FBI-King Section 25, Serials 2674-2750, 248 pages.

2710 shows they were keeping tabs on Jerry in part through Jimmys former associate in the Kroger job, who said he taught Jimmy burglary and had not seen him since that job. He was also under physical surveillance.

2725 teletype to really lean on John Ray through his license to run Grapevine Tavern. Obliterations make it uncertain but there is apparent reference to Albert Pepper in "IF GRAND JURY IS NOT IN SESSION TO SUBPOENA RECORDS, YOU SHOULD INSURE THAT REVIEW OF THE RECORDS CAN BE ACCOMPLISHED WITH FULL SECURITY AND THE BUREAU'S INTEREST WILL BE FULLY PROTECTED.2 Does this mean burglarize but don t get caught?

Unrecorded serial between 2736 and 2737 is clearly based on an inside informant in SCLC Atlanta offices.

2734 is an illustration of the waste of time in building statistics. There is a semi-literate letter from Una, S.C. asking where King was killed, buried, etc. and it was actually answered over Hoover's signature.

No 2740

2749 (2750 withheld) is 17 pp report of ~~EX~~ 4/29 attached to Jevons memo to Conrad. On examinations of evidence. Not possible to say if rifle fired bullet, as in what are probably other copies of this.
15 is definitive enough on the tie being blown off and by something from inside the body larger than the bullet and possibly include bone

FBI-King Section 70 Serials 5171-5231 68 documents 207 pp released

The first [redacted] serials relate to what Huie was up to and inaccurately to the same with J.P. Stoner, attributed to McMillan.

5176 withheld on groubdiof RCMP source.

5193 indications of electronic surveillance, mail inteeception re J.B.Stoner/Ray.

5196 includes copies intercept legal mail, w/ Stoner, Jerry. The Jerry 9/21 is clear indication of what Jimmy never said and Jerry didn't, that Jimmy was trying to arrange for Foreman in September 1968, not for the first time that November. This could have been important in the evid. hrg. It was withheld by the Memphis authorities under discovery. 5198 is Jimmy's letter to Jerry 9/24 also on chaging counsel, getting Foreman. It is clear that Jimmy's concern over his defense is of much earlier date than they told us or we had any reason to believe.

5197 all 9 pp ref. DOJ.

5202 is five more samples Ray's writin from Sheriff and even Judge Battle! With an expression of Canale's concern over the legalities. All withheld on discovery, I think. Including Jimmy's letter to Sheriff. The interpretation of Hanes' comments,5203, including in press at time, is that Hanes might withdraw over Stoner, who was not to be criminal counsel. it appears that Ray was not satisfied with Hanes.5205 more in DC on interceptions and use of them.
5207 all 5 pp withheld because of RCMP origin.

5209 They all knew that Ray's wiritings to his attorney were privilged and were ordered to do no more than scan them for security purposes. 5212 holds other samples of these interceptions not produced on discovery.

Unrecorded serial between 5212 and 5213 includes a news story in which the head is Canale's allegation that Ray's guards do not eavesdrop, what Hanes had charged. This in the midst of the fruit of that eavesdropping/ in these serials.

5213 Canale is not going to let Hanes have evidence seemingly within Battle's order.

5216 Jan Scudder (Sartor), investigated by one Edgar Downing. Harassment of earlier period.

5218 The names masked are masked after I complained about this earlier and in that complaint specified that these names and this identical record are in the court records.

5220 FBI reminds Dept about Huie search warrant for Ray's notes.

5222 Dr. Hadley's name and that of lawyer originally withheld. In Huie index. Also 5223

5227 More sample of copies of Ray's correspondence. inc. from presiding judge. Also 5228.

5230 withheld RCMP

Dear Jim, C.A.75-1996 and Ray's rights 6/5/77

The offenses against justice and Ray's rights grow more serious in my opinion as they also grow more common.

I have just finished going over Section 70. These contain proof of interception of defense communications, copying them, making them available to the FBI as well as the prosecution, etc. Now we have the judge making himself an adjunct of the prosecution by voluntarily giving SAC Jensen the letter Ray wrote him, for use as a lab specimen.

Here also there is a prima facie case of the prosecution lying to the judge, who had to know better than believe there was no eavesdropping.

These stories also remind that bad as he was Battle held that under Tenn. law Ray's legal communications could be scanned byt not read. Here they were copied and read by everyone.

I hope you are keeping a separate file of the extra copies on this general subject I am making for you. The time may come when you may want rapid access. In my own filing on this I am lumping surveillances and rights together.

While I am strongly opposed to saying or doing anything now, in part because I expect there to be much more of this, I do suggest that you be thinking of a constitutional law expert who might be of help to you at some point in the future.

Best,

Dear Jim,

2/5/77

Who phoned at precisely this point!

You may recall that when I returned from St. Louis in 1972 I told you that all indications were that the FBI had done a job on John Ray. I did not have time to investegate then or since. The case made no sense at all, as you know. I may have written ~~xxxx~~ a memo on the transgressions against John's rights, etc/

I believe John filed a request for the files on himself and got a few pages. I'm not certain but this is now important. There is much on John in what I've received.

I believe he should have a) either all the files on him prior to the hearing or b) proof that they have been withheld after proper request.

So I suggest you be certain about the request.

He was not what the FBI regarded as cooperative. He may in fact not have been truthful. They decided to get him and are explicit in this but not as it relates to having him charged and convicted. Just to put him out of business with, perhaps, a liquor permit violation charge. (I think the business was in Carol8s name, a not uncommon practise with liquor licenses.) In Serial 2243 they talk about their "efforts directed toward developing liquor permit violations to serve as lever to force cooperation" in Murkin.

I would not tell John this now because it will be picked up and anything else of this nature will be obliterated.

Best,

P.S. Jerry, 2/20/77

I've put a little more together.

Do you know if there was a breakin at Albert's place of business any time beginning very early May 1968?

The FBI had people you knew talking to it, as you also did.

About May 1, 1968 you told one or the other that you should have told the FBI about a man who claimed to have taught Jimmy how to be a burglar.

You also said that Jimmy considered him a little stir-bugs.

When you were back in Chicago the agents were to have looked you up to see what they could get from you on this. They were to try and learn how close Jimmy was to that guy.

This kind of thing was, of course, necessary for the FBI when it had Jimmy as a suspect.

But you might want to consider which of those you trusted spoke to them.

They did not need any persuading on Jimmy but some of the stuff I've seen must have made an impression of lawyers who read it.

In the report they did not use the name of that particular source but some probably comes from Curtis. They knew he was a liar but the lawyers didn't when they saw what the FBI fed them.