5/21/77 Crm

8/16/80

Hr. S. Ross Duckley Griminal Division Department of Justice Washington, D.C. 20530

Dear Mr. Buckley,

Your letter of the 13 and the recents referred to in it case today. Because I will not be able to read all these recents immediately I did read the attached list on which you post exceptions claimed. Once again, by a carbon to "r. Shea, this is my protective appeal. I've been addressing you in the apparently futile hope that you would respond to seriously intended matters rather than continuing the usual Cointelproing of the act, requesters and, in time, the courts.

Once again you redue (b)(5) and (b)(7)(C) questions by those claims. What I have written you in the past includes these claims. With regard to (b)(5) I've asked if the claim is in accord with fairly recent appeals court decisions. With regard to privacy, and particularly with reference to ^Garrison matters, I've asked you if you have made any effort at all not to withhold the public domain and if your prectises are in accord with historical-case and 5/5/77 policy statement standards.

With more mortals, as distinguished from these who regard themselves as a special class because they live off the taxpeyors, responding to reasonable communication is considered to be common courtesy.

I also inquired about your extraordinarily large percentage of referrals not one of which has been acted on. ^Perhaps this is not as extraordinary to you because you are only now responding to my 5/21/77 request. If you can unashanedly only now be processing a request of more than three years ago - under a 10-day Maot - perhaps you consider inaction on referrals might and proper.

Some of these referrals are to the CIA. It has yet to respond to my 1971 request/ appeal or to referrals made to it in a 1975 case. Some are to the FEL, which has yet to admostledge requests of mere then a decade ago. When this is the record of these who have makes to uphald the law and most their obligations by contemptuous disregard for it, and in this are immune because these who, like you, enforce law violations, are in the same boat, there is neat I regard as a saif-perpetuating subversion and incarity.

We did not take your non-respondiveness in your last latter to resist as of this. Here you are a larger, in the Original Division, no less, of the "opertment of Justice, and you have, in addition, taken this outh, and only pesterday I heard a folgeri judge describe your affidavit as worthloss. From what I ren accross the day before yesterday, that judge predect you and that affidavit. Calling it worthless is predect because it was also false, and a month ago the FRI provided new proof of new false securing by you.

If I were a younger men and not in poor boalth I might tay to do something about such disgreeesful conduct by public exployees.

You also have an appeals affice reminder blant your non-compliance with my PA request of none time four yours app and you have ignored the request and the resinders.

lister you as above at all, so celf-respect? Here you as annoapt of decency?

It is in the perhaps win hope that you have a skeed of decempy left that I make you as I do not ask you to first, get into a position to respend to by inquiries and toom to make that response.

You have node unjustifiable claims to exceptions, I have informed you of it, and you appear to be purpolable; these sifences, at cost that in the bacase considerable to the government and in contraptions disregard for the las and your oblightions under it, as a larger and as a public angleyoe.

Yau cash your paycheds. Will you places start seming it insteal of steeling iv? Sinceredy.

liarold Weigherry