

FBI

Date: 10/6/67

Transmit the following in _____
(Type in plaintext or code)

Via AIRTEL _____
(Priority)

TO: DIRECTOR, FBI

FROM: SAC, CHICAGO [REDACTED]

SUBJECT: [REDACTED]
EXTORTION

On 10/5/67, victim, attorney for First National Bank, Chicago, appeared Chicago office and advised as follows:

He resides at [REDACTED] Lake Bluff, Illinois. On 10/4/67, at his employment, he received two collect calls from a [REDACTED] from St. Louis, Missouri. Inasmuch as he did not recognize these names, he told his secretary he would not accept the calls.

On 10/5/67, at his office, he received the following described postcard:

Postmarked "SAINT LOUIS, MO./ 1A 4 OCT 1967" with hand printed address "First National Bank Monroe & Clark Chicago Ill". The reverse of the card had the following hand printed message: [REDACTED], You know you were behind the Spocksman that gave the order to kill President Kennedy in 63 Send 6½ to Southwest Bank as it was understood [REDACTED].

He believed the word "Spocksman" was meant to be "spokesman". He had no knowledge of a [REDACTED] or what the message on the card meant. He noted he was instructed to "send 6½ to Southwest Bank as it was understood" and said this sentence had absolutely no meaning to him. He has never received similar cards. He was

3 - Bureau
1 - Chicago

JAP/TFK
(4)

62-109060

NOT RECORDED
199 OCT 11 1967

OCT 9 1967

Approved: _____
Special Agent in Charge

Sent _____ M Per _____

ORIGINAL FILED IN 67-1-3260

[REDACTED]

advised that if he desired protection, he should notify the Chicago and Lake Bluff Police Departments of the card and said he would do so. He made the card available to the FBI. He said if he received any other communications from [REDACTED] he would immediately advised the FBI.

On 10/5/67, the above facts were presented to Assistant United States Attorney THOMAS N. TODD by SA JAMES A. POND and Mr. TODD stated the card did not contain a threat within the purview of the Extortion Statute and declined prosecution. He requested he be immediately informed if victim receives similar communications.

In view of AUSA's opinion, no further investigation contemplated. AUSA opinion confirmed separately.

Victim was advised of AUSA opinion 10/5/67. Victim's description maintained in Chicago file.