



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

In Reply, Please Refer to
File No.

Post Office Box 1683
Atlanta, Georgia 30301

January 17, 1978

Mr. James H. Lesar
Attorney at Law
910 16th Street, N.W., Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20006

Dear Sir:

Reference is made to your request of January 1, 1978, for information regarding your client, Mr. Harold Weisberg, under the Freedom of Information and Privacy Acts.

This office has no record of Mr. Weisberg, except as the plaintiff in a civil suit against the U. S. Department of Justice in the U. S. District Court for the District of Columbia, Civil Action Number 75-1996. In that instance, certain documents pertaining to the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., were being processed by the Headquarters of this Bureau under the Freedom of Information Act.

Any further inquiries concerning this matter should be directed to the Headquarters of this Bureau.

Very truly yours,

JAMES J. DUNN, JR.
Special Agent in Charge

By: EDMUND J. PISTEY
Assistant Special Agent
In Charge

affidavit
PA

Dear Jim,

FBI/PA

1/26/78

Thanks for the copies of the FBI field office letters in response to the personal requests. I enclose a carbon in the event you want to take up what I will go into with anyone in Civil. On the chance you decide this is a constructive thing to do I will say less than I can.

Some of these responses are false. I illustrate with Savannah's 9/9/79

Birmingham's of 1/18 proves non-compliance by HQ, the other such field offices of 1996, and suggests other than the reasons given for claim to copyright withholding for the catalogues and the Person's writing on the Bay of Pigs.

Atlanta admits having records and does not provide copies. Date letter 1/17/78

Dallas is stonewalling. They evaded under date of December 30, 1977 and delayed under date of 1/13/78. If you have not heard from them before you receive this they are in non-compliance. I suggest that if we are ever to bring these things to an end without surrendering to lawlessness and intent to delay me we should proceed with those not in compliance when it is clear that they are not. If they need more time they can be in accord with proper procedures and state it in writing and when they will respond. When Dallas acknowledged receipt of the 12/25/77 request under date of 12/30 there would appear to be no reasonable need for more time under date of 1/13/78. Absent something out of the usual there should be response by the latest under date of 1/23/78.

New Orleans wrote you the same day, 1/13. It said the request "is being processed as quickly as possible." This means that processing was begun and that there is no claim to a need for more time for compliance. I feel about this as I do about Dallas.

But let us not kid ourselves about the reality. They are checking with HQ and working out what is embarrassing to them they they will seek to withhold if not lie about. Now where they lie I may have a few surprises for them. One I mention with intended ellipsis is that they were indiscrete in their quest for a favorable press. I guess I can safely add more with regard to New Orleans: my 1969 letter to AG Mitchell about agents' intrusions into my life and work followed reports relayed to me by a friend, Matt Herron, in whom I'm sure there was special interest. He is the source of my Memphis taped interviews of the time of the King assassination. His is credited in Frame-Up. His personal life includes such adventures as being navigator of the ship Greensprings? Green-something, of the ecologists. From whales to nuclear explosions. The FBI insists its Memphis office has no record of what Matt took there at the time of the King assassination. On this we now have enough to leave little doubt that if the FBI was the source of the letter to me from Criminal the FBI was not truthful with Criminal. And there is the popular mythology that Garrison and I were buddies.

Be prepared for needless privacy claims. Some will be sued to disguise mischief of which I have proof.

I believe these are the kinds of reasons there has been no acknowledgement from some offices. They don't know what to do about the nasty business and are awaiting word from SOG. Those offices which have not even written are in intended non-compliance. Failure to respond, if I am not mistaken, means you can go right to court. I'm willing. If you want to persuade or try to persuade people in Washington that someone has to drive those trampling elephants out of the jungles, how about a separate complaint for each office not in compliance? If they are going to continue to behave this way dramtizing it a bit might be informative to others who may look back on all of this. Others like the Congress. Or GAO examining into total eastes of time and money. If not people inside DJ, whose interest is long overdue. Unless by their detachment they declare themselves.

Best,