## ixon probably will re-

By Jon Margolis and Harry Kelly Chicago Tribune

WASHINGTON - House impeachment investigators reportedly are building a case against President Nixon based on interference with an official investigation, a charge they regard as being easier to prove than obstruction of justice.

In this connection, they already have questioned Federal Judge William Matthew Byrne Jr. of Los Angeles and Assistant U.S. Attorney Henry Petersen, and they will talk to former Attorney General Elliot Richardson this week.

The sources said Nixon may have violated two laws against interfering with investigations and that the transcripts he released seem to provide substantial evidence.

One law prohibits interference in an investigation generally, the sources said. The other specifically outlaws lying to a federal investigator.

The strongest case against the President has been thought to be conspiracy to obstruct justice as a result of his discussion of paying hush money to Watergate burglar / E. Howard Hunt.

But the sources close to the inquiry pointed out that conspiracy charges are vague and often hard to prove. The other laws are more precise, they said.

The sources did not provide specific title and chapter numbers of the laws in question. One of the statutes they may be referring to is section 1510 of Title 18 of the U.S. Code, which states that someone has committed a crime who "wilfully endeavors by means of bribery, misrepresentation, and intimidation . . . to obstruct, delay or prevent the communication of information relating to a violation of any criminal statute . . . to a criminal investigator.

The law defines a "criminal investigator" as anyone authorized by any "department, agency or armed force" to investigate criminal activity.

Justice Department sources observed, however, that this statute was designed to protect witnesses against re-

-Turn to Page 12, Col. 1

-From Page 1 general interference.

The sources did not speci-what presidential actions might comprise violations of these laws. But there ap-peared to be several possi-bilities.

Among them:

 Nixon's apparent effort to keep Peterson from investo keep Petersen from investigating the President himself while probing the Watergate coverup. We've got to head them off at the pass." Nixon told Petersen on April 27, 1973, referring to Justice Department investigators, because it's so damned — so damn danger-ous to the use science.

• The President's order, when the covering fell apart, that no White House officials were to receive an imputity form approach than the transcripts. Nixon receives to

concede he issued that order to bar immunity for John Dean, his former counsel who was threatening to implicate others, including

Nixon's reported offer to Judge Byrne of the directorship of the FBI while Byrne was presiding over the Pentagon Papers trial of Daniel Ellsberg.

• The President's lack of cooperation with former special Prosecutor Archibald Cox, whom he fired, and the House Judiciary Committee, whose subpena he complied with only partially.

pena this week, asking the tape of a presidential iversation held April 1. 2 He already has stated to leave a related information in the related information. The committee reportedly

has evidence that on that date Nixon may have been briefed about the political espionage plans of G. Gordon Liddy, plans which cul-minated in the June 17, 1972 Watergate break-in.

mittee said Nixon would get a subpena each time the committee felt he was withholding an especially valuable piace of evidence. He's coing to get a whole string of them," the source said, one after another.

Committee chairman Peter Rodino (D.N.J.) has indicated that all failures to honor subpenas would be considered in the committee's final report on impeachment

Nother Richardson nor Petersen could be reached to comment on their talks with the impeachment in-quiry staff. A secretary in

Judge Byrne's chambers said he would not discuss the subject.