

Mr. Quin Shea
FOIAPA appeals
Department of Justice
Washington, D.C. 20530

6/13/80

Dear Mr. Shea,

Once again your staff has tried to put granddaddy in the crib. Even divided into three, as by your Ms. Janice Adams under dates of 6/10 and 11, he won't fit and it is inappropriate to try - again.

Once again it looks bad.

The confusion extended even to the letters themselves. Instead of the originals I was sent xeroxes - of letters to me.

If Ms. Adams is confused the buck stops with you because you have not yet processed my 1976 PA appeal, to three of the newer additions to which she now has assigned your latest 1980 numbers. There are not really more than a thousand new appeals in line ahead of my 1976 appeal, which covered all Departmental components.

To clear this up and make a nice, clean record I am asking that you provide me with the proper 1976 sequential number - and then at least go through the motions of observing it as you process appeal.

What appears to have happened is this - although it can be interpreted as still another stonewalling and effort to waste me and stop my work and writing.

After a long period of doing nothing about it you nudged components to respond. Some did, some unsatisfactorily. I added to the appeals^{IX} based on these responses. Ms. Adams, mistakenly, interpreted these as new appeals. You thus have not fewer than two contradictory numbers for the one of these that pertains to Civil Division, for example.

Ms Barrett did not have much searching to do to find a stack of about two inches of my Departmental PA appeals. She did not, in her spot check, come up with my initial appeal of 1976 but she did find the 6/30/77 acknowledgement of one of the renewals by Mr. Lesar, signed by Mr. Flaherty. It begins by acknowledging that Mr. Lesar wrote about the Department's non-compliance with my PA request. Isn't even 1977 granddaddy with you?

Sincerely,
Harold Weisberg

Ms. Adams letters:

6/11/80 - OPR - 80-1018

6/10/80 - EX. OF. FOR USA'S - 80-1019

6/10/80 - CIVIL DIV. - 80-1017

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20530

Once again your staff has tried to put somebody in the crib. It is divided into three, as by your Mr. Justice Adams under date of 6/10 and it is not at all as it is

being trying to to try - again.

Once again it looks bad.

The confusion extended even to the letters themselves. Instead of the original

I was sent copies of letters to me.

It is Adams is confused and puts with you because you have not yet processed

my 1976 RA appeal, to three of the new additions to which you have assigned your

latest 1980 numbers. There are not really more than a thousand new appeals in line

ahead of my 1976 appeal, which covered all departmental components.

To clear this up and make a nice, clean record I am asking that you provide me with

the proper 1976 departmental number - and then at least go through the motions of observing

it as you process appeal.

What appears to have happened is this - although it can be interpreted as still

another atomization and effort to waste my time and stop my work and writing.

After a long period of doing nothing about it you nudged components to respond.

Some did, some unsuccessfully. I added to the appeals based on these responses.

Ms. Adams, what you are interpreting these as now is false. You thus have not fewer than

1980

two contradictory numbers for the one of these that pertains to Civil Division, for example.

As Barrett did not have much reasoning to go to find a stack of about two inches or

of departmental RA appeals. He did not, in his spot check, come up with my initial appeal

of 1976 but she did find the 6/30/77 acknowledgment of one of the numbers by Mr. Justice

Adams by Mr. Justice. It is by my acknowledgment that Mr. Justice wrote about the department's

non-compliance with my RA request. Isn't even 1977 somebody with you?

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg