FBI purimy/100

Dear Jin - for possible spletro/KAA resend

13/30/79

While it may appear to be a futility to call a fallely-exerce FBI affidavit to your attention if we climinate on these basis there is no use to which may FBI affidavit can be put.

Attached is the affidavit of Roy Jevons in the <u>Michela</u> case. Jevons fails to identify bisself completely. He was then head of that was known as the physics branch of the FBI Lab.

Jevons states that he personally conducted a review of all the Lab spectro resords. We have received no record of this of which I have any recollection in C.A. 75-226.

As the man in charge he should have provided the affidevit in C.A. 2301-70 and if he had not retired vice filty in 226. He mays all the work was done "under my supervision."

What is false is that a) all the work was done for "Les cuforcement proposes." There was none, as Houver testified to the Commission and as other records I'ves just found state.

It also is false that the file ses made for use solely by U.S. Government personnel" and that there is no disclosure to others.

Under date of 11/23/63, which was the day after the assessmention, the Follocal this information in a report it sent to thes Pallas Chief of Police Jesse Curry. In C.A. 65-1996 they asore this was all the results of all that work, even though some of the tests had not yet been perfermed.

Prior to the date of this Jevons affidavit (which causet be read of the copy but is known by the time of the case) the FMI approved the public Mischaure of the Lab report and other such material. The Warran Consistion published by faceiniles.

Even though Presier was the sajor FBI contact with the Commission in these areas of the Lab's work Jevons should have greater overall impostedge.

Do we want to learn where he is med consider deposing his if there is a recent?