

The trial of Jack Ruby, discussion of testimony of Sgt Dean, p. 166 ff.

In failing to refer to Dean's own sworn testimony to the Warren Commission that its own assistant counsel had, during the taking of his deposition, accused Dean of perjury in that deposition ~~of~~ <sup>by</sup> making false and inaccurate statements to his superiors, the authors were either not completely informed or have laid themselves open to criticism of being less than completely fair to Belli. Either Dean swore falsely to the Commission or the Commission's assistant counsel did accuse him of perjury in exactly the testimony the authors discuss. They do at this point go into the testimony before the commission to point out that it confirms most of what the police witnesses testified to. But it also casts serious doubt on these same police. There is also the highly-suspect delay in the filing of these reports, especially those dealing with Ruby's entry into the building, those who were or may have been present, etc.