

**WILLIAM L. NEICHTER**  
ATTORNEY AT LAW  
1313 LYNDON LANE  
SUITE 115  
LOUISVILLE, KENTUCKY 40222  
(502) 429-0266

March 13, 1995

Dear Harold:

Well, ready or not, here I come! I will fly into Baltimore on April 6, and get into the Red Horse. Perhaps we can have breakfast Friday morn, April 7. I will be solo, it is such a hassle to put the dog in the kennel and so forth, so no Betsy on this trip. I will also be there Saturday April 8 and Sunday April 9, I think I fly out of Baltimore about 5pm.

This will be a social visit, except for perhaps getting a few pages of stuff out of your files. I am at your disposal, if we need to visit a doctor or get a prescription filled, it is OK with me. Do not feel you have to entertain me, if you get busy or something comes up, I can always drive over to Bethesda and see my stepsister or Bailey Guard, one of Sen. Cooper's aids. But if there is anything I can help you with, let me know.

It is a funny story why I am flying into Baltimore. Last year, Betsy and a friend were in Birmingham at a needle work convention. They took a voluntary bump, and got \$240 of free tickets on Southwest, which flies into Baltimore. Which is pretty good, since her original ticket only cost \$44 ! Is this a great country or what?

I just want to see you and Lil. And Hana! I meant to get up there last year, but the year just got away from me. So maybe I can get up there twice this year.

I hope C&G keeps Selections on the shelf. After all, Mark Lane has Rush to Judgment and Plausible Denial on the shelf and I think also sometimes a third book of his which I have not read. I presently have Betsy looking at discount bookstores and such for any and all Selections and Case Open. So far, I have not seen them remaindered yet.

When I went to law school, they told me that after becoming a lawyer, I would never look at things the same way again, and it is true. Now that I have been Weisbergized, I look at things differently. For example, when Candy Garvey got on the stand and talked about how OJ Simpson looked menacing and evil, I thought back to Helen Markham and others about Oswald. OJ may be guilty, but after six weeks, I have not seen one shred of evidence that he is so. I am convinced that the prosecution is "painting a picture", of guilt, but when they present the blood evidence, it is going to be contradictory. I am almost sure of it. Why else did they wait from June until September to send some of it to the lab? When the judge asked for a reason, the answer was "I have no answer for you, Judge." What the hell kind of answer is that?

I can get computer disks copied. I copied the one I sent to Gerry G. I have yet to print out Hoax, must get it done commercially. But I will do so.

I think there continues to be a great interest in the JFK assassination. New books continue to come out, but it is hard to cut through the clutter. People need heroes, the Michael Jordan comeback proves that. But until I read your books, I was one confused guy, and I think I am pretty smart. I still believe that Selections came out excellent. Wish it could get more PR.

I talked to Dave Wrone a few weeks ago, about the Robert Kennedy case. I see many parallels between the conduct of the police and prosecutors in the RFK case and the OJ case. I think it is a grave mistake for the prosecution to take the avenging angel attitude about a case. It allows them to do things that they shouldn't, like ignoring evidence. Since I do a lot of defense work, people think I am so cynical about the prosecutors. But I have never had a cop on the stand who either told the complete truth or at least shaded it pretty bad. And the prosecutors look at it as a game, I had a felony trial a few years ago, when the prosecution's own witness said the other prosecution witness, the person who took out the warrant, was a liar! It was the first prosecution for the young woman, who I beat. Did she shake my hand and say, "Gee, Bill, maybe we were wrong taking this to trial". Hell no! She was crying because she lost! It is supposed to be a search for justice, not a debate society. But it sure as hell is!

To me, the key that the OJ case was unusual and had evidence problems was when they announced that they were not going to go for the death penalty. First, this is the best bargaining chip a prosecutor has. Second, it allows you to get a death qualified jury, one who will vote for the gas chamber, and they tend to be a little more hard nosed than a regular jury. Third, if OJ did kill two people, and they have him in jail without bail, he deserves the death penalty, if anyone does. He doesn't have the poverty excuse, he can't say he is a kid, and a bitchy wife is no excuse for murder. I don't like the death penalty, but if they are going to have it, OJ should be a candidate. After meeting Vince Bugliosi and seeing his arrogance, I think you have a problem when a prosecutor's office is so politicized. They all want to be like Bugliosi, write a book and get \$10,000 a pop speaking to bar associations all over the country.

I gotta tell you, when I asked Bugliosi if a \$20 rifle, with 19 year old ammo and a misguided scope, was an odd choice for a 305 foot fatal head shot, and he said the bad rifle was proof of no conspiracy, because no one would give Oswald a rifle that bad, the lawyers got a good laugh. But he still thinks he is an expert.

I'll write later in the week, after I get the Red Horse reservations, etc, I look forward to seeing you and Lil. Thank you in advance for letting me come up.

Bill

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "Bill", written in a cursive style.