8t. 12, Producick, *6. 21701 2/11/77

الهراز الأحجلا

Er. Clasence selley, Director FEI Vash., D.C. 20535

Dear "r. Kelley,

Four yesterday's letter to me states: "Reference is make to your Procedul of Information-Privacy acts appeal for warren Commission Document 1541. The document you requested in available at this time. This release commists of 315 mages." for this, you say, the charge is \$31.50. By check is enclosed. Essed on recent experiences: I do request that a substantial package be made prior to sailing. I would like it to reach se in good shape.

I still agait response. This other and earlier request is for a dub of a tape already public. The tape was provided to the PAR by Missi. Morida authorities in 1955. It was alayed in sublic by them about 10 years ago, as reported in a 1967 book of sine. Thereafter I published a not quite complete transcript in still andther book. By initial request of the PAR is without response and must be close to 10 years past due in boing responded to. So I hope you do not regard me as a little pushy in reminding you of it now and asking for compliance with it now. I will pay the cost of dubbing, as a long record between us should leave without doubt. And despite all the statistics you have put out, not always consistent statistics, I really so not believe you have any elder FOIA requests except porhaps some of mine.

By a statement of history I mean to include the date of the request to the appeal of a femial of which you now for the first time responds a statement explaining the increment has a femial of your statistics) delay in any response, this delay going back to your before last when the law mays 10 days; what special circumstances, if may, account for this delay; and a statistical representation of this request. By this statistical representation I mean how many requests were responded to after it was received and prior to your letter of yestermay. It is, you see, a request for a single record, one that requires no special search, an indultified, not serely an identifiable record. I therefore see no reason for this considerable layer of time. On the other hand, I can see a correlation between this unexpected latter from you and leaking relating to the House Select Semittee on Assessinations, if there is one, in the timing.

I am a bit bevildered by your tellings as a) that you are responding to my appeal and b) that it is also under the 'rivacy act. Until now I was not sware that you are the Department's appealed officer. From the latters I have received bearing your name I had been led to believe that you are the prosoter of the business of the appeals officer. (This is not to say, of course, that he tends to his business.) It will probably be easier for you to explain to se how this is part of any Fa appeal I have filed. While my memory is no longer what it was, it is my recollection that I do not appear in CD 1347 and in fact my appearance in it is close to depossible.

If this can be explained by a suddent PA interest you or those who write letters for you have. I'll be delighted to accommodate you with a legitimate PA request, again one long past the time for response under aposal. If it really goes back to 1969 when Atterney eneral Mitchell told so I'd be bearing from the then Director, under your Directorship my request for any and all files on or relating to so is one that is elder than any under the statistics you have had presented to fearral court in one of my PAA cases. So if you have some up cial interest in PA. The not use this over the request under it for the indulging of that interest even I would be a bit hap sier if you dis.

I have already invoked the provisions of the Acts that authorize the resistion of fees when there is a legitimate basis for it. I enclose this check subject to my right to ack for its return under those provisions of the las because I as not using this for personal reconstant to add to an unofficial archive in the pix public interest. Singerely, hardly deciders