

NYTimes NOV 19 1975
**Lawyer in Kennedy Gun Case
 Seeks to Call More Witnesses**

Special to The New York Times

LOS ANGELES, Nov. 18—A lawyer involved in the cross-examination of firearms experts in the assassination of Senator Robert F. Kennedy asked a state judge today for permission to call witnesses whose testimony he said would show that further ballistics tests were needed to prove or disprove the so-called "second-gun theory."

The lawyer, Vincent T. Bugliosi, said that he recently interviewed two policemen who told him that while they were on duty in the Ambassador Hotel pantry the night of the June 5, 1968, shooting, they saw an object "that appeared to be a bullet" lodged in a door jamb.

"If that was a bullet, then we're talking about a ninth bullet, and if there's a ninth bullet, isn't that substantive evidence that there was a second-gun?" asked Mr. Bugliosi, who is serving with former New York Representative Allard K. Lowenstein as counsel for Paul Schrade, one of several persons wounded in the shooting.

Mr. Bugliosi's contention is based on the fact that the Iver-Johnson revolver fired by Sirhan B. Sirhan, the Jordanian immigrant convicted of the assassination, fired only eight shots, and that all of those bullets have been accounted for.

Mr. Bugliosi said that he also wished to subpoena a former hotel employee, Robert

Alfeld, who had told him that he and his boss, Paul Dozier, spotted three shell casings, which appeared to be spent under an icemaking machine as they walked through the pantry the day after the shooting.

Mr. Bugliosi's request to call witnesses to the cross-examination proceedings, which was temporarily refused by Superior Court Judge Robert A. Wenke, was met with angry objections by lawyers representing the district attorney's office.

But one of the lawyers, Thomas Kranz, said that district attorney's office would have no objections to Mr. Bugliosi's witnesses after firearms experts who examined some of the evidence in the case had been questioned.

The experts reported that they had found no "substantive or demonstrable evidence to indicate more than one gun was used to fire any of the bullets examined."