

# CLAY SHAW'S TRIAL SET FOR FEBRUARY

## Defense Attorneys, State Reach Compromise

Criminal Dist. Court Judge Edward A. Haggerty Jr. has officially set the date of the conspiracy trial of Clay L. Shaw for the first jury day in February. He made the ruling Monday after attorneys for Shaw and the state agreed on a compromise.

Defense attorneys had sought a six-month delay and Dist. Atty. Jim Garrison's office was in favor of a speedy trial.

Shaw has been charged by Garrison with conspiracy in the assassination of President John F. Kennedy.

The actual trial date will not be known until the judges finish selecting juries for that month. They begin selecting jurors on the first of the month and the first jury day is the first day the jury sits after the process is completed.

The first jury day always falls after the 10th of the month and usually on the 15th.

During Monday's proceedings, Haggerty denied a defense motion for a supplemental bill of particulars of the charges against Shaw. The defense sought more information on alleged meetings attended by Shaw in New Orleans and Baton Rouge in furtherance of the alleged conspiracy.

Chief defense counsel F. Irvin Dymond, however, reserved a bill of exceptions after Haggerty's denial for a possible appeal.

Much of the discussion on the trial date centered on the climate of public opinion.

From the discussion came an indication that the defense may ask for a change of

venue and that the court intends to make contempt citations against those who violated Haggerty's orders not to make public statements about the case.

Haggerty told Dymond that within the law the defense has until two days before the trial to request a change of venue. He asked Dymond to agree to make such a request two weeks before the trial. Dymond refused.

Asst. Dist. Atty. James L. Alcock said that since Shaw was arrested on March 1, the case ought to go to trial within a year of that date.

Dymond said he had no way of knowing what public opinion would be by mid-February and needed as much time as he could get.

Dymond also charged that Garrison had made "a lot of prejudicial and inflammatory statements about the case that would certainly prejudice jurors." He cited a magazine article and a couple of television interviews as examples.

Alcock countered saying that the U.S. attorney general and the Supreme Court had made similar statements on the opposite side.

Haggerty said he had no control over federal officials.