## Bid for New Wolfson Trial Is Studied

## By EDWARD RANZAL

The United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit took under advisement here vestook under advisement here yesterday a motion for a new trial for Louis E. Wolfson, the Florida financier now in jail, who is a key figure in the resignation of Supreme Court Justice

Wolfson, who never made an application to remain free sending the outcome of the new trial motion, surrendered last April 25 to begin a one-year term. He is incarcerated at the minimum security Federal prison at Eglin Air Force Base, Fla.

The motion was filed in conin 1967, in which he was convicted of selling unregistered shares of Continental Enterprises, Inc., a small Florida company that he controlled.

Following the first trial, wolfson was tried last year on an indictment charging a conspiracy to obstruct the Securities and Exchange Commission investigation into sales and purchases of stock of the Merritt-Chapam & Scott of the Merritt-Chapam & Scott Corporation.

A Second Conviction

The second trial also ended in a conviction and Wolfson and Wolfson was sentenced to 19 more than a sent to Judge Palmieri for a new trial and the judge held a six-day evidentiary hearing. The defense produced two that a watermark on the exhibit did not exist in 1950, that the earliest it appeared was in 1952.

The evidence in the Commission.

Associated Press
Mr. Bittman recalled that he then asked Judge Palmieri for a new trial and the judge held a six-day evidentiary hearing. The defense produced two that a watermark on the exhibit did not exist in 1950, that the earliest it appeared was in 1952.

The Government made exhibited that he then asked Judge Palmieri for a new trial and the judge held a six-day evidentiary hearing. The defense produced two that a watermark on the exhibited in new trial and the judge for a new trial and the judge held a six-day evidentiary hearing. The defense produced two that a watermark on the exhibited in not exist in 1950, that the earliest it appeared was in 1952.

The Government made exhibited that he then asked Judge Palmieri for a new trial and the judge held a six-day evidentiary hearing. The defense produced two that a watermark on the exhibited in the produced that he then asked Judge Palmieri for a new trial and the judge held a six-day evidentiary hearing. The defense produced two that a watermark on the exhibited in the produced that he then asked Judge Palmieri for a new trial and the judge held a six-day evidentiary hearing. The defense produced two that a watermark on the exhibited in the produced that he then asked Judge Palmieri for a new trial and the judge held a six-day evidentiary hearing. The defense produced two the produced that he then asked Judge Palmieri for a new trial and the judge for the produ



The trial evidence showed that in 1950 Wolfson was in-terviewed in Washington by the regional administrator for the Security and Exchange Commis-sion, the late Russell Kelly.

The Government introduced as an exhibit a memorandum by Mr. Kelly following the interview in which it was demonstrated that provisions of the S.E.C. Act of 1933 had been explained to Wolfson.

Wolfson's trial defense was that he was so busy with the press of work that he was never aware that he had violated S.E.C. regulations.

S.E.C. regulations.

Mr. Bittman told the Appeals
Court that last June he received information from a lawyer that the memorandum was
spurious. He refused to identify
the original source, but Douglas
S. Liebhafsky, assistant United
States attorney, told the court
it was an employe of the commission.

The second trial also ended in a conviction and Wolfson was sentenced to 18 months in prison and fined \$32,000, the prison trms in the two cases to run consecutively. The Appeals Court will hear the appeal from this conviction next month.

Federal Judge Edmund L. Palmieri presided at both Wolfson trials. Wolfson's wife, who had been ill with cancer, died several days after he was sentenced on the second in-dictment.

Deters of fine family would not the earliest it appeared was in rest until the score had been 1952.

The Government made exhaustive tests of the memorandum paper and its witnesses concluded that such a water-mark did exist in 1950. But bers of Mr. Morgenthau bers of Mr. Morgenthau's staff.

Exhibit Attacked

Wolfson's lawyer, William O. Several days after he was sentimental trial as not authentic tenced on the second in-dictment.

Bethis tarning would not the score had been 1952.

The Government made exhaustive tests of the memorandum paper and its witnesses concluded that such a water-mark did exist in 1950. But Judge Palmieri was most month.

Exhibit Attacked

Wolfson's lawyer, William O. Several days after he was sentimental trial as not authentic and argued that a new trial and Mr. Bittman argued that a new trial and Mr. Bittman took the case to the Appeals Court.