

March 18, 1975

Mr. Terry Chapdelaine  
Route 4, Box 137  
Franklin, Tennessee 37064

Dear Mr. Chapdelaine,

After we finished speaking today I remembered that I had filed an affidavit against General Haile last August charging him with making false statements in a pre-hearing brief in the James Earl Ray case. I am sending a copy of this affidavit to you immediately under separate cover.

My affidavit refers to a false story which was planted in the Memphis Press-Scimitar and picked up by AP. While there are one or two other possibilities which I can not yet definitely eliminate, I believe Haile was probably responsible for this. In this connection, could you advise me whether or not the Nashville Tennessean reporter John Haile is any relation to Henry?

I consider Haile's conduct in the Ray case litigation unprofessional and unethical in the extreme. I will give you a few of the instances which are on the record and probable:

1. At the August 21, 1974 preliminary hearing, Haile referred to the counsel representing James Earl Ray as "Mr. Fensterwald and his ilk" during an attempt to defeat Ray's discovery rights.

2. When I attempted to introduce into the record a letter by William Bradford Huie, Haile claimed that the letter was a forgery. When I asked him who forged it, he said "you did!" Later, in my motel room, he apologized. However, at that point in the evidentiary hearing he did manage to get the letters excluded. [After the hearing, by filing a motion with irrefutable evidence that the letters were Huie's, I managed to get them admitted.]

3. In chambers on August 21, 1974, Haile referred to Sixth Circuit Judge Harry Phillips as "crazy old Judge Phillips."

4. In early October, 1974, Haile and his assistant, Joseph Haines, vigorously obstructed my attempt to examine the evidence in the James Earl Ray case. As a result, the Court's discovery orders were only very partially implemented. I doubt James Earl Ray got ten percent of the discovery to which he was entitled by court order. The tactics used to achieve this ranged from bullying and stalling to lying to me and to Judge McRae.

5. As the evidentiary hearing approached, Haile sought to disrupt my preparations for the hearing. On October 4th he filed several discovery motions. For the most part these motions were obviously absurd and designed only to intimidate the judge and to obstruct my capacity to properly prepare for the hearing--and in any event, the time for discovery had long since passed. In a certificate of service Haile false stated that I had been informed of these motions on October 4th. This was false. Haile's motions requested a hearing on October 8th and I did not receive his motions until October 7th, when I was out of town during the day. Late that evening I discovered what was up and at 1:00 a.m. on October 8th I sent Judge McRae an angry telegram. [I am enclosing a copy of that telegram herein.] Judge McRae called the next morning [October 8th]. Haile was with him in chambers, I believe. McRae said he had shown Haile my telegram and that Haile was abashed or apologetic at his "mistake."

6. During the evidentiary hearing Haile introduced into evidence a draft of a letter from Ray to Rev. Bevel. When I asked where Haile had obtained it, he said he got it "from your files." This was false. Since it was probably obtained illegally by Ray's prison guards who delivered his correspondence to the prosecutor's office, this was of great importance. Haile claimed that the delivery of Ray's mail to the prosecution had stopped in October '68 and that we had been given all the correspondence which the prosecution had obtained. Since the Bevel letter was written in January 1969 and we had not been given a copy of it, both these statements appear to be false on that basis alone.

7. After the hearing ended, Haile wrote Judge McRae a letter in which he stated that our ballistics expert, Prof. Herbert McDonnell, was "a complete fraud." He did not make that charge when McDonnell was on the stand, nor could he make it outside of court without a libel suit.

There is much more than I have listed here, but much of it is more complicated than I have time to describe at present. And some of it I must hold until I can make best use of it.

I need to obtain the docket entries from the lawsuit which the law firm of Hooker, Keeble, Dodson & Harris filed against Percy Foreman in Chancery Court. Could you send me the address of the Chancery Court?

You said a couple of times that our image was not too good in Nashville. Why? Also, why did you contact me rather than my co-counsel?

Sincerely yours,

Jim Lesar