RETURN TO CIA
Background Use Only
Do Not Reproduce

06-77-6286 1371-77

11 January 1977

MEMORANDUM FOR: Chief, SE Division

ATTENTION : Division Security Officer

FROM : (Thomas L. Briggs)

· SE/X/LA

SUBJECT: Appearance As Witness In Behalf of the

United States Government

REFERENCE: USA V. Gerald P. Hemming, Et Al. (76-371-CR-CA)

- 1. During the period of my employment as a Special Agent at the Drug Enforcement Administration (M.) 1871 Jan 1877), I conducted an interview of Gerald Patrick Hemming (DPOB 1 March 1937, at Los Angeles, California) on 23 May 1975 at DEA Headquarters in Washington, D.C. My report concerning that interview has become part of the case file in USA v. Gerald P. Hemming, Et Al., Case Number 76-371-CR-CA, Southern District of Florida, Miami, Florida.
- 2. Upon my entrance on duty in SE Division on 5 January 1977, I orally informed the Division Security Officer, Billy Hix, about the information in paragraph 1 above. Mr. Hix asked me to submit the information in writing as soon as I was settled in the Division. On 7 January 1977, however, Special Agent Robert Fredericks telephonically contacted Hope Mason, DC/SE/X/IA, and told her that the United States Attornery, Southern District of Florida, had requested that I appear at the U.S. Courthouse, Miami, Florida on 10 January 1977 to confer with the Assistant United States Attorney, Karen L. Atkinson, regarding my appearance as a witness in behalf of the U.S. Government in the trial of Gerald P. Hemming.
- 3. During the afternoon of 7 January 1977 I conferred with Mr. Hix who advised me to contact the Office of the General Counsel. I talked to Mr. Edmund Cohen who advised me to get in touch with the Office of Security, External Activities Branch (OS/EAB). I completed an Outside Activity Approval Request (Form 879), obtained the concurrence of DC/SE, Mr. John Stein, and submitted the Form 879 to OS/EAB. OS/EAB sent me to Central Cover Staff (Mr. Blandford) and then to the Office of the General Counsel. After discussions with Mr. Cohen, I called

S/A Fredericks in Miami at Mr. Cohen's suggestion. S/A Fredericks was not available. Mr. Cohen then advised me to return to my office and he would contact me with further instructions. Mr. Cohen retained the Form 879. Subsequently, Mr. Cohen advised me that I should travel to Miami as requested and that CIA would reimburse me for expenses connected with my activities in behalf of the U.S. Government. He further advised me that being in an overt cover status I should state, if asked under oath, that I am currently a CIA employee.

4. On 10 January 1977 I traveled to Miami where I met and conferred with AUSA Karen Atkinson and DEA S/A Robert Fredericks. They informed me that Gerald P. Hemming's case had been severed and his trial would not begin on 11 January. AUSA Atkinson told me she wanted me as a rebuttal witness if Gerald P. Hemming presented the defense that he had been working at the direction of DEA. She said they would not call me until and unless that defense was presented. She also said that she felt that any attempt to question me concerning my current place of employment was irrelevent and she would object to any such line of questioning. She said she would only ask me where I was employed at the time I interviewed Hemming. I returned to Washington D.C. the same day.

03 (Thomas L. Briggs∫

Distribution:

1 - CCS

1 - OS

1 - OGC

SEURE

16 January 1978

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

FROM:

14-00000

Edmund Cohen

Assistant General Counsel

SUBJECT:

U.S. v. Hemming

1. On 22 November 1977 the undersigned accompanied by Messrs. Thomas Briggs Gary Mattocks and Robert Barteaux, travelled to Miami to confer with Judge Hoeveler, and Assistant U.S. Attorney Thomas M. Sherouse, U.S. District Court, Southern District of Florida, about subject case. Messrs. Briggs and Mattocks had dealt with Mr. Hemming while they were employed by the Drug Enforcement Administration and Mr. Sherouse wanted them available as rebuttal witnesses. Mr. Barteaux also was sought as a possible rebuttal witness to describe the Agency's relationship with Mr. Hemming in the event that Hemming raised a CIA defense.

- 2. On 23 November Mr. Briggs, Mr. Barteaux and the undersigned met in chambers with Judge Hoeveler, Mr. Sherouse, Mr. Roger Howard, law clerk to Judge Hoeveler, and Mr. Ted Sakowitz, Public Defender for the Southern District of Florida. Mr. Sherouse decided that Mr. Mattocks would not be required to testify and he did not attend the meeting. The Judge initially expressed some reluctance to have an exparte conference because Mr. Hemming had assumed primary responsibility for his own defense with only limited assistance from the Public Defender. The Judge insisted that a transcript of the meeting be made but he promised that the transcript would be sealed and, in fact, would not be transcribed.
- 3. The undersigned indicated that the Agency had no interest in the outcome of the case and interposed no objection to the introduction of any relevant information. Our sole concern was to protect Mr. Briggs and his relationship with CIA both before and after his DEA employment. The Judge was informed that Mr. Briggs sole connection with Hemming was on 23 May 1975 and that he had no contact with Hemming during any period of Agency employment. The national security consequences of exposure of Mr. Briggs as well as the career consequences were outlined. In addition, the Judge was informed that Mr. Barteaux was prepared to testify as an overt Agency employee about any relationship between Hemming and CIA.

SECRET

E. 2. IMPDET CL BY 035114

- 4. Judge Hoeveler asked Mr. Sakowitz to cross-examine Mr. Briggs to determine whether he had any information which might be relevant to Hemming's defense. Mr. Sakowitz stated that although he was aware that Mr. Hemming wished to call Mr. Briggs as a witness, he was not fully informed of all aspects of the case and, therefore, reluctant to question Mr. Briggs) Thereupon, Judge Hoeveler, swore in Mr. Briggs and proceeded to ask him a series of questions to determine whether Mr. Briggs interaction with Mr. Hemming had been in any way connected with his CIA employment. At the conclusion of this examination the Judge gave Mr. Sakowitz a second opportunity to question Mr. Briggs and when Mr. Sakowitz again declined, he stated that in light of the national security consequences which had been brought to his attention he was not inclined to permit questions relating to Mr. Briggs CIA employment.
- 5. At the conclusion of the conference in chambers, but before the jury was admitted into the courtroom, Mr. Sherouse informed Mr. Hemming that Mr. Briggs) was available as a witness. When the trial proceeded Mr. Hemming concluded his defense without calling Mr. Briggs). Mr. Sherouse, however, did call Mr. (Briggs) as a rebuttal witness. On cross-examination Mr. Hemming asked Mr. (Briggs) whether he was with CIA. Mr. Sherouse promptly objected to the question, the Judge sustained the objection and Mr. Hemming went on to the next question. The trial concluded soon afterwards without Mr. Barteaux being called as a witness. It was subsequently learned that Mr. Hemming was found guilty as charged.

Edmund Cohen

EC: jz

Distribution:

Original / LITIGATION-CRIMINAL, Hemming Gerald P.

1 - EC Signer

1 - Chrono

	CL	ASSIFY AS APPROPRIATE								
	OUTSIDE AC	CTIVITY APPROVAL REQUE	ST							
	COMPLETE AND FORWARD ORIGI	NAL AND 2 COPIES TO EXTERNAL	ACTIVITIES BRANCE	н						
TO :	DIRECTOR OF SECURITY; ATTN:	BRANCH	DATE 7 Jan 77							
THRU:	(Staff, division or office head and se	curity officer, where assign	ned)							
	S2 Division Security Offi									
EDOM:	NAME AND GRADE OF EMPLOYEE (Print or type)	COMPONENT	ROOM NO. AND BLD	G. PHONE						
FROM:	Chicas, Thomas 24, 12/3	W. W.	1 30 58 29	1.594						
1. FULL D	10	<u> </u>								
1. FULL DESCRIPTION OF OUTSIDE ACTIVITY FOR WHICH APPROVAL IS REQUESTED INCLUDING NAMES OF ORGANIZATIONS OR INDIVIDUALS CONCERNED. DATES. LOCALE, ETC. (Refer to Hr 10-7 before completing) CA. 7 January 1977 an approax. High one. I approved in the rate of the first in that she had been to high conducted by a r. Treverselve of the in Mistil. Florida (CIC 305-101-1092), the profession one tele wind In wents me to trough to Mistil to materia a pre-trial conference on languary in crear to propers for possible appearance as a situacian becaming it is a scalar a break Retrick Highle. I consulted still the dr. division becaming it into a a service so to contact the CIC. At approx. If the sais sate I talked a case to contact the CIC. At approx. If the sais sate I talked a case of the covised so to contact the CIC. At approx. In the Requested Activities was cit. 2. REMARKS BY REQUESTOR IN ENGAGING IN THE REQUESTED ACTIVITY, I WILL MAKE NO REFERENCE TO OR DISCUSS MY CIA ASSIGNMENTS OR DUTIES. I (WILL, WILL NOT) BE IDENTIFIED AS EMPLOYED BY CIA FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS:										
un	was a Old employee from Jam 69 Ger cover at them time. I have Jam77).	s mit prin bush dug ard 		e by be n is a significant of the significant of t						
3. COMMEN	ITS AND CONCURRENCE OF STAFF. DIVISION OR	OFFICE HEAD								
·	CONCUR:	DATE SI	IGNATURE OF OPERAT	ING OFFICIAL						
	FOR COMPLETION BY EXTERNAL ACTI									
DATI SECU FOR	E: URITY APPROVAL HAS BEEN (GRANTE THE ACTIVITY CONTEMPLATED BY T	D, DENIED) HIS REQUEST.								

(FOR) CHIEF, SECURITY SUPPORT DIVISION

CLASSIFY AS AL

9/7 Mo Sovery - discuss Therese all re Q Doc the DCD anderty on Drugg - Lets de Bob Bosteaux to be ready to tookly-Info Brocery section. MFR on a Doc Spoke W Tom Sherouse 305 350 5449 Trul 250et. 250ct - but calender call set for 200ct Thur Cal Call Il call bk on 210cd to see where y tand 10/25 Spoke W/ Shewer Hem care is #8 m Judger Calada in a coult 1 earlied is late Next whe as earlied Henry - will be own lawyer Balan, By, Madox of prebulled care Huber for late AM row to call on 16th to check.

11/15 Meet of Mo 5. (Bry) Maddox, Barteaux review Shows statent, ok or why left apry or why returned, who doing, Sales meet of Me & Boutemen get NOO (Mal) view re import of public exposure on (Arygi) or Modelon or briefor review of Boutemen all record on Henry.

reserve for the EA 195 Not 1900 & 9 am 1/20

3/PV

11/17 - Called M - fr mm

Pom Briggs 1 19 Evans St)
Rockville Md 20850
1 smpl - cover
a Jan 69 - May 74 C/A - Arry & Ar Umine - Army
overper ops "clentity
Til DEA 2. S. Jan 77 - No amen, State Even 2 only control of Herry -23 May 75 3, Weny to DC - & see Comen up so Y NOW Sor taget resemble to name from 50 - regioned - law Inforcements

Le contract of contract of

3/12/

···	US vs Hemming Case No 76-71-Cr-CA Judge Hoeveler P.O. Bldg + Ct Home 300 NE. First Ave Migni Florida 1st Ave 3 St Me 33anine Floor 350-4136										
	Thomas	s M.	Sherou	مه	20 64	ntta :	ney 🤅	305)_	<i>3</i> 50	5449	~ 4471
<i>'</i> ,	Sec	Mary 3	Sherou Tres	300	Ainsley B)	do		hn	. 856	, 228	s
-			•		••						
					augus adirikanis — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — —						
	· .			·			· .	-			
						·					
											
•	•						•				* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
						. ,					
						······································	·	•	•		
				,, , .				-	*. r		
		· .		,							

	,	:								,	-
	, ·									-	
			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	·	1	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				.	· · · · ·
					•						

-:

1879

521 Florida Ave and 104

Bany Maddox - 4378958

19nd - 69-73 - Chy Che Vt Han

- DEA Aug 73 - 26 Ed 77 (comm che) CID 27. Feb 77 - gen 5-6 mby Han State Cover now lugar pro- ca, to pople descartons 2 (no later than Dec 76 cular of Maddax no color before DEA

rever personal control only french DEA contr 3. rel of Henny not made over se purhase I navethors

3. rel of Memory and re from

3. rel of super specific Commences

A stered-iffe of specific Commences Y nn - - aba gr -

2 who treat ogphe fi supl-ned No problems av al for Rends de not it of he one engloy has filely damped asse 3. In Och 60 3 enny m eng 1161, 1 m 1967, 3 m 1970 - Ale 23 Ay 70 Henry can: who sperly need in oc W

