

JL- I've read the Post story on Geesall's tapes decision of the 5th. We will want copies of it because he ranges beyond the tapes and beyond court evidence into "public information" into basic concepts that while they may have been his beliefs of the past are quite opposite his FOI rulings. I think it not unlikely that we have influenced his understanding. I think that his ruling can have value in damage suits, too. And when I have time I'll be going back to the special prosecutor on the old request based on it. Meanwhile, I'm still wondering about sending him a copy, perhaps with a comment on this decision. However, I wish I knew someone else who would give it to him. But I don't want to do anything that would have any influence in any way if we are before him again and I think we should be. ...I am now more inclined to believe possible what I suggested earlier as his intent in ruling without even an offer of proof leave alone the required proof on investigative file. I think he was passing a loaded deck to the appeals court. And he knew he was stacking it ~~shakabuzzuz~~ when he did it. HW 12/7/74