

Ms. Carolyn D. Poindexter, paralegal specialist  
OLP/OIP/7238 Main  
Department of Justice  
Washington, D.C. 20530

7627 Old Receiver Road  
Frederick, Md. 21701  
7/17/89

Dear Ms. Poindexter, re what should not be #89-1077

From your form letter of 7/7/89 it is apparent that the government is wasting money by hiring paralegal specialists for what can be done at least as well and at least as accurately by referrals from the association for the retarded.

You do not even spell my name correctly (which can help with misfiling and further stonewalling), no doubt because <sup>I</sup> was both typed and printed correctly.

You refer to my letter not by its date, which I know, but ~~me~~ by when it got to your office, which I do not know. It was dated 6/25/89.

And why do you give it a new, 1989 number? Because it states specifically that it is NOT a new appeal but is the subject of "repeated appeals going back some 15 years." This is amplified in the attachment that is part of the renewed appeal, my letter of the same day to the FBI.

One of the matters I appealed is the deliberate violation of my rights under FOI and PA in the disclosure of defamatory records relating to me to others, in apparent contradiction also of the Department's and the FBI's <sup>no copy</sup> filing ~~referred~~ to in Stone v. FBI, CAB7-1346 CRR. This includes disclosure to others of information, if I may use that word, that defames me while it remains withheld from me under my 1975 requests the appeals of which I renewed regularly since then. For the most part they were and they remain ignored.

As I say in my <sup>short</sup> letter that I presume you read before flailing your ever-handy rubber stamp, people in your office should have personal knowledge. This includes those at the top, to whom I wrote and who signed the letters to me. I do not recognize them as responses and they were not.

I therefore also ask that you take this up with those who head your office and that you or they respond stating whether or not this is a new appeal to go at the bottom of your stack or is certainly one of your oldest, if not the very oldest, and ought get immediate action.

Particularly when I am the "subject" of the requests and disclosures and can be defamed by them beyond remedy.

I think also, this much harm having been done me already by violations of both Acts, that I should be informed immediately of the requests and the requesters.

Sincerely,



Harold Weisberg