

Addendum relating to 105-82553-2270, which is also H.O. 100-10601, Dallas 100-10451 and Ottawa 163-364:

The field office copies are withheld as "previously processed." But the HQ version, of two pages, has one withheld. What little appeared on the cover page is totally withheld. The worksheet alleged (b)(1). Certainly the subject matter was reasonably segregable, or the identification of the subject, particularly with the disclosure involved in the file number for police cooperation. (Section 92)

2040 got his books on all three copies and sent the attached 0-79 to Dallas and the New Orleans on 7/12/77, when he made the initial classification of ^{the} 1964 record.

(I repeat that prior to 1977 case supervisor, John Howard, testified to the supervision of three prior reviews of this file so the failure to classify earlier was neither oversight nor the FBI's alleged practice of not classifying the classified ~~unclassified~~ records it held.)

⁴initially, DHRU rubber-stamped.

There is an alleged explanation of the withholding of the page attached to the 0-79. (Both attached.) It is "all containing the investigative agency." This not only is not the language of the Act, it is not accurate because more than the investigative agency, already disclosed, is withheld.

Does it appear likely to you that the Legat provided a page on which he did no thing but repeat "CONF"?

In fact the one bit of information that is NOT withheld is the information for which the phoney (b)(1) claim is made.