Venue Change Won in Nixon Tax Case

By LESLEY OELSNER Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, April 16— The two men charged with for a change of venue if four ries a maximum five-year prisfalse tax returns for former involves use of the mails; it is maximum three-year President Richard M. Nixon one of a certain group of of-Each count also involves a posand Mrs. Nixon won the right fenses in the Internal Revenue sible maximum fine of \$10,000. today to be tried separately in Code; the prosecution was be-their home towns rather than gun in a district other than the tion of when the trials would special Watergate prosecutor dence, and the transfer motion appeal and the trials are transhad wished.

It was the first change of arraignment. venue to be granted in the long line of Watergate cases.

by Judge Oliver Gasch of the prosecution was the meaning of United States District Court the first condition, involving

A spokesman for the prosecution said tonight that the office was considering an returns.

provision was not applicable.

assisting in the preparation of conditions are met: The offense on sentence and the other, a together in Washington, as the district of the defendant's resi-begin. If his opinion withstands is filed within 20 days after ferred, the judges in the courts

Major Dispute

ne of Watergate cases. A major point of dispute be-More significant, the ruling tween the defendants and the

United States District Court here will, unless reversed on appeal, deprive the prosecution of various advantages, including the possible advantages of a joint trial.

Some advantages are logistical—requiring witnesses to appear only once, for example. But others can sometimes affect the outcome of a case—in a joint trial, for instance, one codefendant might in the course of his defense injure the defense of the other defendant.

Appeal Considered

A spokesman for the prose-

office was considering an appeal.

Judge Gasch, who announced his ruling in a 12-page opinion filed at the courthouse this pre-presidential papers. Accordafternoon, based his decision on a statute that allows for change of value upon request of the defendant in certain types of cases.

Both defendants—Frank De-Marco Jr., a lawyer in Los Angeles, and Ralph G. Newman, a appraiser in Chicago — had contended that their case came with the indictment was Mr. Nixon's disputed gift to the National Archives of his pre-presidential papers. According to the charges, both men men knew that the gift was not made before a change in the tax laws prohibiting deductions for such gifts, but nevershowing the contrary.

Mr. DeMarco was indicted on three counts, each of which carries a maximum penalty upon conviction of five years

prosecutor had argued that the in prison and a \$10,000 fine. Mr. Newman was indicted on Basically, the statute provides two counts, one of which car-

to which the cases are sent would presumably set the trial