

JFK assassination records appeal "Arnold Weissberg 2/24/70"
Finney privacy claims
— Covertproving the House assassins committee

The appeal I typed prior to this one is that in which I quote the FBI's alleged historical case standards, standards by which it would not disclose only if there was a reason that was absolute and compelling. The privacy standard required that there be exceptional circumstances in which deeply personal information would be harmful.

So now I come to attached Not Recorded of 3/15/77 in 62-103060.

First withholding is of the names of two FBI officials to whom copies were directed.
(Absolute ~~and~~ compelling or deeply/personal?)

Then we have an obvious fabricator of false information looking for the ~~same~~ favor explicitly asked: dropping the charges on which he was convicted as a quid pro quo for his testifying before the House assassins committee.

This man's name simply must be secret because, according to the records:

He was convicted (no doubt secret charges and secret trial and sentencing)

He participated in the Bay of Pigs invasion. (names of all prisoners disclosed)

In 1975 he was identified with five bombings, four of federal agency offices, including the FBI.

After he was found in Chile and returned from there, he was indicted on 17 additional counts of a bombing nature.

He ~~entered~~ entered a guilty plea in federal district court and was convicted on State ~~nine~~ nine charges, ~~most~~ most of them of similar nature.

So, with this kind of record and his attempt clearly spurious, the FBI recommends that the information be provided to the assassins committee, which it regularly Covertprood. And withholds his name even though there is no statement nor suggestion of confidentiality being asked, offered or being understood.

fn attachment see;

JFK Appeals - Phoney Privacy Claims

The appeal is based on the fact that the appellant has failed to provide any evidence to support his claims that the President's privacy rights were violated. The appellant's claims are based on the fact that the President's name and address were published in the New York Times on June 30, 1963. The appellant claims that this was a violation of the President's privacy rights. The court has held that the President's privacy rights are not absolute and that the public has a right to know who is the President of the United States. The appellant's claims are based on the fact that the President's name and address were published in the New York Times on June 30, 1963. The appellant claims that this was a violation of the President's privacy rights. The court has held that the President's privacy rights are not absolute and that the public has a right to know who is the President of the United States. The appellant's claims are based on the fact that the President's name and address were published in the New York Times on June 30, 1963. The appellant claims that this was a violation of the President's privacy rights. The court has held that the President's privacy rights are not absolute and that the public has a right to know who is the President of the United States.