Hr. Quinlan J. Shea, Director FOLA/PA Appeals Department of Justice Washington, D.C. 20550

Dear Quin,

This is an addition to my appeal relating to the Dallas Field Office JFE assemblation records.

I attack a record that emerged haphamerely from the organize of the records I have selected for other uses from the entire file or records just provided. I explain so you will know that this is an accidental, not a complete illustration.

When I receive such records I keep them as I received them and indicate with paperelips those of which I want copies for other purposes. By alfe, preserving the records as received, then makes the indicated copies. Later I go over the copies she has made (often wondering why I wanted one or two of them).

Decause my wife asked me a question about the attached record a few minutes ago my attention was attracted to it.

It is one of the records to which I referred earlier in alleging new and improper use of (b)(7)(4). It also is a record in which the withheld name was already released by the Fol. I believe that name is Marris.

I have already stated that the field office filed orgics contain information not included on PHING copies. This attached record illustrates some of the kinds of information on field office but not on MC copies.

There is the additional question, what is the need to withhold the name of the source in this, historical case? Hundreds if not thousands of similar names were never withhold, at the outset because Director Hoover ordered that they be undervaliable once the Warren Commission had done the identical thing.

On this the record is clear: the FRI is withholding under FOIA what it did not withhold prior to FOIA. Surely this is not the intent of the act. I would hope it is not the Department's intent. But it has once again become FRI policy.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg