

6/10/72

Dear Sir,

There is a great deal of fascination in the Jimmy Roberts case to James. The copy has just been received.

What I will, it would tend to show that James knows the people that have had a lot of trouble, or is they are prisoners at Detroit.

Now, it's possible that Roberts had been jailed at Detroit with Jimmy, for it shows the box number of the person.

But why would it be a card? One that seems to have no any civil message? It's not a card, of course, and into the printer legend, "Just don't top up every day" is a crack about spreading out.

If it is some information, this may identify some of James' present pals. These are not the names of the two I saw through him.

The name of the person who is listed as a friend of James that in the past only certain names, that one had received by someone not on his list would not reach him.

Do you or Jim have any hunches?

It is possible that James of sending the keep it Cool was age 10 James H., Robert J. or H., Jimmy Roberts might be sending greetings from them, I suppose.

The 91758 might be, I think, in the L.A. area. The copy is not clear. The return address is 91758 - Ontario. It is not clear what's where. Jimmy Roberts and Jimmy Roberts both live.

Best,

The Federal v S.O. P.I. CA decision is interesting and can be hurtful, but I think it's proper and functioned well not at least cost of our interests. It is in something "a non-public investigation". The contents were neither used nor disclosed, that is, the contents of what was sought, and I think that despite the common sense, there is a possibility of further violation that would require O.C. to resume its investigation and possible action flowing from it. Or, there remained law-enforcement suspicion as to what the court emphasized that other results was available to the plaintiff under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

It is a good decision or a useful one, particularly not because the court below had ordered only in camera inspection.

But the case does not seem to me to parallel the way of Warren Commission materials nor any other in which there is either final action or any kind of public use. Now, yes, when the plaintiff was denied copies of what was the basis for the suit and instructed, that may be bad.

15