Crimmal-JFK

Mr. Quin Shea, Director
FOIPA Appeals
Department of Justice
Washington, D.C. 20530

10/18/80

Dear Mr. Shea,

When I was hospitalized I phoned to request such additional time as may be necessary for appeals and other such matters. Now that I am home I formalize that request. All the indications are that my prior limitations are greatly increased. There also is a considerable accumulation, a month more of them.

In your letter of 10/9/80, to which you thoughtfully attached copies of my 8/4/80 appeal to you and its attachments, you state that the Civil Division informed you it never received any JFK request from me, that they believe I referred to my PA request, and you suggest that I write Civil Division separately.

With regard to the latter, as I look back on 67 full years I can recall few if any more fruitless endeavors. The letters I have written to Civil without any response, even acknowledgement, are ample testimony to this. That Division has remined nonresponsive for years after I informed it where pertinent and withheld records were kept.

It now is impossible for me to do any file searching. It is my recollection that I filed a general JFK assassination records request of the entire Department, addressed to the Attorney General. I never received any request for specification of any divisions, which indicates that at the time my request was correctly taken to include all components. Some components have provided some records. There also were referrals to Civil.

The second page of my 8/4/80 letter to Mr. Buckley, also sent to you as an appeal, cites specific Civil Division records not provided by it. So does the third paragraph of my 8/4/80 appeal addressed to you. There are other pertinent records I am confident Civil Division does not want to disclose. Among these are records pertaining to what the Department has styled the Garrison follies. And among these in particular are records pertaining to the case of Louisiana v. Shaw, particularly the case in D.C. Superior Court.

While I have welcomed the information I have received as a result of it I have always regretted the disenchantment of members of the families of federal employees as a result

of what these employees did and did not do when the President was assassinated and that crime was investigated. At the time of Louisiana v Shaw and particularly as it pertains to the autopsy there was disagreement about right and wrong within Civil Division and there was family distress over this.

While Garrison did prevail in Superior Court he then abandoned that litigation after the Department announced it would appeal.

It also is my recollection that I filed appeals with Civil Division when it did not provide information. If my recollection is accurate, then it follows that Civil Division was aware of a request.

If Civil Division persists in claiming that I filed no request because it is impossible for me to do any file searching it can date my request as of the time of my first appeal and can process the pertinent records as though my first appeal was my request.

Civil Division does acknowledge my PA request. It also was a Department-wide request - of four years ago. I still await compliance with that request.

I am aware of a thin mailing from it that came when I was hospitalized. I have not had time to read it. However, the scantiness of the content indicates that it cannot represent compliance.

Some years ago I provided your Ms. Linda Robinson with a considerable amount of information pertaining to my ignored requests that various components claimed not to be able to locate. Perhaps she then found the request in question.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg