Dear Mark and Jim, 1/30/85

You may both be busy and not have time to read it when the enclosure reaches you so while I am keyed up and there is no point in trying to sleep this brief note that will accompany it.

As Jim knows because I obtained it from him only this morning when I was at my Washington surgeon's office for the regular checkup and returned a lengthy deposition to him, I had not seen the DJ petition in his Shaw case. Filed, apparently, at the very last minute and in cited attempted refutation of my petition. As Jim also knows, the trip itself, even with a professional driver, is always hard on me and my today efforts to work that off merely added to my unsteadiness and circulatory constrictions in the head. I therefore worked on other things, of which I'll be sending copies, until suppertime, when I read the Shaw petition and, with all my prior experiences, was absolutely astounded to see that with consummate brazenness and the apparent assumption that nobody at the court would checks its citation of my petition, lied all over again!

I neither said nor even suggested anything that can be represented as they represented it and as you will see from the first attachment, actually said the exact opposite!

With but part of a single citation in the Shaw petition, none relates in any way to mine, to which it transparently is addressed. That single citation actually says exactly what I represented, that with regard to search, first-person attestation is required.

With regard to my yesterday's interpretation of the potential of their petition of which I mailed you a copy today, only what the court does or does not do provides the answer. I would like to hope that I have frustrated whatever they are up to.

When my wife can retype this addition, hopefully tomorrow, it ought not run over 5 pages. The rest is two attachments, the cited page of my petition and marked pages of their's.

1/31, snowed-in and placid: I continue to marvel that unending official mendacity is tolerated by the courts and lawyers and both can still consider this a nation of laws and that none is willing to take any step to correct or end it. Aside from obvious hurt to individuals like me, when what I state is the fact can anyone really regard the country and its people as free? I ask nothing of either, make no personal accusations but can you understand an old man's concern after what he's lived through and seen elsewhere in the world and here lawyers have yet to get together to end or at least make an effort to deter such basic subversion? I am trouble not for myself, at my age and in my condition, but I am for you and yours and for others who will live longer under the undeterred authoritarianism the beginning of which this represents - forecasts? any effort is risky for an invididual lawyer but not for lawyers collectively. And as you both know, I'll be a willing guinea pig.

Best

Harold