8/16/80

Ar. S. Rose Duckley Grindnal Division Department of Justice Washington, D.C. 20530

Dear Mr. Buckley.

Tour letter of the 13 and the records referred to in it case today, because I will not be able to read all these records immediately I did read the attached list on which you post exemptions claimed. Once again, by a carbon to "r. Shee, this is my protective appeal. I've been addressing you in the apparently futile hope that you would respond to seriously intended satters rather than continuing the usual Cointelproing of the act, requesters and, in time, the courts.

Once again you redee (b)(5) and (b)(7)(C) questions by those claims. What I have written you in the past includes these claims. With regard to (b)(5) I've asked if the claim is in accord with fairly recent appeals court decisions. With regard to privacy, and particularly with reference to Carrison actions, I've asked you if you have made any effort at all not to withhold the public domain and if your prescribes are in accord with historical-case and 5/5/77 policy statement standards.

With more mortals, as distinguished from those who regard themselves on a special class because they live off the tempeyers, responding to reasonable communication is considered to be common courtesy.

I also inquired about your extraordinarily large percentage of referrals not one of which has been acted on. Perhaps this is not as extraordinary to you because you are only now responding to my 5/21/77 request. If you can unashamedly only now be processing a request of more than three years ago - under a 10-day Maot - perhaps you consider inaction on referrals might and proper.

Some of these referrals are to the CIA. It has yet to respond to my 1971 request/
appeal or to referrals made to it in a 1975 case. Some are to the PEI, which has yet to
adminished requests of more than a decade ago. When this is the record of those who have
made to uphald the law and most their obligations by contemptation disregard for it, and
in this are image because those who, like you, enforce law violations, are in the same

boot, there is what I regard as a salf-purpotential subversion and insurity.

End that not take your non-responsiveness in your last letter to resize up of this.

Here you are a larger, in the Orderinal Division, no less, of the "operation of Justice, and you have, in solution, taken this outh, and only penterday I board a following judge describe your afficient as worthlose. From what I can accross the day before yesterday, that judge predest you call that afficient. Calling it worthlose is predes because it was also follows and a sport age the FMI provided and proof of now false securing by your

If I were a younger men and not in poor houlth I might try to do sociething about much diagraceful conduct by public exployees.

You also have an appeals affice resider blook year non-compliance with my Pa request of now than four years upp and you have depend the request and the resident.

Here you no shows at all, no relf-respect? Here you no empospt of decempty?

It is in the perhaps with hope that you have a sixed of decemy last that I make you set I do not not you to first, get into a position to respect to my inquiries and them to make that response.

You have note injustifiable claim to exceptions, I have informed you of it, and you appear to be proportionally these offeness, at cost that in the because considerable to the government and in contrasphone disregard for the law and your obligations under it, as a larger and as a public analogous.

Yes deal your paycheds. Hill you please start saming it insined of specific in

gradules blend