

NR_key_name: FD4DAEA7D45B896A8625636400634428

SendTo: David_Marwell @ jfk-arrb.gov @ internet;Eileen_Sullivan @ jfk-arrb.gov @ internet

CopyTo:

DisplayBlindCopyTo:

BlindCopyTo: CN=Eileen Sullivan/O=ARRB

From: garb @ ix.netcom.com (Garby Leon) @ internet

DisplayFromDomain:

DisplayDate: 07/11/1996

DisplayDate_Time: 10:42:37 AM

ComposedDate:

ComposedDate_Time:

Subject: Fwd: Re: Fwd: Judge Sues Over JFK Information: He wants CIA to answer questions on mystery man (fwd)
Dear Mr. Sullivan --just wanted to add this FD to the Capehart article, sent to me by Lisa Pease of CTKA.Thanks for your attention; no acknowledgment required for this one - just append to the previous notes if you can.Best,Garby Leon FROM LISA PEASE, CTKA: Just for clarification - the earlier stories on Judge Minier and Capehart related that Capehart claimed to be with Oswald AT the time of the assassination, providing Oswald an alibi, if true. So any records on Capehart would be of SUBSTANTIAL importance to this case!! :) Lisa PeaseOn Tue, 9 Jul 1996, Garby Leon wrote:> You wrote: > >> >Dear Mr. Leon:> >> >Thank you for your message. The Board has received thousands of leads > >regarding the potential existence of assassination records. We carefully > >review all of the information. The recent news article on Claude Barnes > >Capehart will be reviewed by the appropriate Board staff members.> >> >The Review Board has not dealt with any records related to this individual, to > >the best of my knowledge. As a matter of policy, the Board does not discuss > >specific communications with other agencies relative to specific records in > >which we may be interested. > Thank you for your response, but I didn't ask anything about "specific communications > with other agencies" -- I asked if you were going to pursue information on Claude > Capehart at all, from anywhere, in general, and if in fact you were aware of the > Minier case and the publicity and discussion surrounding it. > > It's the "...in which we may be interested" part of your sentence that interests me. > Is the ARRB "interested" in pursuing Capehart information? If that hasn't been > officially decided yet, when will we know what the decision is?> > You see, from your note it kind of sounds like any ARRB disposition of this matter > will be shrouded in secrecy, perhaps only to be made public at the end of the > process, when it will be too late for a citizen to respond, urge, or object to the > ARRB's actions or lack thereof. That's why I'm asking for this information -- I and > many other JFK students and researchers are highly interested in this case, and in > the ARRB disposition of it. We would like to feel that the ARRB is responsive to > respectable suggestions, as this instance surely is. And we would like to do our > part in urging the process forward, if for some reason the mechanism for reviewing > what the ARRB is "interested" in fails to work in this case. > > Today I forwarded you a more recent article on Judge Minier's case, which has been > decided in a ruling against the Judge's request for information on Capehart. It > would seem to me that this court ruling -- protecting government secrecy in a JFK > related inquiry -- makes it even more imperative that the ARRB pursue all relevant > documents, from all relevant agencies, in this matter. > > I appreciate that, as you say, "The Board has received thousands of leads > >regarding the potential existence of assassination records." But I wonder if you > have received "thousands of leads" from published articles, about former judges who > have sued a federal

Body:

recstat:

DeliveryPriority: N

DeliveryReport: B

ReturnReceipt:

Categories: