10/11/89

Dear Jin.

I presume the Houston FBI's 8/28/89 to you re your request responds to a request to that field office and for records relating either to Foreman or to surveillances of him. The other obliterated names might be associates or codefendants in the case Patchen was handling for his cousin.

What you sent me is the single page attached to the FBI letter.

that page, however, is incomplete. It does not include the supervisor's response to the SAC with regard to Foreman telsurs.

And the response is incomplete. I mean the response to you, because it does not include Houston's response to FBIHQ. .

Telsurs also required mornical approaval and sometimes the approved request for permission.

Then there is the matter of whose telsurs. Local police also did that and not uncommonly informed the FBI. I presume the local police had the desire at least.

I don't know what you are following or seeking but bear in mind that the locals in "emphis did have Foreman's suite at the Peabody wired for sound. Hy sounce is excellent-the borhter of a prosecutor.

They'd lie about ito as would the FBI, because that would give Jimmy a new trial.

And they'd hide it to lie, both local and FBIHQ. Mostly likely hiding places if filed: at all are the 80 files in the field offices and 66 at FBIHQ. If not hidden, then of course they'd be in main files denied or lied about.

Remember DJ's great reluctance to pay any attention to what he got on Foreman that Steven ^Duke told it about. Under Mleindienst. That could, of course, have related to the Ray prosecution but they were prosecuting Foreman later. Or at least giving that appearance.

Best. Lacoly

U.S. Department of Justice

Federal Bureau of Investigation



In Reply, Please Refer to File No. 2500 East T. C. Jester Suite 200 Houston, Texas 77008

September 28, 1989

Mr. James H. Lesar Attorney at Law 918 F Street, N.W., Room 509 Washington, D.C. 20004

Dear Mr. Lesar:

This is in further response to your Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request.

Pursuant to your request three (3) pages were reviewed and one (1) page is being released. Excisions have been made in order to protect material which is exempt from disclosure pursuant to Title 5, United States Code, Section 552 as follows:

- (b) (1) (A) specifically authorized under criteria established by an Executive order to be kept secret in the interest of national defense or foreign policy and (B) are in fact properly classified pursuant to such Executive order;
- (b) (2) related solely to the internal personnel rules and practices of an agency;
- (b) (7) records or information compiled for law enforcement purposes, but only to the extent that the production of such law enforcement records or information
 - (C) could reasonably be expected to constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

If you desire, you may submit an appeal from any denial contained herein. Appeals should be directed in writing to the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legal Policy (Attention: Office of Information and Privacy), United States Department of Justice, Washington, D.C. 20530, within thirty days from receipt of this letter. The envelope and the letter should be clearly marked "Freedom of Information Appeal" or "Information Appeal". Please cite the name of the office to which your original request was directed.

Sincerely yours,

Andrew J. Duffin Special Agent in Charge

By: ans C. Fairan

James E. Farnan Principal Legal Adviser

