

11/15/70 - 3 in, re: Wellford v Hardin

175-4, records: direct comparison in letters, and's accidentally seen that mis- file in archives in which archives gets 33 to reimburse what they have written about my requests. He should remember this for when in court on claimant's suit.

Exalted-seems to be a '60I specialist, figuring in other suits also. I think in '77 'law, top, antitrust'.

173 note this persistent dependence upon Tuckinsky, have said mislaced, as with us.

177 Torture's first paragraph on Tuckinsky is worth remembering because of the limitation it imposes on interpretation of significance, which is other than D's.

Did they not also cite the reversed Bristol-Myers on this?

179 The Bristol-Myers interpretation of law-enforcement exemption is very narrow, limiting it to only -emphasis- "procurement discovery", i.e., not even discovery where there is nothing before a court.

If (4) there is a parallel, in arguing before Cessell, to ask that all negotiations on the letter agreement and memo transfer be produced in camera. Here, in addition, the Clark memo on what a plaintiff can know should be invoked.

179-no blanket on interagency relevant to AFCA-33 corres; letter-agreement, memo transfer arguments.

And, although it is under "interagency", there is this that is so relevant in spectro, I'm surprised you didn't take it:

"Purely scientific, factual reports and scientific studies cannot be cloaked in secrecy by an exemption..." and here it goes into the intent of the exemption, the real intent.