4/2/85. With regard to that, the pontifications and self-serving language of the form letter could hardly be more inappropriate.

If anything sticks in your (singular and plural) minds from repetition, it ought be that about a decade ago I filed all-inclusive requests for any and all records on or in any way relating to me. This includes the FBI's search slips. I finally got what clearly are not all these search slips and asked the FBI to, for once, try to be honest and provide them all, and to further document the long-ignored and often-amplified appeal I sent a copy to you. (So much for your form letter's reference to your "attempt to afford each appellant equal and impartial treatment," the alleged basis for assigning a 1985 number to so ancient an appeal. It is 254,713, and I suggest that you reassess it and stop compiling unfaithful records by phony statistics.)


As my 4/2 states, those search slips do not include records that are cited in records that were disclosed to me. The records they do not cite are the subject of specific appeals you persist in ignoring. The apparent reason is that the FBI either lied, which it did do rather frequently, or that the withheld records were favorable to me, which I presume embarrasses it today.

My prior appeals have FBI copies attached and they are, pretty certainly, older than your claimed backlog.

Now if you really want to be other than a rubberstamp, I suggest that you compare these search slips with the FBI's own records, copies of which I've provided your office over the years, and with my other documentation of its withholdings. What I've provided includes the correct file numbers of the information that is pertinent and the FBI first withheld and now does not include in its "search" slips.

I believe that under law, regulation and court decision I am entitled to expedited handling of this ancient matter and I do herewith request it. I'm 72, in poor health, as your office has known for years, this is an ancient matter, and I ought not be denied the opportunity of confronting the official character assassinations, fabrications and assorted abuses of truth, decency and myself.

Sincerely,



Harold Weisberg
7627 Old Receiver Rd.
Frederick, MD 21701