NYTimes 52 M. OCT 2 7 1973

ASH IN A CONFLICT **OVER RESIDENCY**

O.M.B. Head Cited Capital and Los Angeles as Home

By WALLACE TURNER Special to The New York Tim

LOS ANGELES, Oct. 26 dispute in Superior Court here today showed that Roy L. Ash, director of the Office of Mandirector of the Office of Man-agement and Budget, had made conflicting statements under iath as to his place of residenc. under

Last March Mr. Ash signed a document in which he stated under penalty of perjury that he lived in a home he owns in the Bel Air section of Los An-geles. The statement saved him less than \$200 on his property tax bill.

tax on. Recently, Mr. Ash filed a declaration in Superior Court swearing that since last De-cember his place of residence was in Washington, D.C.

The statement filed last March was to enable Mr. Ash to benefit from a California statute that provides a lower property tax on homes accu-pied by their owners. The statement claiming Wash-ington, D. C., as Mr. Ash's resi-dence was filed in an attempt

to gain him an excuse from appearing as a witness in the retrial of a libel case here.

Suit Over Sudden Wealth

The libel case has its roots The libel case has its roots in events 20 years ago when Mr. Ash was chief fiscal officer and a friend of his, Charles B. Thornton, was chief executive officer of the Hughes Aircraft Company, an offshoot of the financial and industrial empire of Howard B. Hughes

of Howard R. Hughes. They left the Hughes company together and founded Lit-ton Industries, the conglomer-



ate, which made them both milate, which made them both mil-dionaires. An associate of those years sued them, contending that they had frozen him out of his proper share of the wealth. As a part of that liti-gation, testimony was taken from Noah Dietrich, who was once the chief lieutenant of Mr. Hughes. Hughes.

Mr. Dietrich's statements were adverse to the interests of Mr. Thornton and Mr. Ash.

of Mr. Thornton and Mr. Ash. Mr. Thornton caused the prep-aration and circulation inter-nally at Litton Industries of a statement criticizing Mr. Diet-rich and alleging that his mo-tives were bad. Mr. Dietrich sued. On March 11, 1968, a jury here awarded Mr. Dietrich \$6,215,000 plus in-terest at 7 per cent. The award was against Mr. Thornton, Lit-ton Industries and George T. Scharffenberger, a former vice president of Litton, who played a role in circulating the intera role in circulating the inter-

A thread of the swirling controversy in-volved questions of whether the Air Force had been purposely overbilled and whether false inventory accounts had been kept specifically at Mr. Ash's orders while he was chief fiscal offi-cer at Hughes Aircraft.

Mr. Ash was a witness in that trial. The verdict was set aside on appeal and a new trial ordered. That trial was sched-uled to open next Wednesday. In August Mr. Dietrich's counsel, Harold Rhoden, caused a subpena to be served on Wr Ash who was then in Los Mr. Ash, who was then in Los Angeles. The subpoena called Mr. Ash to testify in the retrial. Move to Kill Subpoena

The disclosures today came

Move to Kill Subpoena The disclosures today came in response to Mr. Ash's re-quest that the court quash the subpoena. Mr. Ash stated in his formal request to the court that since last December he had lived in Washington, D. C., and that it was improper to hold him in readiness in Los Angeles to testify in the retrial. Mr. Rhoden showed today that Mr. Ash swore in March that "I occupied the property described hereon [in California] as my principal palce of resi-dence." The lawyer also told the court today that Mr. Ash owned six cars, all with Cali-fornia licenses, that he had a California driver's license, and that the telephone at his Los Angeles house was answered "Ash residence." Mr. Ash also maintains a bank account" in a bank in Beverly Hills, Mr. Rhoden told the court. Felice Cutler, who represented Mr. Ash, said that Mr. Rhoden was "treating this man as if he's just a garage mechanic."

Mr. Ash, said that Mr. Rhoden was "treating this man as if he's just a garage mechanic." She said that Mr. Ash held an important Government posi-tion and that he was at the call of the President. She ac-cused Mr. Rhoden of grand-Standing for the publicity value. Mr. Phoden rapided that it

Mr. Rhoden replied that it was central to his case to have Mr. Ash testify. Mr. Rhoden said, "I want the jury to hear him and see the expression on his face."