

Court in Albuqueque for vioto 10 years in prison for viojating Federal fiveness; regulations.

In the 1966 romany, defense
counsel had contended that
some of those arrested were
only gun collectors or that they
disclaimed active counsctions
with the Minutemen of any viojent intentions.

If Ludwig said festivitay

anythood there had

cone decision. It said the af-filitagine had been sworn to by a detective in the District At-turney's office who did not in-dicate "who the informant was or in what way the informa-tion was reliable."

Although the detective later testified in reports that even-tually he read that the infor-mation had come from police-men acting as undercover men-the Appellate Division said "the

affidavits were defective on their face under the test" set forth by a 1964 United States Supreme Court decision.

That decision.—Aguilar vs. Texas—did not require disclogure of an infermant's name, but did require establishing the basis for his reliability. Mr. Ludwig said, me.

The decisions. Mr. Ludwig said, meant that 14 of 16 counts in the original indictments had to be eliminated, involving felony charges of possession of dangerous weapons and explosives.

They meant that all but seven men had to be freed, he said, leaving seven defendants

rday accused only of two counts of had conspiracy to commit arson in tracy the third degree and to endan-