THE NEW YORK TIMES

U.S. Judge Delays Wiretap Ruling in Chicago Riots By JOHN KIFNER Special to The New York Times CHICAGO, July 21—A Federal judge today put off ruling on the legality of the Government wire taps in the case of eight persons charged with conspiring to incite riots at the Democratic convention last year. In delaying his decision until the trial is over, United States District Court Judge Julius J. Hoffman avoided immediate decision on Attorney General John N. Mitchell's controversial dictum that the Justice Department has the legal power to eavesdrop without court approval on organizations it believes to be seeking to "attack and subvert the Government." Procedure would be to conduct a hearing after the jury trial," Indomas E. Hayden, Jerry C. Rubin and Bobby G. Seale. The three other defendants in the trial, which is scheduled to begin on Sept. 24, are Abbot H. Hoffman, Lee Weiner and John R. Froines. Judge Hoffman said, adding the trial, which is scheduled to be begin on Sept. 24, are Abbot H. Hoffman, Lee Weiner and John R. Froines. Judge Hoffman said, in refusing to turn over the logs of and no one will be permitted ("keep them under lock and key of the defense has sought discourse of the logs, and a full public hearing on their legality District Court in Washington in an attempt to fight the Justice Department has the legal Dellinger, Rennard C. Davis, down a defense motion that the Government."

Mr. Mitchell made the contention in court papers filed in the case, which disclosed that the Government had used wiretapuping and bugging to eaves-drop on five of the defendants. It was the first time that the Justice Department said that it had the power to eavesdrop on domestic groups, free of court supervision and without regard to the Fourth Amendment.

Hearing After Conviction

If some or all of the defend-If some or all of the defendants were convicted, Judge Hoffman said, he would then hold a hearing to determine whether the Government's evidence was "tainted" by illegal electronic surveillance.

Such a finding would be ground for a reversal of the decision.

ground for a reversal of decision.

Judge Hoffman said that if the defendants were acquitted, there would be no need for a hearing on the wiretap evidence. Thus, there would be no ruling on the Justice Department's position.

"I have determined that the most appropriate method of