Mr. Joseph Backes 9 Kaine Terrace Albany, New York 12208-1215

Dear Mr. Backes:

This is in response to your April 9, 1996 letter, which was faxed to the Assassination Records Review Board's offices.

First, you are correct that 14 documents that were released on September 20, 1995 were scheduled for re-review, not 13 as indicated in the Chairman's letter.

Second, except for document number 104-10095-10001, which was reconsidered at the January 30-31, 1996 meeting and has postponements until 9/2017, none of the documents which you listed from earlier meetings have been reconsidered yet. Additional evidence from the CIA which the Review Board expected to have for its consideration has not been made available. The Board hopes to reconsider these documents in the near future, but does not have a specific date at this time.

Third, according to my review of the relevant Federal Register notice, two of the documents which you indicated were scheduled for re-review in December 1995, already have dates for release. Document number 104-10015-10105 is scheduled to be released in full in 2017 and document number 104-10052-10087 is scheduled to be released in full in 2005.

Fourth, additional information provided to the Review Board by the FBI contains classified information and cannot be disclosed. Document number 124-10085-10330 and Document number 124-10085-10330 are both scheduled for release in 8/2005.

Fifth, appropriate documents relevant to closed Review Board meetings about which you inquired are enclosed. In addition, I have enclosed all of the documents which have been prepared at this time for the April 16-17, 1996 meeting.

Sixth, Mr. Gunn is out of the office for the rest of this week and next week. Your request for an

additional document in connection with the October 25, 1995 meeting with Department of Defense personnel will have to wait until he returns and I can discuss it with him.

Seventh, I cannot send you correspondence with the Department of Justice concerning the dispute with District Attorney Connick because this is a pending legal matter. I am able to enclose a copy of the subpoena because this is a public document. The court is the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana. It is located in New Orleans. I do not have the address.

Eighth, I can provide you with the following information regarding the Boswell and Humes depositions: Members of the Review Board staff recently took the depositions of doctors Boswell and Humes, both of whom were cooperative. The depositions were taken under oath, and lasted a full day, The depositions were taken at the National Archives and the original autopsy photographs and x-rays were used and the doctors were questioned about the autopsy material. As is standard deposition practice, the doctors have been given the opportunity to review their transcripts to correct any errors that they noticed. They then sign and date the corrected transcripts before a notary. Doctor Humes has completed his review. (His corrections were minor and of no substantive import.) We are continuing to pursue leads regarding the medical evidence. Once our work on the medical evidence is complete, we will be sending to the Archives: (A) the (uncorrected) transcript; (B) the corrected transcript; and © the original audio tape recording of the deposition. There are other key individuals connected with the medical evidence under consideration for depositions. However, besides Humes and Boswell, no other depositions relevant to the medical evidence have been taken yet. Until the depositions are taken, I am not at liberty to discuss specific names.

Ninth, a copy of the Review Board's annual report is enclosed.

Sincerely,

Thomas E. Samoluk, Esq.
Associate Director for Communications

enclosures