

C.I.A. Rebuffs Request in Trial For Data on a Hughes Burglary

NYTimes

Special to The New York Times

JAN 6 1976

LOS ANGELES, Jan. 5—The Central Intelligence Agency refused today to produce in court any information regarding the mysterious burglary of Howard R. Hughes's headquarters in 1974.

The information had been sought by Donald R. Woolbright, who faces trial in connection with the burglary of the offices at 7000 Romaine Street. Mr. Woolbright is charged with attempting to extort \$1 million from Mr. Hughes's Summa Corporation for the return of two footlockers with the billionaire's confidential files, reportedly stolen on June 5, 1974, by four unknown safecrackers.

Assistant United States Attorney Dominick Rubalcava told Superior Judge Earl C. Riley that the C.I.A. would not yield up information subpoenaed by Mr. Woolbright's attorney. Mr. Rubalcava offered no explanation for the refusal.

Sought Documents

Mr. Woolbright had sought "all notes, letters, memoranda, internal reports, tape recordings" relating to the "alleged burglary" and to "security measures" on documents involving the C.I.A. vessel Glomar Explorer.

Summa served as a front for the intelligence agency in a covert attempt by the Glomar Explorer to recover a Soviet sunken nuclear submarine from the Pacific in 1974. Summa posed as owner of the Glomar, a sophisticated electronics equipped vessel, and announced that the ship would engage in private ocean mining.

This C.I.A. cover was exposed by the burglary, in which a

Hughes document detailing the C.I.A. mission vanished.

Los Angeles police expressed the opinion that the burglary was an inside job, set up by someone with intimate knowledge of the Hughes headquarters.

Mr. Woolbright's attorney told the court that the C.I.A. records were necessary for the defense. He also sought records from the Federal Bureau of Investigation regarding the burglary.

The Justice Department said that the F.B.I. was studying the request but had not yet decided how it would respond.

The Hughes organization refused to pay the million-dollar extortion demand in 1974, which was voiced in a series of telephone calls after the burglary.