

Harold Weisberg
Rt. 8, Frederick, Md. 21701
2/5/73

77

Dear Mr. Williams,

Your letter of the second reads, in full, "Peter Taft advised me that he turned over all of our files to you when you changed counsel." Except that he may have told you this, there is nothing accurate about it and it does not really respond to what I asked of you.

When the files I received were turned over to me, he was in California and it was done by one of your office employees after copies were made, for which I waited.

He did not change counsel. You abandoned us, and under the most prejudicial conditions. If you do not have a copy of the letter Mr. Taft wrote the judge and opposing counsel, our present counsel will, I am confident, supply it. Sending it to the judge, with the history of the earlier case, was particularly hurtful. Moreover, with a firm like yours dropping the case, it was inordinately difficult for me to obtain new counsel, as I think you can understand. The judge himself was not happy with the record or the letter and it was some time before he would release you, as the record will show. I know when he did it because he discussed it with me. I was then forced to act xxx xx. I do not have this letter, but I presume the judge wrote it after raising the question with me.

I do not know whether or not you let the statute run on us. I know only that the government alleges this. My purpose in writing to you was to see if you could help us with this problem in any way. If it is a real problem, it is of your creation and one about which I would hope you would want to be helpful. If it is not a real problem, there are other ways in which you could be helpful. I am not a lawyer, but it seems to me that the more obvious of these would be the possibilities of conferences Mr. Taft had with the government. He discussed some of them with me. At one point he made an effort or rather offer to settle without prior discussion with us and for a figure he knew we would not accept. Whether or not such discussions or negotiations stop the running of the statute I do not know, nor can I estimate how a judge would react to the fact of them. I do feel, however, that it is essential for our present counsel to know of them so that if he can use them he will be able to. If Mr. Taft kept no records of them, I had hoped he would recall them. If he discussed them with you, I had the same hope. This is a tender area for any lawyer, one I am assuming our present counsel might find too delicate, hence I address it. But I did not write you without discussing that with him when he told me of the government's motion.

As I believe I informed you, my diaries show that I made a very large number of visits to your office on this. I did a considerable amount of work when asked to, and there is reflection of it in the files. I did everything asked of me and more. If you do not recall my concern over delays, your files should hold my letter asking if justice delayed is not justice denied. These same files hold what seems to be support of the essence of the government's motion, and that also now troubles me, for I have learned of it only recently. You never got an answer to the interrogatories Mr. Taft finally filed and never did anything to get an answer.

If you are unwilling to do anything, that is another matter. But if you are not unwilling, I hope you will see if you can't find some way to help with this matter. Its seriousness to us should be obvious.

Sincerely,

cc: Harvey Claff, III, Esq.

Harold Weisberg