

Attachment 1 -- Photostatic copies of the original documents obtained from Wilson

306 Hunt-Hunt's
 Complete Catalog of Cars Listed on Page 28

Handwritten: LR 84775 Rev 1214

Hunt Mgr Jane Mrs 1047 De Lohr	EM 1-0511	Hunter Annie D
Hunt Mary L 11006 Ardson Ln	DA 7-2254	Hunter Archie E
Hunt Mickey 6151 Mockwood Ln	TA 4-1239	HUNTER ARCHIE
Hunt Motors 6017 Ross	TA 4-0173	Hunter Archie E 11002
Hunt Mrs W 3303 Crocker St	TA 6-2385	Hunter S J 415 Hensle
Hunt J E 4500 Lakeside Dr	LA 8-9228	Hunter S J 2565 W Park
Hunt Motors Buick 4508 Lakeside	LA 6-6173	Hunter Beatrice Mrs 35
Hunt Motors Buick all		Hunter Bell 4844 Don D
Hunt Mrs 1000 Hunter Trust Est		Hunter Belle Mrs 2941 F
Hunt O C 8714 Center St	EX 1-2300	Hunter Ben J 2171 Melb
Hunt O H 422 Vermont	AD 5-0110	Hunter Ben Lee 3314 L
Hunt P L 705 Oak Fr	FR 4-8155	Hunter Betty 5623 Bala
Hunt P L 1012 Dal Ash Club Bldg	RI 8-1167	Hunter Betty Veyds
Hunt Page P 8812 Sweetstr	DA 7-5649	Hunter Bill C 675
Hunt Paint & Supply Co 100 Hume	RI 1-1309	Hunter Bill C 675 Add
Hunt Pet Mrs 1214 Hickory Tr	AT 5-7247	Hunter Bill R 3544
Hunt Progy 222 E 8th	WH 1-4561	Hunter Bill W 3435
		Hunter Erley Serr
		Hunter Erley Serr
		Hunter Erley Serr


Handwritten:

dean 150,000.00
 Hospital 15,000.00
 Tribunal 175,000.00
 Sonesta 25,000.00
 Canada 75,000.00


430,000.00

before 4-15 de mark
 after 4-15 x 2.13

Attachment 2 -- Diagram of area surrounding the Lorraine Motel



Attachment 3 -- Aerial photograph of area surrounding the Lorraine Motel



A South Main Street

B Mulberry Street

C Lorraine Motel

D Jim's Grill

E Backdoor of Jim's Grill

F Backyard

G Rooming House

H Bathroom Window

I Parking Area

J Firestation #2

K Room 306


L Brush & Retaining Wall

M Police Response Route


N Footprints

O Canipe's Store

Attachment 4a -- Photograph of police responding to shooting



Attachment 4b -- Photograph of police responding to shooting



[DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE LETTERHEAD]

U.S. Department of Justice
Civil Rights Division
BLL:BFK:bbm
DJ 144-72-1991

[Attachment 5]

Lewis Garrison, Esquire
100 North Main Building
Suite 1025
Memphis, Tennessee 38103

Mar 19 1999

Dear Mr. Garrison:

Thank you for the opportunity on March 18, 1999, to discuss with you the issue of immunity for your client, Loyd Jowers. This letter is intended to memorialize that conversation and to assist you in presenting an immunity proposal to your client.

You expressed concern that this investigation is questioning the credibility of your client's allegations. I confirmed that we do currently have such concerns for two reasons. First, there has been a substantial and inexplicable delay in your response to my proposal for immunity offered in my letter to you of November 19, 1998. While I have sent you several letters and left many messages for you to call me, you have never returned my calls and have not responded in writing in a timely manner. After four months, according to you as of yesterday, you still had not discussed my immunity proposal with your client. Such conduct raises doubts about the seriousness and sincerity of your public position that you and your client want an immunity grant.

Additionally, notwithstanding your claims otherwise, your client has offered different information on materially significant facts in his allegations over the years. In our conversation yesterday, you indicated the only material contradiction attributable to your client was his statement to District Attorney General investigator Mark Glankler that the rifle belonging to James Earl Ray was the only rifle involved in the killing, there was no second rifle. You indicated that statement was a false statement by your client, motivated by a desire to stop Glankler from bothering his family and Jowers' interest in promoting the success of a motion, then pending, to test the Ray rifle, which test he believed would eliminate that rifle as the murder weapon. I contend that this is not the only example of material contradiction by your client. These material contradictions raise questions about the credibility of your client. However, as I said in our conversation, I am only aware of your client's statements according to others. For that reason, it is imperative that I have a proffer of his allegation from him before I can properly make an immunity decision.

Accordingly, I am again proposing that you provide me a copy of the October 27, 1997 video recording of the interview of your client by Dr. Pepper and Mr. Dexter King. That recording, as you indicated in our conversation, is an accurate account of Mr. Jowers allegation. It will allow me and Mr. Campbell the opportunity to review your client's allegation as related directly by him. As I stated, we will agree not to use anything in the proffer against Mr. Jowers. Consequently, his Fifth Amendment Right can be protected while providing a proffer.

Without a proffer, we are unwilling to consider immunity. It would be irresponsible for any prosecutor to do otherwise.

On October 12, 1998, in response to my inquiry to speak to your client, you indicated that he would likely want immunity before he cooperated. As soon as you confirmed that fact to me, I provided you with a immunity proposal. Four months later, we still have no answer from you. We are well into the investigation of what we understand your client's allegations to be and are still awaiting a response to our immunity proposal.

You agreed to provide me an answer by March 22, 1999. I appreciate that commitment. Your client should know that this investigation cannot wait any longer for his decision. If we do not hear from you by March 22, we do not intend to pursue the matter any further. We will not continue to bother you or your client if he has no interest in quickly seeking to resolve this matter.

We are committed to obtaining truthful information in a timely manner regarding the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. We hope you and Mr. Jowers will assist us.

Our position should be clear. If not, please call me at 202-514-4067.

Sincerely,

Bill Lann Lee
Acting Assistant Attorney General
Civil Rights Division

By:

Barry F. Kowalski
Special Litigation Counsel
Criminal Section

[LETTERHEAD OF LAW OFFICES OF LEWIS K. GARRISON]

March 22, 1999

Fax: 202-514-4067

[Attachment 6]

Honorable Barry F. Kowalski
U. S. Department of Justice
Special Litigation Counsel
P. O. Box 66018
Washington, D. C. 20035-6018

Re: Investigation - Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

Dear Mr. Kowalski:

Since our telephone conversation, a conference has been held with Mr. Lloyd Jowers. The grant of immunity that you mentioned has been considered.

As you may know, Mr. Jowers has suffered both financially and reputation wise for the statements that he has made regarding the murder of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Mr. Jowers had nothing to gain by his statements except to try to reveal what he knew about the assassination.

In view of the apparent doubt that you have that he may be telling the truth, he has asked me to advise you that he does not intend to make further comments regarding this matter. He will not permit anyone to review the video tapes that you requested.

In view of his instructions to me as his attorney, I cannot offer you anything else in this matter.

If you have any questions, please advise.

Very truly yours,

LEWIS K. GARRISON

LGK:b

[DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE LETTERHEAD]

U.S. Department of Justice
Civil Rights Division
BLL:BFK:bbm
DJ 144-72-1991

[Attachment 7]

April 22, 1999

Mr. Donald Wilson
[Address Omitted]

Dear Mr. Wilson:

Enclosed is a draft of an immunity agreement that I have prepared at your request.

In our April 20, 1999, telephone conversation, we discussed a grant of immunity from federal prosecution "in connection with the documents" before speaking to us any further about them. The draft agreement is intended to cover explicitly all possible federal criminal exposure you might have for your past conduct related to the documents in order to afford you the opportunity to speak candidly about them in the future. As I said, we are more interested in obtaining the complete truth from you on this important public issue than prosecuting you.

If you took evidence related to a federal criminal investigation, concealed and retained it, such conduct can violate 18 United States Code 641. If you knowingly and willfully made material false statements to Mr. Massie and I or to Inspector Bonner, such conduct could violate 18 United States Code 1001. Accordingly, the draft agreement makes specific references to those potential violations. However, it is intended to also cover any past conduct "in connection with the documents" that could violate some other federal statute.

As I also mentioned to you, we cannot grant immunity from future false statements. Accordingly, paragraph 3 in the draft addresses this issue.

Because our primary concern is to insure that our investigation obtains truthful information, I have also included in paragraph 2 a requirement that you submit to polygraph examinations, if we believe they are necessary. We did not discuss this point when we spoke. However, I noted that you advised the *Chicago Tribune* last month that you were willing to take a polygraph examination. The obligation to submit to a polygraph provides the United States a means to test the truthfulness of your information in return for our grant of immunity from prosecution.

The enclosed copy of a letter from the Acting Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights indicates that I have the authority to enter into an immunity agreement on behalf of the Department of Justice.

Please call me at 202-514-4067, as soon as you have considered this proposal. As you know, we are at a stage in our investigation where your prompt response is required.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Bill Lann Lee
Acting Assistant Attorney General
Civil Rights Division

By:

Barry F. Kowalski
Special Litigation Counsel
Criminal Section

cc: Enclosures

IMMUNITY AGREEMENT

1. This agreement between Donald G. Wilson (Mr. Wilson) and the United States Department of Justice (the Department) constitutes a grant of transactional immunity from federal prosecution in return for complete and truthful information from Mr. Wilson regarding certain documents that Mr. Wilson claims he recovered from James Earl Ray's car in 1968.
2. The United States agrees not to prosecute Donald G. Wilson for any past conduct in connection with said documents, as well as for any information or statements he has previously provided about those documents, that may violate 18 United States Code §§ 641 or 1001 or any other federal criminal statute.
3. Mr. Wilson agrees to cooperate fully with the Department by providing complete and truthful information to agents of the Department regarding the subject matter of this grant of immunity as specified in paragraph 1. In this regard, Mr. Wilson will answer all questions posed by agents of the Department both completely and truthfully. Mr. Wilson also agrees not to withhold any information, documentation, or physical evidence related to the subject matter of this grant of immunity. Additionally, Mr. Wilson agrees to submit to polygraph examinations administered by the Department related to the subject matter of the grant of immunity, if determined to be necessary by agents of the Department.
4. This grant of immunity does not extend to any false or misleading information or statements that Mr. Wilson might knowingly and willfully provide to the Department subsequent to the execution of this agreement. Accordingly, if Mr. Wilson knowingly and willfully provides false or misleading information or statements to agents of the Department in the future, he may be subject to prosecution under 18 United States Code § 1001 or other applicable federal criminal statute for such conduct.
5. Further, if Mr. Wilson does not fully comply with the requirements of paragraph 3 above, this grant of immunity will become null and void.
6. No promises have been made other than those expressly set forth in this agreement.

DONALD G. WILSON

DATE

BARRY KOWALSKI
United States Department of Justice

DATE

[DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE LETTERHEAD]

U.S. Department of Justice
Civil Rights Division
BLL:BFK:bbm
DJ 144-72-1991

[Attachment 8]

Mr. Donald Wilson
[Address Omitted]

MAY 6, 1999

Dear Mr. Wilson:

On April 22, 1999, I wrote you forwarding a draft of an immunity agreement that you had requested. That draft agreement provided you with immunity from federal prosecution. In return, it required you to provide truthful information to our investigation of your allegation that you had found certain papers in the abandoned automobile of James Earl Ray, some of which you claim have been subsequently stolen from you.

I called you on April 29, 1999, at your home to determine whether you had received the draft immunity agreement. You advised me that you had received the draft and that you would inform us of your response to the immunity proposal by May 3, 1999.

On May 3, 1999, you called me at my office. You advised me that you were "not interested in any further dialogue with the Department of Justice."

During that May 3 conversation, I noted that you had advised the media of your interest in submitting to a polygraph examination to establish the truthfulness of your claims. I offered to arrange a polygraph if you indeed wished to take one. You refused to respond to that offer.

We are disappointed that you are not willing to cooperate with our investigation. Nonetheless, we respect your right not to cooperate. Accordingly, I will not contact you again.

Sincerely,

Bill Lann Lee
Acting Assistant Attorney General
Civil Rights Division

By:

Barry F. Kowalski
Special Litigation Counsel
Criminal Section

