Other chancy appeals in Appeals file

C.A.78-03221 Withhold by dirty tricks, in part and in toto BW 7/18/78

In my initial review of the records that reached me 6/28/73, a review to indicate which pages I wanted copied for other uses, my attention was taken by two that refer to Dallas Hotorcycle Policemen James James H. Chaney. From Dallas files 89-43 these are Serials 9446 and, in reverse chronological order, 9570.

My interest in Chancy dates to 1964. Two are incorporated in <u>Whitewash</u>, completed 2/15/65.On reading these two Dallas records my interest was further attracted by a gross and deliberate lie - that Chancy had never been interviewed. Couched, however, to make a different interpretation possible.

In this I also address possible notive in the sudden burst of withholding of the names of SAs after more than half the Dallas file was processed without excisions of SA names.

The name obliterated from 9614, I'm certain, is Charles T. Brown, Jr. Brown is one of the SAs who worked on the JFK investigation.

The lie is on p. 2 of 9614. It is that Dallas indices and references from Dallas indices regarding the assassination fail to indicate that CHANEY was interviewed by Agents of this Bureau following the assassination."

At the bottom of the first page Brown quotes Lt. Jack Revill as saying "Chaney told REVILL that he had never been interviewed by anyone following the assassination to obtain his observations as a witness." "The addition of "to obtain his observations as a witness, "referring to the assassination, is important. I doubt it is Chaney's exact language because he WAS interviewed to OBTAIN HIS OBSERVATIONS AS A WITNESS & BUT to an ethiraly differnt observation (Caps from ribbon fault, not emphasis intended.)

On 12/26/63 Chaney was interviewed by SA Raymond H. Lester, whose report is page 652 of one of the earliest consolidated reports, I think the very first, CD 4. Although flags Chaney was one of the outriding DFD motorcycles escorts he is the ONLY one not used as a Commission witness and about whom I could never find any FEI report. Now these were the closest of eyevitnesses. The others were called. In addition, as I state in Whitewash, in the opinion of Officer Studebaker Chaney had done some work that appeared to have significance. Studebaker's lead was never followed.

From Lester's report all he saked Chaney about is having seen ack Ruby the day after JFK was killed and the day before Ruby killed Oswald.

Now the FEI was so exhaustive it conducted special hair examinations to prove that the hair (public) on the blanket that was without any question Oswald's blanket was in fact Oswald's hair. So I found two such oversights to be two two many and I was always interested in Chaney.

.2

The first time I had a chmace to look into the Chaney matter was when I was in Dalias in December 1971. The first sentence of that memo is accurate and pertinent, "...failure to call Chaney as a witness is cleared up by a tape of his initial comment on what he saws a bullet hit JTK in the face. He could be wrong," this continues, or could have misspoken himself. I tried to locate the tapes. The station's news editor is dead others have no knowledge, and the owner's secretary, Gordon McClendon, eaid he also had no knowledge of their present whereabouts or existence. But he had made a record in which part of the Chaney interview was included. He sent it to me and this is what Chaney did say. It was unwanted testimony, as it would have been if he had corrected it in any way.

Both of the cited Dallas records were in headquarters. If the FBI is now telling the truth neither was released in the 12/77 and 1/68 releases. I think the reason is obvious: all Washington reporters would have known that the self-serving explanations worked into them are not valid - that the Commission did not call Chaney. The FBI was in charge prior to the appointment of the Commission and it was the Commission's major investigative arm.

The next day, referring to this memo, Assistant Director Harold W. Barrett wrote Dal/as directing that Chaney be interviewed immediately. If this was done it is not included in these Dallas records. If it is in the HQ releases there is no possible way of locating it.

FEIEQ also ordered a review of other cases of police not being interviewed. He directed be given "promptly" to the General investigative Division, whose files the FEI steadfastly refuses to search — in any and all cases. He relevant records has been provided by Dallas and again there is no way of knowing if it exists in the almost 100,000 pages of FEHEQ releases.

The Butler memo to SAC includes a quotation from former Dallas police chief Curry that is conjectent with what Chaney said, that "two men were involved in the shooting" of JTK. It included expressions of winest sympathy for Special Agent/HOSTY and his present publicity..." The refers to the note from Lee Harvey Oswald he destroyed. An extensive FBI investigation was Conducted. All Dallas FBI employees provided statements. There is virtually no reflection of this in the files just provided. If they are in the EQ releases there is no way of finding them.

It will not be possible to go into all withholdings or to prepare memos on them all. I have done it in this case in part because of my immediate and continuing interest and because motive for withholding outside the exemptions of the act can be perceived. It was the FBI's job to interview Chaney as a Presidential escort immediately. It didn't. It interviewed him about a minor matter related to Ruby and more recently it misrepresented that no interview report is reflected in the Dallas indices.

My we will chave uppers in Expension

C-A-78-0322: Withhold by dirty tricks, in part and in toto WW 7/18/78

In my initial review of the records that reached me 6/28/73, a review to indicate which pages I wanted copied for other uses, my attention was taken by two that refer to Dallas Motorcycle Police an James James H. Thaney. From Dallas Files 89-43 those are Serials 1446 and, in reverse chronological order, 9570. 9614 + 9540

My interest in Chancy dates to 1964. Two are incorporated in <u>Whitewash</u>, completed 2/15/65. On reading these two Dallas records my interest was further attracted by a gross and deliberate lie - that Chancy had never been interviewed. Couched, however, to make a different interpretation possible.

In this I also address possible notive in the sudden burst of withholding of the names of Sas after more than half the Dallas file was processed without excisions of Sa names.

The name obliterated from 9614, I'm cortain, is Charles T. Brown, Jr. Brown is one of the SAs who worked on the JFK investigation.

The lie is on p. 2 of 9614. It is that Dallas indices and references from Dallas indices regarding the assessmention fail to indicate that CHANEY was interviewed by Agents of this Bureau following the assessmention."

At the bottom of the first page Brown quotes Lt. Jack Revill as saying "Chancy told devill that he had never been interviewed by envone following the assessmention to obtain his observations as a witness." The sociation of "so obtain his observations as a vitness, "referring to the assessmantion, is important. I doubt it is Chancy's exact language because he was interviewed to OBTAIN HIS OBSERVATIONS AS A JITNESS & BUT to an ethirally different observation (Caps from ribbon fault, not emphasis intended.)

On 12/26/63 Chancy was interviewed by SA Harmond M. Lester, whose report is page 682 of one of the earliest commodifiates reports, I think the very first, CD 4. Although that Chancy was one of the outriding DFD motorcycles escorts he is the ONLY one not used as a Commission witness and about whom I could never find any FBI report. Now these were the closest of eyewitnesses. The others were called. In addition, as I state in Whitewash, in the opinion of Officer Studebaker Chancy had done some work that appeared to have significance. Studebaker's lead was never followed.

From Lester's report all he saked Changy about is having seen "ack huby/the day after JFK was killed and the day before huby killed Oswald.

Now the FBI was so exhaustive it conducted special hair exeminations to prove that the hair (public) on the blanket that was without any question Oswald's blanket was in fact Oswald's hair. So I found two such oversights to be two two many and I was always interested in Chancy.

Steven

C.A. /U-0322: Withholo by dirty tricks, in part and in toto

IN 7/18/78

In my initial review of the records that reached me 6/28/78, a review to indicate which pages I wanted copied for other uses, my attention was taken by two that refer to Dallas Lotorcycle Police and James 2 Chaney. From Dallas files 89-43 these are Serials 1446 and, in reverse chronological order, 9570.

by interest in Change dates to 1964. Two are incorporated in Whitewash, completed 2/15/65. On reading these two Palias r cords my interest was further attracted by a gross and deliberate lie - that Change had never been interviewed. Couched, however, to make a different interpretation possible.

In this I also accress possible notive in the sudden burst of withholding of the names of Sas after nor than half the Dalias file was processed without excisions of SA names.

The name oblitarates from 9014, I'm certain, is Charles T. Brown, Jr. Brown is one of the San who worked on the Jrk investigation.

The lie is on p. 2 of 9614. It is that Dallas indices and references from Dallas indices regarding the assassination fail to indicate that CHANEY was interviewed by Agents of this Eureau following the assassination."

At the bottom of the first page brown quotes Lt. Jack Revill as saying "Chaney told affill that he had never been interviewed by anyone following the assassination to obtain his observations as a witness." "The addition of "to obtain his observations are a witness." "The addition of "to obtain his observations are a witness." "The addition of "to obtain his observations are a witness." "The addition of "to obtain his observations are a witness." "The addition of "to obtain his observations are a witness." "The addition of "to obtain his observations are a witness." "The addition of "to obtain his observations are a witness." "The addition of "to obtain his observations are a witness." "The addition of "to obtain his observations are a witness." "The addition of "to obtain his observations are a witness." "The addition of "to obtain hi

On 12/28/6% Chaney was interviewed by SA Raymond M. Lester, whose report is page 682 of one of the earliest consolidated reports, I think the very first, CD 4. Although Chaney was one of the outriding DPD motorcyclyc escorts he is the ONLY one not used as a Commission witness and about whom I could never find any FBI report. Now these were the closest of eyewitnesses. The others were called. In addition, as I state in Whitewash, in the opinion of Officer Studebaker, Chaney had done some work that appeared to have significance. Studebaker's lead was never followed.

From Lester's report all he asked Chaney about is having seen "ack Ruby the day after JFK was killed and the day before Ruby killed Oswald."

Now the FBI was so exhaustive it conducted special hair examinations to prove that the hair (public) on the blanket that was without any question Oswald's blanket was in fact Oswald's hair. So I found two such oversights to be two two many and I was always interested in Chaney.

p-3

L CHELLOY

The first time I had a chiface to look into the Chaney matter was when I was in Dalins in December 1971. The first sentence of that memo is accurate and pertinent, "...failure to call Chaney as a witness is cleared up by a tape of his initial comment on what he saw: a bullet hit JFk in the face. He could be wrong," this continues, or could have misspoken himself. I tried to locate the tapes. The station's news editor is dead, others have no knowledge, and the owner's secretary, Gordon beclendon, said he also had no knowledge of their present whereabouts or existence. But he had made a record in which part of the Chaney interview was includes. He sent it to me and this is what Chaney did say. It was unwanted testimony, as it would have been if he had corrected it in any way.

Both of the cited Dallas records were in headquarters. If the FBT is now telling the truth neither was released in the 12/TT and 1/Qu releases. I think the reason is obvious: all Washington reporters would have known that the self-serving emplanations worked into them are not valid - that the Commission did not call Chaney. The FBT was in charge prior to the appointment of the Commission and it was the Commission's major investigative arm.

The next day, refer ing to this memo, Assistant Director Harold M. Barrett wrote SAC Pauls directing that Chaney be interviewed immediately. If this was done it is not included in these Dallas records. If it is in the My releases there is no possible way of locating it.

FBTHW also ordered a review of other cases of police not being interviewed. He directed be given "promptly" to the General investigative Division, whose files the FBT steadfastly refuses to search - in any and all cases. No relevant records has been provided by Dallas and again there is no way of knowing if it exists in the almost 100,000 pages of FBTHW releases.

The latter memo to SAC includes a quotation from former Dallas police chief Curry that is conjustent with what Chaney said, that "two men were involved in the shooting" of JFk. It included expressions of regret sympathy for Special Agent/noSTY and his present publicity..." The refers to the note from Lee Marvey Oswald he destroyed. An extensive FBL investigation was gonducted. All Dallas FBL employees provided statements. There is virtually no reflection of this in the files just provided. If they are in the not releases there is no way of finding them.

It will not be possible to go into all withholdings or to prepare memos on them all.

I have done it in this case in part because of my immediate and continuing interest and because motive for withholding outside the exemptions of the Act can be perceived. It was the FBT's job to interview Chaney as a Presidential escort immediately. It didn't. It into viewed him about a minor matter related to muby and more recently it misrepresented that no interview report is reflected in the Dallas indices.

In my initial review of the records that reached me 6/28/78, a review to indicate which pages I wanted copied for other uses, my attention was taken by two that refer to Dallas Hotorcycle Policeman James & Chaney. From Dallas files 89-43 these are Serials 216 and, in reverse chronological order, 9570.

Ey interest in Chaney dates to 1964. Two are incorporated in Whitewash, completed 65.0n reading these two Dallas records my interest was further attracted by a and deliberate lie - that Chaney had never been interviewed. Couched, however, to a different intermediate. 2/15/65.0n reading these two Pallas records my interest was further attracted by a gross and deliberate lie - that Chaney had never been interviewed. Couched, however, to make a different interpretation possible.

In this I also address possible motive in the sudden burst of withholding of the names of Sas after more than half the Dallas file was processed without excisions of SA names.

The name obliterated from 9614, I'm certain, is Charles T. Brown, Jr. Brown is one of the SAs who worked on the JFK investigation.

The lie is on p. 2 of 9614. It is that "Dallas indices and references from Dallas indices regarding the assassination fail to indicate that CHANEY was interviewed by Agents of this Eureau following the assassination."

At the bottom of the first page Brown quotes Lt. Jack Revill as saying "Chaney told PEVILL that he had never been interviewed by anyone following the assassination to obtain his observations as a witness." "The addition of "to obtain his observations as a witness, referring to the assassination, is important. I doubt it is Chancy's chaot language because he WAS interviewed to OBTAIN HIS OBSERVATIONS AS A MITHESS \* BUT to an ethirely different observation (Caps from ribbon fault, not emphasis intended.)

On 12/28/63 Chaney was interviewed by SA Raymond M. Lester, whose report is page 682 of one of the earliest consolidated reports, I think the very first, CD 4. Although Chancy was one of athe outriding DPD motorcycle escorts he is the OHLY one not used as a Commission witness and about whom I could never find any FBI report. Now these were the closest of eyewitnesses. The others were called. In addition, as I state in Whitewash, in the opinion of Officer Studebaker, Chaney had done some work that appeared to have significance. Studebaker's lead was never followed.

From Lester's report all he asked Chaney about is having seen each Rubyothe day after JFK was killed and the day before "uby killed Oswald.

Now the FBI was so exhaustive it conducted special hair examinations to prove that the hair (public) on the blanket that was without any question Oswald's blanket was in fact Oswald's hair. So I found two such oversights to be two too many and I was always interested in Chaney.

The first time I had a chrace to look into the Chaney matter was when I was in Dallas in December 1971. The first sentence of that memo is accurate and pertinent, "...failure to call Chaney as a witness is cleared up by a tape of his initial comment on what he saw: a bullet hit JFK in the face. He could be wrong," this continues, or could have misspoken himself. I tried to locate the tapes. The station's news editor is dead, others have no knowledge, and the owner's secretary, Gordon McClendon, said he also had no knowledge of their present whereabouts or existence. But he had made a record in which part of the Chaney interview was included. He sent it to me and this is what Chaney did say. It was unwanted testimony, as it would have been if he had corrected it in any way.

Both of the cited Dallas records were in headquarters. If the FBI is now telling the truth neither was released in the 12/77 and 1/48 releases. I think the reason is obvious: all Washington reporters would have known that the self-serving emplanations worked into them are not valid - that the Commission did not call Chaney. The FBI was in charge prior to the appointment of the Commission and it was the Commission's major investigative arm.

The next day, referring to this memo, Assistant Director Harold N. Barrett wrote SAC Daylas directing that Chaney be interviewed immediately. If this was done it is not included in these Dallas records. If it is in the HQ releases there is no possible way of locating it.

FBIH, also ordered a review of other cases of police not being interviewed. He directed be given "promptly" to the General "nvestigative Division, whose files the FBI steadfastly refuses to search - in any and all cases. No relevant record, has been provided by Dallas and again there is no way of knowing if it exists in the almost 100,000 pages of FBIHQ releases.

The first memo to SAC includes a quotation from former Dallas police chief Curry that is conjustent with what Chaney said, that "two men were involved in the shooting" of JFK. It included expressions of right sympathy for Special agent/HOSTY and his present publicity..." The refers to the note from Lee Harvey Oswald he destroyed. An extensive FBI investigation was conducted. All Dallas FBI employees provided statements. There is virtually no reflection of this in the files just provided. If they are in the HQ releases there is no way of finding them.

It will not be possible to go into all withholdings or to prepare memos on them all.

have done it in this case in part because of my immediate and continuing interest and because motive for withholding outside the exemptions of the Act can be perceived. It was the FBI's job to interview Cheney as a Presidential escort immediately. It didn't. It interviewed him about a minor matter related to Ruby and more recently it misrepresented that no interview report is reflected in the Dallas indices.