Sheriff's Office, and the Memphis Police Department, be ordered by this Honorable Court to make available to your Complainant, through his attorneys of record, all documents, photographs, drawings, writings, electronic recordings, mockups, and oral statements reduced to writing and things pertaining to the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, on April 4, 1968, and offers of rewards published in connection with said incident.

2. For such other, and further relief as your Complainant is entitled.

GIPSON & TUCKER Attorneys for Complainant

Thames Augistan

Robert A. Tucker

PSON AND TUCKER PRATES AT LAW ANGE BUILDING TIE TENN. 38103 907/325-6331 JAMES EARL RAY; Dr. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. - VICTIM

This document contains neither recommendations nor conclusions of the FBI. It is the property of the FBI and is loaned to your agency; it and its contents are not to be distributed outside your agency.

## $\it 1emorandum$

Mr. Franck

DATE:

11-27-73

Assoc. L Asst. Dir.:

> Admin. Comp. Syst. \_ Ext. Affairs

Plan. & Eval. \_ Spec. Inv. Training Legal Coun.

Telephone Rm.

:G. E. Malmfeldt

SUBJECT: GEORGE MCMILLAN

FROGMORE, SOUTH CAROLINA

REQUEST FOR DATA FROM OUR FILES ON JAMES EARL RAY

Captioned individual called Bureau Headquarters on 11-26-73 and was referred to Farrington of the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) Unit. Mr. McMillan advised that he was working on a book concerning James Earl Ray which he hoped to eventually be published by Little, Brown and Company. In this regard, he stated that he had received various data on Ray which he feels is accurate but which he would like to have verified by the FBI. This information included evidence that there was, in fact, no conspiracy involved in Ray's slaying of Dr. Martin Luther King. He would also like to verify some information coming to his attention concerning Ray's activities while in prison and his association with one Stumm.

The provisions of the FOIA, particularly the exemption covering investigatory files compiled for law enforcement purposes that were not over 15 years old, were explained to him. Although he was quite disappointed over our inability to cooperate with him, he claimed that he fully understood. He stated that he would be back in touch with us some time in the future to determine if our position on furnishing him data on James Earl Ray had changed.

Our files reveal that Mr. McMillan is a free-lance writer who has contacted the Bureau on a number of occasions previously concerning the James Earl Ray case and various civil rights investigations conducted by the FBI in the South. As recently as January, 1971, in response to his request for data from the James Earl Ray case, the Department advised him that the only information which could be made available to him consisted of documents filed on behalf of the States of Tennessee and Missouri in the extradition proceedings concerning

1 - Mr. Franck

l - Mr. Miller

1 - Mr. Gebhardt

1 - Mr. Heim

1 - Mr. Malmfeld

JCF:law (7)

ed 12 17 18/3

CONTINUED - OVER

14 DEC 4 1973

2025 RELEASE UNDER E.O. 14176

REC'D GEBHARDT

Nov 30 2 45 PH 1973

FBI HISTICE

REC'D GEBHARBEOTD-OT

HLLER STI**C**E

Nov 28 9 58 AM 1973 - 4 - 7 1073 Nov 76 11 36 AM 773

FBI

ASSISTANT DIRECTOR
EXTERNAL AFFAIRS DIVISION

Nov 27 4 51 PM '73

G. E. Malmfeldt to Mr. Franck memo Re: George McMillan

Ray in the British Court. Since it was the Department's intention to make those limited papers available in the future to authors, publishers or members of the public who wished to inspect them, Mr. McMillan was invited, by the Department, to review those documents only.

## RECOMMENDATION:

For information in the event Mr. McMillan contacts the Bureau in the future.

Det REGIN

- 2 -

			<b>D</b>	
· · · · ·	FBI	` . I	-	·
	Da	ite: 12/28/73	!	
smit the following in	(Type in pla	intext or code)		
AIRTEL				
- <b></b>		(Priority) — — — — — — — —		
TO: NOW DI	RECTOR, FBI (44-388	61)		
FROM: SA	AC, MEMPHIS (44-1987	') (P*)		
SUBJECT: MU	URKIN			
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	arranda en esta en est			
Re	· Memphis teletype t	o the Bureau	dated 12/27/	73.
En	closed for the Bure	au are two p	hotostatic co	pies
static copie	on for Temporary Reses of a complaint, burt, MDT, Nashville,	oth document	s filed in U.	S.
	· other action being	token at th	is time howe	vor
contact will	be maintained with will be properly s	USA, Nashv	ille, and fur	ther
•	1 1 1			
			$\Lambda$	
		85	A HAR	
		05 C-47. //,	Jarof 4-38861	-5
· ·	RE	C-47.		
	RE		12 JAN 2 197	
3 - Bureau (	RE	C-47.		
3 - Bureau (1 - Memphis WGR:dls (4)	RE	C-47.		

U.S.Government Printing Office: 1972-455-574

Special Agent in Charge

Fa.

GENERAL HAVESTIGATIVE

JAN 2 11 40 AH 174

JAN 2 11 40 AH 174

REC'D-CIV RIGHTS
FBI

JAN 2 11 50 AH '74

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT MIDDLE PISTRICE OF MEMBESSEE MASSIVILLE DIVISION.

MILLED

IEU 27 1973

JAMES R. RAY, #65477
Plaintiff/ petitioner

BRITTON TOTALS, OFFIER

ws.

MON. WINFIELD DUMM, Covernor, State of Tenn.

civil action no 2338

MARK A. LUTTNELL, Commissioner of corrections, State of Venn.

Pefendants

## PETITION FOR TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER

Potitioner, acting pro se, alleges:

- 1. That on or about, December 21st 1975, potitioner was informed by deputy warder, Robert Merford, an employe of the Fenn. State grison, Machville, division, that said prison officials was negotiating with Pederal authorities to transfer potitioner-who is an inmate of said prison- to a United States government penitentiary.
- 2. That petitioner is under no ponitchtiary scatteres persuant to a conviction in United States courts, nor does the Federal jovernment hold detainers egainst petitioner.
- 3. That said reported transfer is a logralling operation devised by the Venn. Attorney General's office, and the State administration, to obstruct petitioner's legal processes under the charge petitioner is incorrected under and, political considerations for 1976; and not, as Cov. Dunn implied Dec. 21st during a SV news conference, Whist Venuscoccur are incorable of processing their own institutions.

4. What potabloner intends to contest and regarded terms or the action tourist.

Y20 6 1 1974

D.1.

YEROKED GRISIMAL-RETAIN

44-38861-5928

ENTRESUM:

- 5. That an article in the, Tennescean, dated Dec. 22nd 1973, suggest's that their is a move afoot by Federal & State bureaucrats to surreptitiously attempt a removal of petitioner from his present jurisdiction, without reguer to due process of Law, to a Federal mental institution in, Springfield, Missouri.
- 6. That the State of, Miscouri, not the Fdderal Government, has alleged succeeding jurisdiction over petitioner.
- 7. That petitioner received a back injury approximately thirty (30) days ago which prevents him from standing or sitting in excess of ten (10) minutes at a time, the nature of which would preclude his being transferred a substantial distance without the possibility of irreprable physical harm being done.
- 8. That petitioner has received inadquate treatment for said back injury and a transfer to Federal jurisdiction would obsecure the negligence, if any, between Federal & State authorities.

WHEREFORE, petitioner prays the honorable court issue orders restraining the defendants from transfering petitioner beyon the instant court's jurisdiction, until a hearing can be held, as said reported transfer would result in immediate & irreprable legal & physical damage to petitioner; that the court also overlook technical errow herein— until petitioner can retein counsel which he is in the process of doing— since petitioner is denied use of the prison Law library.

Respectfully submitted:

plaintiff/ petitioner

Station-A

A. Block

Nashville, Tenn. 37203.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TEXHESSEE MASHVILLE DIVISION

FILED

JAMES E. RAY, 65477
Plaintiff

0년027年73

VS.

BEATT ATTE CLOTE
By The African D.C.

MARK H. LUTTRELL, Commissioner of Corrections, State of Tenn.

JAMES H. BOSE, Warden, Tenn., State prison.

ROBERT V. MORFORD, Dep. Warden, Tenn., State prison.

DAVID M. PACK, Attorney General for, State of Tenn.

W. HENRY HAILE, Asst. Attorney General for, State of Menn. defs. Civil Action no 7338

COMPLAINT

- 1. ALLECATION OF JURISDICTION:
- (a) Jurisdiction of the parties in the herein subject matter is based upon the amount in recovery.

Plaintiff, acting pro se, is a citizen of the State of Tennessee under "operation of law" in the subject matter; defendant, Mark H. Luttrell (here-in-after, Luttrell) is a citizen of the State of Tennessee; defendant, James H. Rose (here-in-after, Rose) is a citizen of the State of Tennessee; defendant, Robert V. Morford (here-in-after, Morford) is a citizen of the State of Tennessee; defendant, David M. Pack (here-in-after, Pack) is a citizen of the State of Tennessee; defendant, W.Henry Haile (here-in-after, Haile) is a citizen of the State of Tennessee.

The matter in controversy exceeds, exclusive of interest and costs, the sum of ten thousand dollars.

44-38861-5928

(b) Jurindiction founded in the estatence of a fairest question and the amount in scatterversy:

The action erises under the sixth, eighth, and fourtesith, Armanents to the Thirst States constitution, F.C.7. Thile 23 § 1331 (a) as here-in-after more fully appaars. The matter is controversy exceeds, eveluative or interest and costs, the sum of ten the most pollers.

(c) Jurisdiction founded on the existence of a question existing under particular statutes:

The action origes under Act 42 0.S.C.A. § 1983; J.S.C. Title 28 § 1343 (4) and 2201. As here-in-after more fully appears.

Plaintiff, JAMES C. DAY, Sucs Defendents, MARE H. LEITFPLL: JAMES H. POSS; CONCID V. MOSFORD; DAVID M. PACA; I. HENY HAILE, and alloges:

2. Their on or about July 1)th 1960 initiality efter being ortradited from, hondon, daughend to the United States variant to or. indiscussit no. 16665 were lodged in the Shelby county juil in, reachie, Scancesco whereis call indistrict was issues from.

3. That onio jail section (4-Thoch) inintiff was confined in has been described emong other whys on a "voult" by response of the wisdoms were covered with steel plates, lights were burned twenty-four (24) and, a day; also verious other provenges operations were put into effect therein by the State.

i. That althous plaintiff was a prisoner of the State of Connecese (\*) \*(\*) because for the state of Connecese (\*) \*(\*) because for the state of chaintiff's living quarters in soid jail, and the doctoral tion of calcar presents, operations of calf jail section and has habitents therein, chaintiff and the (2) security justice.

- 5. That during the period plaintiff was confined in said joil, bitvoen July 19th 1963 & March 10th 1969, he was beset with (.as the logs maintained by his joilars will confine) chronic designaches & noce bleeds due to the venslating system therein; and mader the guiss of security medical attention was delayed when required.
- 6. That amongst the security officers stationed im acid call-clock section with plaintiff for curveillance their was above average absentación due to illusades are to the eforcientiqued construction of plaintiff's quarters: at least one(1) officer therein was hospitalized with pneumonia.
- 7. That the aforesentioned confinement conditions were deviated and substitute operation by the government to enervate the prisoner therein and (sic) impare his ability to defend himself under said or, indictment and, or, induce a guilty plea therein.
  - 8. That it is public anowledge that the aforestationed confine ent practices by covariants are, when the situation requires, but into operation against recolcitrant defendants in cr. prosecutions ( before a after trials) when the prosecution has the support of Cominsut poveramental 2 private institutions. (See Exhibit- A).
- 9. That it was public knowledge that those representing the State, the prosecution, and evidently in this instance the court, and those they represent, the corporate business community, were solicitions of a quilty plea by the defendant in the aforementions or a indictment.

<sup>1</sup> A look published by McGrav-Hill in 1969 and anthored by Prof. Fillian

J. Granblian titled "Crime and the legal processes exceines in detail,
among other legal processes, institutionalised uncities employed by
the State in the confinement area to influence were defendant's decision
particularly to avoid jury trials.

perend on March 17th 1960, the trains sudject or the extension, guide the first the

Proofer bettle) all cold told coporter, bevoor, in effect that he wrated a mility don from the cofe don't thorein seconds he (the Andre) was concerned that wridesfendant with have jot a hung jury or, have been acquited in a jury trial.

19. That on or about Hovember 12th 1988 Attorney Toron Foreman of the Mounton, Terms, ber became counsel of record for the defendant (herein plaintiff) in the eforementioned or. indictiont by usurping that title by means of Transmicht representations to defendant - Court from the littleste counsel of record, attorney Arthur J. means or. of the Mr. mingles, Alohoma, ber.

(11. That said Percy Forenen sided D absted the promountion in the effectionationed confinement conditions of his client(Pay) through moral in that he (Forenen) hade no legal moves to alleviate said confinement conditions although requested to so set by said client.

12. That said Percy Foreman, who has a history of defreading clients, exploited the aforementioned confinement conditions his client was enhisting under for his own (Forements) finicial cartichment, and to the legal ends sought by the proceeding therein (a guilty plea) through a series of, among other transproprious, finicial freeds perpetuated against said client a Court connected as follows:

(a) On November 12th 1988 Att. Foreunn presented to his client (Reg) a typed written document to sign for his (Foremain) <u>retainer foo</u>.

(See Exhibit- 3)

on December 11th 1963 Att. Poreion represented to the trial court while inducing said client to falsely owers to a pasper's orth that no loney was available for involvementive purposes or itteracy focs. (Transcript,pp.1-2-27. See Prhibit-C.)

(b) On Hovember 17th 1960 Att. foreign met publiching figure, dilliden

retrord Fule, of Particula Alabama, in fort worth, Taras, therein they unknown to said elient entered into paral agreements to finance Forements fee, to plead said elient guilty, through appliching ventures.

(See Exhibit- D)

on February [rd 1969 Att. Foresceneral sold client entered into literary contract pursuant to the aforescentioned Forescentific parol agreement providing that Att. Forescenerate contract the entire proceeds therein to defend sold client at "trial or trials" in Shelby county, Tenacesce...said contract the later energed on March 9th 1959 to movide, Att. Porescen with [169.000 on condition sold client plead guilty as charged to sold or. indictiont.

( See Exhibit-1)

on February 170 3, 1969, Att. Foreign signed resented to the trial court through two (2) written sotions that while he (Fernan) had received no fee and light expect to receive a dee the defence was without deads to proceeds the trial arrier soid indistribut and thereby he (Poreign) was patitioning the court for proviousles to take and soil pictures of his client car, for the State to finance the resulting trial tr. (Transcript p.1-2. See Inditit-P) on February 7th 196) Att. Foreign in support of the aformantions notions orolly disrepresented to the trial court to the intensed to receive none of the processes from the rate of said client's pictures. (Transcript p.23-21. See Skhihlt- 6)

15. Best the procession a trial count were to a considerable extent conversant with said Percy Porenan's heretofore Jeserabed finicial manipulations under said or, indictment on witnessed by the tr. Verein. (Typesary 14th 196) transcript p.34. See Emilii - 1)

14. That in testimony given under eath in November 1969 before the U.S. Dis. Ct. for the W.D. of Tenn., Memphis division (case no. 69-199), said Percy Foreman in effect admitted he defrauded the trial court and his client (herein plaintiff) in the aforementioned cr. indictment through the notions he (Foreman) filed, cited in count 12 herein above, by testifying in said Dis. Ct. that he & client (Day) had verbally agreed in Marrary 1969 to enter a guilty plea to said cr. indictment. (See Ex- J).

15. That plaintiff as defendant in said or, indictment furnished said Percy Foreman with various items of information gursuant to a jury trial therein, including one phone number in the, Batom Rouge, Louisians, area which he (Foreman) either 1) Regelected to Envestagate )2 investagated and suppressed the results thereof 3) furnished said information to the prosecution & his legal associate, the late John J. Hooker sr. of the Mashville bar or, 4) availed said information to his (Foreman's) literary confidents, William Fratford Huie & Gerold Frank.

16. That subsequent to plaintiff's plea to the aforementioned cr. indictnent (on March 10th 1969) he (plaintiff) indirectly furnished in the
form of two (2) phone numbers in the Raton Rouge & New Orleans, area
of, Louisiana, information- including that furnished said, Percy Foremento the late Z.T. Osborn jr. of the Nashville, bar to have investigated.
"Mr. Osborn reported the resident listed under the Baton Rouge, phone
number was a parish official under the influence of a Teamster Union
official in the Baton Rouge area; that the resident listed under the,
New Orleans, area was—among other things—an agent of a Mideast organization distressed because of Dr. Martin Luther King's reported forthcoming, before his death, public support of the Palestine Arab cause.

17. That plaintiff would produce exhibit to indicate State agencies, including the Tenn. Attorney General's office, were conversent of the reterial furnished seid, Percy Forenan, cited in counts 15 % 16 herein above.

11. The boundary to the eron 10th 1000 ples of defendant (heroin plots till) to the aforementioned or. Encioteent deintiff who, on a such 119h.

1000, transferred to the State penitentiary in, Cambrille, and fortheith placed in the punitive-administrative segregation building.

19. That plaintiff was shortly thereafter informed by then Correction's Commissioner for the State of Tennessee, Fr. Harry Avery, that of he (plaintiff) would emong other things cooke efforts to over-turn the aforementioned multiplea he (plaintiff) would be releasted from regressation and treated like any other pricener, Commissioner Avery said he was specifing for the inigest authority!

20. What thereafter plaintiff tid not coose efforts to have said plan reversed in the courte and pulsequently said, Harry Avery, amounted at a news conference that plaintiff would never be releasted from organization as long as he (Avery) was fennesses's correction's commissioner.

21. That upon catering and prison plaintiff had recurring severe notableeds, which were first semifested in the Chelby county, lenn., joil, and which on two(2) occassions required addicted trestions in the capractical building for relief such as compaintive injections, est. est...a prison physician attributed this condition to the type consinement plaintiff was incorrected under in said Shalby county tail, a lack of natural fir.

22. That plaintiff during soid period, described in count 21, also experience attaches of sought, as species and on one (4) occasion required houseless that these out wherehe needestion maked Constal was prescribed...a priced paysicies attributed this condition to the type confinement plaintiff was a biotim under both in said shelby county, from., joil and later the later, the fact the later than the star to be an appreciation.

AND . Not madecall effection so relabilities all sits, conclude in counter 14 % 22 herein-above, was arequestly achegod under the guilt of security by defendant, nose, then a capaty word n.

24. that thereafter plaintiff petitioned the U.S. Die.et. for the M.D. of Yenn. (for. Million C. Millor, meated) for coefficient relief; the court grants a hearing (divil sector so. 2000, Jon. Doth 1970) and there-in feeder State Corrections consistantly, Verry Avery, who had been displied from that position prior to said harriag, testified that he and, Mr. Alliant. Marry, estimaterative association to the cover of Tenn. had not before plaintiff had pleaded guilt, under the aforementioned or, indictions and coulded be (plaintiff) would represent the State of Land. prison system be confined in punitive-administrative sepregardon... Tr. Avery offered a written document to support and testimony to justify his actions in the matter but the court railed seid document inadviceable.

25. That Tenn. Correction's complectioner, Yr. Like Eussell, who succeed Mr. Avery, testified in effect at hald Fig. et. heaving that he (Tunnell) intended segregating plaintiff until his libigation was terminated.

26. That Judge Miller granted plaintiff limited relief in said hearing under a "Consent Decree" but shortly Character that the gains of security the defendants suspended portions of the relief ordered; and there-after due to trivial harresponent plaintiff was empthed to discontinue to relief order in toto.

27. That in April 1970 plaintiff was transfered to the Youngessee State penitentiary in Potroc, Tennessee.

26. That in the, Petron, institution Andutiff who confined in 6- against therein worked in quarters bounding the nore realizable properties, on well as having yeren in the with, and a whater, which wishes personalized

29. That in the first querter of 1971 (r. Robert C. Heare pas appointed Cerden of said, Petros, institution and he (Poore) shortly thereafter fased out all force of segmention by Fleck in the prices.

30. That in May 1971 plaintiff was transfered to A-clock and thereafter - was under absolutely no forms of negregation in said institution, proceedive or security, until the prices was closed in July, 1972.

31. That on or about July 22nd 1972 plaintiff was transfered back to the State Maditantiary in, Tashville, and forthaith placed in Unit-6, the segregation building.

32. That on or about July 28th 1972 periatiff appeared before the prices classification beard composed of former, Petrop, Smrden (Fr. Sebert S. Moore) and defendant (Sebert Forford) of the, Vachwille, prison and therein each beard releasted strintiff, with approval of the Ferden (defendant Rose), into the general prices population after piclatiff followed wises policy of algains a decument requesting and taking responsibility for release into the general prices population.

33. That on or about August 1st 1972 plauntiff was called off the win prison yard to the operations of dec and given a foundant by defordant, Morford, receing that plaintiff was being receive pated because or previous escape attempts. (See Emhibit- L.).

34. That plaintiff then requested from defeadant, Torford, to examine the Varden, defeadant Pose, about the confine tent emitter and thereupon defeadant, Pose, verbally gave on about out of passons for the reserve-gation of glaintiff, and others in effect as follows:

(a) the nomeropers wight find recovers to spitched the administration if plaintiff was releasted into the original repulsition and recovered took out took place.

- (b) these remember Appethic in the elementationed of indict out the men decrease with a fact that respectively appear of his (Mayte) attempts to obtain a jury trial therein, and that plaintiff of his be releasted from correcution if he toroingtee his litigation.
- (a) that he (wose) was ordered by thister authoraty to research plaintiff.

55. What defe dant, Rose, then assured plaintiff he would be releasted from sepregation after approximately two (2) meaths if the, Petros, isothicution was not respected within that period; and that while plaintiff was confined in the sepregation building he would be granted theoretical specified in the aforementioned order issued by Dis. dudge, William F. Miller.

36. That thereafter abstract was confined and did work in the segre attent building and or request was paralitied to go to a small enclosure (verd) behind said building for exercise and therein gively with other principal serving rule violation conteness.

By. That the phintiff in so more explect to account from insector than our other prisoner in the institution; if the plaintiff was subject to account it would be from the State which has account to him twently-four hours you day requeritions of his consinerent quarters.

38. That in September or Setowar of 1.72 plaintiff was advised by fr. Solin Hayes (a prison cuployes) and hob Succe 170613 (a convict counselor) that the grann's office had imprised that the Governor of Tennessus (101. infield Dune) had personally ordered initiatiff into segregation.

29. Hot thereafter during an improcision of the angregation building by conference, I would, planning was impulsed upon laquity that as Intimple bullensed for the courts to deside them plaintiff was releasted from segregation.

- 40. That in response to a latter from plaintiff dated January 2nd.
  1975 the office of the Covernor of, Tennessee, denied knowledge of
  plaintiff's confinement circumstances in the prison. (See Exhibit-N).
- hat on may 1st. 197, during a news conference, Connessee's Sovernor, Son. Minfield Punn, endorsed the herein alleged confinement conditions being practices by State correction officials against plaintiff.
- in the segregation building and not being releasted into the general prison population, and the progress promised by defeadant (Soce) unfor addler's aforementioned order being gradually subverted by prison officials alleging security consideration, plaintiff returned to locu-up status.
- 43. That it is a tectic of State correction officials to arbitrarily continue a prisoner in sognegation until he consists an event act then justify prior a continued segregation by reason of said act.
- 44. That in January 1973 plaintiff protested, along with others prisoners in segregation under questionable circumstances, by refusing all meals and throwing said weals back on-to the welk.
- 45. What thereafter, approximately four (4) days after plaintiff had begun remain; meals defendent, Morford, entered plaintiff's cell and & ordered him out to be taken to the 'hole', hen plaintiff turned to retrive his shirt said, Morford, puncted plaintiff in the back of the head and called a quard conscaled nearby and plaintiff was then transported to the 'hole'.
- 46. That several days thereafter on being treamfered back to the supergration building from the 'hole' plaintiff, who had had a tooth broken off earlier, was required to wait approximately three (3) weeks before receving feetal treatment on order's of defendant, warford.

47. That on or about February Azar. 1975 plaintiff was transfered to enother more restrictive suggestion incloding (unit-1) and in the process numerous items of personal property was confinented or destroyed, allegedly to comply with unit-1 raies, aquiphone: logal books; fan; shaving equipment, set.ect.

48. That prisoners in the present copye, ation building (unit-1) are runjected to a substitute of petty & serious inequities in comparison with the
regular prison population as follows:

- (a) dictary restrictions.
- (b) hydienic restrictions.
- (c) denial of recreation actives; relactioning progress; law litrary; commissary purchases, telesct.

49. That plaintiff is now a disting under collitery souther and some littons under precise interpretation of that paracolly that in concert with being transfered to sait-1, in Feb. 1973, orders were gut into effect by the Warden's office desping plaintiff appointion situation price prices, even on the segregation building yard. (See Emploit-1).

50. That the plaintiff has now ocen incorporated in the Teamessae orison system in excess of five (5) yrs. and smoot for the interface in the Petros institution, where he wordens were note independent, conditions have become progressively some energiant, and plaintiff consot receive equity from the prison disciplinary board, maich in suppose to safe guard prisoners the process, since the Parkings office can and frequently has overruled said board when the board rules favorably for involves.

51. That on or about June 12th 197, coursel vage making plaintiff, or. Bernard constitueld, evalue before the ".S. Nic. Ti. the ".D. o" cur. for relief from said confinement (See civil netica no. 7006) ander on order to show cause issued by said court; therein fast/ Att. Con. W. Monry Raile representing the Tenn. correction consticuloner's office made various

disregressations of natorial facts to the court, subject to proof, as follows:

Hails- (1) the plaintiff has attempted to escape seven times from the Missouri positiontiary (p.14) a and twiced attempted to escape from the Franky Mountain (Petros) institution. (p.29)

Fact- "both of these representations are numerically faise".

Heile- (2) the plaintiff was not in the general prison population at the Eruchy Mountain institution. (pp. 15% 2)

Fact- "the pleintiff was in the general population at the brushy Mountain institution beginning May, 1971; also, apparently the court has been mislead respecting this matter in the Crafton case. (2.15)

Haile- (3) the plaintiff would have the run of the entire segregation building (unit-1) and a chance to meet more prisoners. (2.13)

Fact
"prisoner working in unit-1, all of whom have asked for protection, are releasted from their cells for approximately one(1) hour three times per day at meal time to help feed the other prisoners & class the Flock; they are restricted during said one (1) hour periods, except when working on walks with officers, to an area approximately 20x60 feet; further, under the special rules of unit-1, workers therein could be placed in the 'hole' and eleminated from their job if cought either telling to non-working prisoners or receive ground the unit.

Haile- (4) the plaintiff was recognized-after being releasted two(2) days into the general prison population-'coance their had been no change in his classification. (p.22)

Fact- "the plaintiff was releasted into the general population for four (4) days by a classification born consisting of former armay fountain Windon, Nobert F. Moore; and security careen, Nobert Morford, of the Machville price.

- .2. Unit the defendants are guilty of the violations as follows:
- (a) defendants, buttroll, Wood and Morford of the following violations:
  - (1) less saling framewhent representations to the Die. Ct. through the Tenn. Att. Gen's. office in the aforesentioned civil suit (no.7006) in order to prolong plaintiff's lock-up in solitory confinement.
  - (2) or arbitarily with radicious invent withholding timely medicial treatment from plaintiff.
  - (3) of attempting to impair plointiff health with the approval; of the present Covernor of the State of remember.
  - (4) of arbitrarily conting plaintiff accest to prison Law library.
- (b) gerendents, Pack, and Helle of the following violations:
  - (1) of nating realizant descriptions to the Dis. et. in the aforementioned civil suit (10.7.00).
  - (2) of bein, convergent with, including external cited in count 16 herein above, exculatory viscose respecting plainties of the defendant in the aforementioned or, indictions through their client, the Att. Con. for the distribute judicial life, of Tonn., and (sic) they owing to inclin vested interacts are advecting and maintainin oppressive condingment conditions against plaintiff to an to oppressive condingment plaintiff from exectain, his cenet. That to appear a review under said or, indictment.
- '(c) referred to noting collicity by of the vicintions as follows:
  - (1) of acting in collusion to deprive plaintiff of his const.

    right (civil 3 and ral) by arbitrarily coinstituting, with

    an expressed molice direct toward plaintiff, coursesive confit and sometions in order to include a subvert deintiff to

    decisions in the approximations or, indictment he is incorcorated under and (sie) obstanting justice.
  - (2) of sating in collation to amove to the agreements in the eforce monutance clv 1 main (60.00,0).

53. That the plaintiff is entitled to examplary damages because defendants should be taught that their hereinabove described operation is repugnant and violative if public policy as evidenced among other ways by Mational politicial figures & Media editorialists not infrequently pointing self-rightous fingers at what they allege to be inequities in other countries corrections & Legal systems; furthermore, that it is legally reprehensible for the State to resort to the same legal tactics ' when arbitrarily holding a prisoner under oppressive confinement conditions as they do in controversial cr. suits, i.e., procrastinate for years before a final adjudication, a tactic which C.J. Warren Burger in a public address on Sept. 20th 1973 refered to as "...forcing them (cr. defendants) to wait endlessly while memories grow dim and witnesses move or die.

54. Taht as a proximate result of the defendants tactics and their predecessors plaintiff has not only been falsely imprisoned for a crize he didn't commit, as interpreted under the Anglo-American Extradition Treaty, and therein subjected to unnecessarily oppressive confinement conditions but several of thoes allegedly representing him, particularly said Percy Foreman, have also exploited this confinement situtation for personal  $\boldsymbol{\&}$ prosectorial interests.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff demands a judgment from the defendants for punitive damages of five hundred thousand dollars; and prays the honorable court overlook any technical deficientcies in this complaint until Counsel can prefect same since plaintiff is denied accest to the prison Law Library, and (sic) cannot research remedial Law.

Station-A

Hashville, Tenn. 37203.

By THEODORE SHABAD The New York Times News Service

MOSCOW - The public recantation by two Soviet dissidents has renewed the issue of political confessions that was dramatized by Arthur Rapelles in his 1949 nevel "Darkness at Noon."

The basic question is, what tat of circumstances can possibly induce presumably strongwilled dissenters political opposition in the Soviet Union is not for the weak - to avow such a total change of mind and heart as Viktor A. Krasin and Pyotr Yakir did at a widely publicized news conference Wednesday.

Yakir, a 50-year-old historian, and Krasin, a 44year-old economist, reiterated testimony given at interests of the state by publishing an underground typewritten newsietter, the well-known Chronicle of Current Events, and by main-. organizations abroad.

minent general purged under of 12 years.

Stalin, "that it was not fear Although the sincerity of members of Yakir's family, ultimately undermine the to recant, but realization of enough is known from the a role in persuading Yakir to leaders.

a realization that did not come overnight, but after long soulsearching."

Krasin, speaking in the same even tone, as if reciting

## Behind the News

a rebearsed text, in the flare of king lights before more than 200 Soviet and foreign newsmen, sald:

"I want the Soviet and foreign public to know that our behavior in the investigation and at the trial was the result of a rethinking of our past errors that led us to rogators operating within a these crimes, and that any well defined idenlegical framasuggestion of the use of work and appealing to the of all foundation."

There is obviously no immediate way of establishing whether the metamorphosis of their wial the previous week the two men is genuine or that they had damaged the a carefully disguised sham designed to earn a reduced personal weaknesses of the sentence for their dissident accused. Yakir, for example, activities. They were given a term of three years' confinement to be followed by taining links with anti-Soviet another three years' endorsed of the country, instead of the hospitalized twice for deprivasaid Yokir, the son of a pro- maximum combined sentence tion of alcohol.

the harmfulness of my acts. Stalin purges to suggest that cooperate with the authorities. day-in, day-out cajeling and intimidation can gradually Koestler has shown in his book.

Similar methods were used in the controversial "explanaation" sessions at the end of the Korean war in late 1853, when Chinese and North Koreans sought to persuade Communist prisoners of war to choose repairintion,

The method appears to have when used by skilled interfellow citizens.

. The impact produced by a carefully focused ideological persuasion might be further of what makes such men reenhanced by playing on any was known to be a heavy drinker, and some dissidents group. have suggested that he gave information to interrogators residence in a remote part only after having been

of punishment that led me their repudations necessarily including his daughter, to acknowledge my guilt and remains an open question, Ikrina, may also have played as now conceived by its

Although there appears to be some superficial similarity wear down the psychological between the Yakir-Krasin reresistance of a prisoner, as cantations and the public confessions of the great Stalin purge trials, there are also significant differences.

The defendants in the triols of the 1930's confessed to fancied help of francishes after they had been confronted with charges that were leter officially declared to have been without foundation.

Yakir and Krasin, on the been particularly effective other hand, were well known as political oppositionists, and at least some of the activities they now declare to have been illegal, such as meetings with pressure, threats or illegal sense of patriotism, the feel-methods against us is devoid ing of loyalty to one's coun-roborated by any of the try, and moral obligation to western newsmen who received dissident news items from

But the tantalizing question cant still leaves unanswared the broader issue of why the Soviet Union feels compelled to root out its tiny dissident

The apparently overwhelming preoccupation with even the slightest political opposition seems to reflect an inner insecurity and a fear that Reported interrogations of disaffection may spread and structure of the Soviet system, .

revenue to be derived from the writings of Wm. Bradford Huie. These are my own property unconditionally.

However, you have heretofore authorized and requested me to negotiate a plea of guilty if the State of Tennessee through its District Attorney General and with the approval of the trial judge would waive the death penalty. You agreed to accept a sentence of 99 years.

It is contemplated that your case will be disposed of tomorrow, March 10, by the above plea and sentence. This will shorten the trial considerably. In consideration of the time it will save me, I am willing to make the following adjustment of my fee arrangement with you:

If the plea is entered and the sentence accepted and no embarassing circumstances take place in the court room, I am willing to assign to any bank, trust company or individual selected by you all my receipts under the above assignment in excess of \$165,000.00. These funds over and above the first \$165,000.00 will be held by such bank, trust company or individual subject to your order.

I have either spent or obligated myself to spend in excess of \$14,000.00, and I think these expenses should be paid in addition to a \$150,000.00 fee. I am sure the expenses will exceed \$15,000.00 but I am willing to rest on that figure.

Yours truly,

/s/ Percy Foreman

-7.

/s/ James Earl Ray

PF-4

Exhibit 4

(11/22/69)

Shelby County Jail Memphis, Tennessee November 12, 1968

Hon. Phil Canale, Jr.
District Attorney General
Shelby County Court House
Memphis, Tennessee
Sheriff William Morris
Shelby County Court House
Memphis, Tennessee
Judge W. Preston Battle
Circuit Judge
Shelby County Court House
Memphis, Tennessee

### Gentlemen:

You are holding as evidence in the case of The State of Tennessee v. James Earl Ray a 1967 White Mustang automobile and a Remington rifle. I have this day assigned and by this letter do here now assign them to Percy Foreman, my attorney, of Houston, Texas, as his property absolutely. At the conclusion of my trial, he will request delivery of these items to him or his order. This is your authorization and my request that you give them to him.

Respectfully yours,

/s/ James Earl Ray

EXhisit - B

# December 18, 1968 JAMES EARL RAY

THE COURT: Alright, Mr. Foreman, I believe about a month ago I asked you to give me a report on your progress in the matter about this time. MR. FOPEMAN: Yes, your Honor. May it please the Court, when I came into this case on the 10th of Nowember, the afternoon, I had no intention or plans or expectations of being, I was committed to mamy Courts, however, it came to me as my duty bouth to my profession and to my man, to accept thme case. I have spent most of the time, more When three fourths of the time since I was committed to this to arrange my docket so that I would have time for this case. All of the Courts in Texas both Federal and State have deferred to my responsibilities in this case. However, the first two weeks of the effort from the 12th of November, maybe a few days longer than that, were dedicated to attempting to get the results of the investigation of the counsel in the case shead of myself. I eventually received a transmittal of what reported to be an investigation accompanied with a letter stating that, of course most of the investigation is in the

EXHIBIT-C

mind of the lawyer and the, regardless of what may have been stated or may have been printed about the case being ready for trial, your Honor, in my experience and my judgment, the case was not and is not and will be a miracle if it is ready for trial on March 3rd. I was furnished a list of some 360 witnesses by the prosecution. I was told that 90 to 95 would probably be all that would be used but I was not given the names of those 90 tm 95 so that I am relegated to attempting to contact and I have made arrangements to that end to the best of my ability, your Honor. May it please the Court, there is no money whatever available in this case for either investigating expenses or attorney fees as of now. There have been numerous offers by publications, magazines and writers to underwrite the fees of this defendant but most of them have a hook in them. I am not willing at this late period of my life to prostitute principles that I hold dear in defense of a thorough case to a pandering press end it may be that there will be an arrangement under which these can be available but they did not induce me to come into this case and

33

that have to be answered under oath so raise your right hand, "Do you solemnly swear that you will truthfully answer the questions asked you about your indigency at this time?"

DEFENDANT: Yes, Sir.

THE COURT: Alright, you can put down your hand. Do you have any money or property available to make available for the investigation of your case and for the expenses of so investigating?

No, Sir. DEFENDANT:

THE COURT: Alright, you can be seated.

MR. DWYER: Your Konor, do we have the right to ask him

any questions about his indigency?

THE COURT: No, Sir, I can handle that myself.

Thank you, your Honor. MR. DWYER:

Mr. Foreman, I think the requirements of THE COURT: this case are peculiar in that as I observed ... once before we have some 360 potential witnesses. They are scattered over North America and Europe. You as I understand it practice alone.

MR. FOREMAN: Yes, your Honor.

niBiT: C

THE COURT: I think that we have here one of the fimest Public Defender's Offices as I know anything about. They have the necessary expertise and the necessary policy of any I know of. They don't merely put up a token defense.

the psychiatrists in Missouri who had examined Ray told me: "From what we know of him it's hard for us to believe he was capable of the initiative required to commit such a crime. We have to believe that he was directed."

So in what I wrote in September I supported conspiracy. My articles were useful in that I presented Ray as a human being, and I revealed places he had been and things he had done which the FBI didn't know about. The I-BI didn't even know that he had plastic surgery until I told them. But all that doesn't justify my mistake of plugging conspiracy. Sure there may have been conspiracy in the strictly legal sense that one or two other men may have had prior knowledge. But not in the sense that so many people want to believe, or that I implied.

Now I wish that I had never gone into this case at all. A let of nonsense is being talked about the value of my rights to "the story." The story is of relatively little value because it's only the story of another Oswald, another Sirhan, another twisted not who kills a famous man to get on television. That's all there is no it. I'm going to complete a book for what it's worth, and try to present a true picture of a twisted nut and all the damage he can do. But far from making any money, I don't expect to get back what I will have spent.

And speaking of mistakes, I believe you've made one. This is not your sort of case. You let them get you to Memphis where the old fire horse couldn't resist another race to the fire. But a week after you begin trying to work with Ray you'll know that where is no defense, and you'll be as sick of the case as Hanes was. You did Art a favor by replacing him; you just haven't realized it yet.

Mr. Foreman liked my three-way contract with Ray. All he wanted was for Mr. Hanes to get out so he could have what Mr. Hanes had had. "I like the idea of owning 60 percent of one of your books," he said, "while you own only 40 percent. So you get Hanes out and let me in, then, goddam it, get to work and write us a good book and make us a good movie and make us some money."

"I don't mind you having the money," I said. "But your effect hasn't met his obligations. I want to know how, why and when he decided to kill Dr. King."

"He may be incapable of telling anybody that," Mr. Formian

FK HIBIT-D

PERCY FOREMAN coast controls
Houston, Texas 77002

March 9th, 169

•

MAIN AT RUSK

Mr. James Earl Ray, Shelby County Jail,

Memphis, Termessee.

Dear James Earl:

You have heretofore assigned to me all of your royalties from magazine articles, book, motion picture or other revenue to be derived from the writings of Wm. Fradford Huie. These are my own property unconditionally.

However, you have heretofore authorized and requested me to negotiate a plea of guilty if the State of Tennessee through its District Attorney General and with the approval of the trial judge would waive the death paralty. You agreed to accept a sentence of 99 years.

It is contemplated that your case will be dis posed of tomorrow, March 10, by the above plea and sentence.
This will shorten the trial considerably. In-consideration
of the time it will save me, I am willing to make the following adjustment of my fee arrangement with you:

If the plea is entered and the sentence accepted and no embarassing circumstances take place in the court room, I am willing to assign to any bank, trust company or individual selected by you all my receipts under the above assignment in excess of \$155,000.00. These funds over and above the first \$165,000.00 will be held by such bank, trust company or individual subject to your order.

I have either spent or obligated myself to spend in excess of \$14,000.00, and I think these expenses should be paid in addition to a \$150,000.00 fee. I am sure the expenses will exceed \$15,000.00 but I am willing to rest on that figure.

PF-4 Jame El Cos

Young truly,

34

EXHIDIT-TE

J. BLACKWELL, CLERK BY B. C. Coham D., C.

IN THE CRIMINAL COURT OF SHELBY COUNTY, TENNESSEE

Division III

STATE OF TENNESSEE

Vs.

No. 16645 and No. 16819

JAMES EARL RAY,

Defendant

TO SAID HONORABLE COURT:

COMES NOW, James Earl Ray, Defendant in the above styled and numbered causes presently pending on the docket of this Court and files this Motion to Permit a photographer of his selection to take photographs of said defendant for the purpose of obtaining funds with which to prepare for the trial of his case or cases; and, in support of said motion, would respectfully show said Honorable Court:

Ì.

Defendant is advised that there is a commercial value to a series of pictures if they can be made available as exclusive to a picture magazine and that this value is respectively either \$3,000.00 or \$5,000.00.

II.

That there is insufficient money available to bring necessary witnesses from other States and other Countries, unless this request be granted. That, if granted, all such monies derived from the sale of said pictures, will be expended in the actual preparation for trial and the trial of said case or cases. That Defendant is without funds or monetary rescurces with which to prepare his case properly for trial, unless these funds be made available.

III.

Defendant says that the taking of a great number of photo graphs will be necessary in order to obtain the two or three dozen
that would comprise the selection for publication, and this would
require a considerable period of time for the photographer to pre-

EXLIBITE DITTE

to

IN THE CRIMINAL COURT OF SHELBY COUNTY, TENNESSEL

DIVISION III

J. A. BIACHURLI CLERK
BY (Black mar D. C

STATE OF TENNESSEE

Vs.

NOS. 16645 and 16819

JAMES EARL RAY

MOTION TO DESIGNATE COURT REPORTERS AND PROVIDE FOR THEIR COMPANISATION BY THE STATE OF TERRESSEE

TO SAID HONORABLE COURT:

COMES NOW, James Earl Ray, Defendant in the above styled and numbered causes and files this Motion to Designate Court Reporters and to enter an order that will provide for the payment of their fees by the State of Tennessee; and, in support of said motion would respectfully show the Court as follows, to-wit:

٠Ì٠

Said Defendant has heretofore testified in open court to the fact that he is an indigent person and has been so adjudicated by this Court; and, pursuant to said finding this Court has appointed the Public Defender of Shelby County to act as counsel for said Defendant. Co-counsel, Percy Foreman, admit - ted for the purpose of appearing in the above cases has received no fee and does not contemplate that he will receive any such fee for his appearance herein.

it.

This motion is filed pursuant to the provisions of the Tennessee Code of Criminal Procedure, Articles 40-2029 through 40-2043, inclusive, the same being Chapter 221 of the Sesions Laws of the Legislature of the State of Tennessee, Acts of 1965, which give the Court the power and authority to grant all of the relief herein prayed for, and, in the opinion of the att orneys for this Defendant, make the granting of such relief mandatory.

TTT.

Defendant says that Shelby County, Tennossie is a principal metropolitan area of the Soule of Tennessee, Maying a population

description of this defendant at all and would be very material evidence if I were on the jury and I think the Trial Judges and trial lawyers would know that such material testimony would be material and we think we are entitled to produce it the only way that we can. I will get to the \$5,000 in a minute, your Honor.

THE COURT: I imagine we will get to a number of things in a few minutes.

MR. FOREMAN: At any rate, I will dispose of that at this time. Your Honor, that \$5,000 is on deposit in a bank in another, in a trust fund and the expense of this case if it were to come within, from the defense standpoint, if it were to come within the \$5,000, it would be some merit to the argument of Mr. Dwyer but the expense, actual out of pocket expense for the trial of this case, if we are relegated to bringing witnesses here for the defense alone, will run \$50,000 or \$100,000, your Honor, and we intend to report to the Court and to give the Court cancelled checks for every item of expense in this case if the Court will receive and review them because I went it said at the conclusion of this trial that

JUIT C

I did not receive anything for my part of this case and it is true that this \$5,000 that he speaks of was paid. It was due under a previous contract between the previous attorney, the defendant and Mr. Huie and Mr. Huie asked permission to pay it but that's all that has been paid, your Honor, and as of today I have no reason to believe that anything else will be paid. It was already accumulated. It was due under this contract to have been paid December the 12th and it was paid as soon as we would permit Mr. Huie to do it. Now, that's the \$5,000. It will not go anywhere near the compensation. Actually, we already have accumulated alleged bills more, than twice what the \$5,000 would amount to. Now, going on to the other witnesses here, we don't, we at least hope this Court does not picking our cue from the argument of the prosecuting attorney, believe that anybody can prove any fact either from the Missouri State Penitentiary or elsewhere that we are relegated to what the prosecution believes will be a favorable witness to prove that fact. We are, we

Fred, 714.

-21-

EXILIT G

## 2-14-69

to make daily reports turned over to his counsel. I think the State of Tennessee is alot nearer bankruptcy than anybody realizes, because that will break anybody. I think Court reporters and this is no reflection on anybody, but I think that the reason that we ve got machines now, is because they priced themselves out of the market and the available money for reporting cases for indigents, the only way It could be done was by use of these machines. So, I think that we are going to have to clarify and solve the status of Mrs. Otwell. Mrs. Otwell was hired while Mr. Hanes was in the case and while money was freely flowing from Hule to Ray to Hanes. Now, Mr. - since that time, well, Mr. Ray has gotten up in Court and sworn that he was Indigent and he had no money to provide for his defense. Since which time it has further been complicated by a payment of \$5,000.00 to you, Mr. Foreman, as I understand It, by - (INTERRUPTED)

MR. FOREMAN: To my control, your Honor, but not to

me, to Mr. Ray. I wouldn't accept it.,

THE COURT: I see. Well, that's that and it's further

EXHIBIT-H

Q.

Your conversation with Judge Battle where

### Tennes State Plenitentiary

STATION A @ NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE 37203

August 1, 1972

#### MEMORANDUM:

TO:

Mr. James Earl Ray #65477

FROM:

J. H. Rose, Warden Tennessee State Prison

1

Robert Moore, Warden // Brushy Mountain Prison

After reevaluating the decision to release you to the general population, this is to notify you that you will be placed back into protective custody in Unit #6 because of the following reasons:

- (1) You have an attempted escape from Missouri State Penitentiary.
- (2) Attempted escape on two (2) occasions from Brushy Mountain Penitentiary.

When Brushy Mountain is reopened and you are transferred back to that facility, your status will be reevaluated by that institution in regard to letting you into population.

JHR/RM/bjm

cc: Commissioner Luttrell
Assistant Commissioner Bass

EXHIBIT- L

January 9, 1973 Mr. James Earl Ray #65477 Confinement Tennessee State Prison Nashville, Tennessee Dear Mr. Ray: Governor Dunn has asked me to acknowledge the عندا receipt of your letter of January 2, 1973 relevant to your treatment while confined in the State prison system. Please be advised that the Governor has never personally directed any of the alleged mistreatment you complain of. The Governor has the utmost faith and confidence in the ability and integrity of his Commissioner of Corrections, the Honorable Mark Luttrell; and he has taken the liberty to forward a copy of your letter to Commissioner Luttrell for his complete and thorough investigation. With every good wish, I am EXHIBIT- M 2025 RELEASE UNDER E.O. 14176



### Tennessee State Penitentiary

STATION A 9 NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE 37203

June 27, 1973

#### MEMORANDUM

TO:

James Earl Ray 65477

Unit 1

FROM:

Robert V. Morford, Deputy Warden

SUBJECT: Exercise Privileges

and the englight was a contract of the analysis of the analysis of the contract of the contrac

Your memorandum of June 24 concerning your recreational privileges has been forwarded to my attention. There are several residents beside yourself who are offered exercise in the smaller enclosure rather than the larger yard, and it is not factual that a different set of rules applies to you specifically. In regards to your statement that "about once every three days" you are offered the opportunity of going to the smaller yard, the facts do not support your statement.

6.

A log is maintained on each resident in Unit 1 to indicate when they exercise or when they are offered the opportunity of exercising. This log book, in regards to your situation, reveals the following:

- 1) On June 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 20, 21, and 22 you were not offered the opportunity to exercise.
- 2) On June 3, 6, 9, 10, and 11 you did exercise in the smaller yard.
- 3) On June 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 23, 24, 25, 2nd 26

EXHPGIT-N

#### Page 2

you were offered the opportunity to exercise and refused to do so.

The fact that you have been restricted to your cell in regards to exercise privileges has been your choice and not the Administration's.

RVM/md

cc: Mr. Robert Childress

#### FB₩

Date: 12/27/73

		ļ.	
mit the following in _	(Type in plaintext or code)		
AIRTEL	AIR MAIL		
	. (Priority)		
TO: DI	RECTOR, FBI (44-38861)		
FROM: SA	SAC, MEMPHIS (44-1987) (P*)		
SUBJECT: MU	RKIN		
of a newspap	closed for the Bureau are origina er clipping from the "Commercial aily newspaper, for 12/27/73.		
JAMES EARL R Tennessee. court offici	is office has received no informa AY's having filed any motion in t Memphis will maintain contact wit als and with the USA, Nashville, ureau of any additional developme	he USDC at Nashvil h appropriate and will promptly	
LEADS:			
THE MEMPHIS	DIVISION		
AT	NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE	f	
of Judge L. EARL RAY ind	ll maintain contact with the USA a CLURE MORTON regarding any motion icating that he was involved with murder ARTIN LUTHER KING.	filed by JAMES	
② - Bureau ( 1 - Memphis	Encs. 2 ENCLOSURE REC 27	861-597	
JCH:cjs (3)	15	JAN 2 1974	
	EX-117	- The ship	
*EXCLOSURE A	TTACHED		
Approved: What	SentM	Per	
JANO 1974	And the Channel	Pernent Printing Office: 1972 — 455-57	

REC'D-COM MICHTS

RECEIVED RECEIVE

MH 2. 4.5276 1374

JAN 2 4 07 PH 974

F. B. U.S. DEPT. OF JUSTICE

and the second of the second of the second

and the second of the second o

 $\label{eq:control_eq} \mathcal{A}_{ij} = \left( \left( \left( \mathcal{A}_{ij} \right)^{-1} + \left( \left( \mathcal{A}_{ij} \right)^{-1} \right)^{-1} \right) \right) + \left( \left( \left( \mathcal{A}_{ij} \right)^{-1} + \left( \left( \mathcal{A}_{ij} \right)^{-1} \right) \right) \right) + \left( \left( \left( \mathcal{A}_{ij} \right)^{-1} \right) \right) + \left( \left( \left( \left( \mathcal{A}_{ij} \right)^{-1} \right) \right) + \left( \left( \left( \left( \mathcal{A}_{ij} \right)^{-1} \right) \right) \right) + \left( \left( \left( \left( \left$ 

The constant of the month of the stage of the transplant of the stage of the stage

and the second of the second o

. . .

# TV Station Says Ray Named Others In Plot

NASHVILLE, Dec. 26. — (UPI) —A television station quoted "highly placed sources" Wednesday night as saying James Earl Ray has completed a document in which he names several persons who he claims were involved in a conspiracy to assassinate Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.

However, U.S. Dist. Judge L. Clure Morton said late Wednesday he had received no documents from Ray, who is serving 99 years in the state prison here following his conviction in the 1968 murder of the civil rights leader in Memphis.

Several federal court clerks also said they had received no such document by closing time Wednesday.

WSM-TV said the sources said Ray's statement was attached to a writ mailed to the U.S. District Court Saturday and that it named persons who he claimed gave him money to participate in a conspiracy.

WSM said Ray "is reported to have dismissed his lates t attorney, Washington lawyer Bernard Finsterwald, and is apparently representing himself."

Efforts to reach Finsterwald Wednesday night failed.

Last week state Corrections Commissioner Mark

Luttrell said he had approached the U.S. Bureau of Prisons about getting Ray transferred to a federal maximum security penitentiary.

WSM said Ray reportedly did not like the idea and "reportedly drew up a writ which was forwarded to federal court in an effort to block the proposed transfer."

"Officials in the federal court clerk's office said they could find no record of having received the petition from Ray," WSM said. "However, the spokesman said Ray filed a writ as a pauper and that it probably went to Judge L. Clure Morton."

Reached at his home, Morton said he had received no letter or document from Ray.

Morton's assistant, Claude Raymer, told WSM that if Morton had received such a writ, he probably would not release it to the public before making a decision.

But Raymer told the station he had no personal knowledge of any communications from Ray to the court in recent weeks.

One federal court source said that as of closing time Wednesday, no such document had been filed in the civil division.

(Indicate page, name of newspaper, city and state.)
— PAGE 3
COMMERCIAL APPEAU
MEMPHIS, TENN.
Date: 12 - 27 - 73
Edition:
Author: Editor: GORDAN HANNA
Title:
Character:
or
Classification:
Submitting Office: MEMPH IS
Being Investigated

44 - 38861 - 5929

2025 RELEASE UNDER E.O. 14176

# TV Station Says Ray Named Others In Plot

NASHVILLE, Dec. 26. — (UPI) —A television station quoted "highly placed sources" Wednesday night as saying James Earl Ray has completed a document in which he names several persons who he claims were involved in a conspiracy to assassinate Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.

However, U.S. Dist. Judge L. Clure Morton said late Wednesday he had received no documents from Ray, who is serving 99 years in the state prison here following his conviction in the 1968 murder of the civil rights leader in Memphis.

Several federal court clerks also said they had received no such document by closing time Wednesday.

WSM-TV said the sources said Ray's statement was attached to a writ mailed to the U.S. District Court Saturday and that it named persons who he claimed gave him money to participate in a conspiracy.

WSM said Ray "is reported to have dismissed his lates t attorney. Washington lawyer Bernard Finsterwald, and is apparently representing himself."

Efforts to reach Finsterwald Wednesday night failed.

Last week state Corrections Commissioner Mark

Luttrell said he had approached the U.S. Bureau of Prisons about getting Ray transferred to a federal maximum security penitentiary.

WSM said Ray reportedly did not like the idea and "reportedly drew up a writ which was forwarded to federal court in an effort to block the proposed transfer."

"Officials in the federal court clerk's office said they could find no record of having received the perition from Ray," WSM said. "However, the spokesman said Ray filed a writ as a pauper and that it probably went to Judge L. Clure Morton."

Reached at his home. Morton said he had received no letter or document from Ray.

Morton's assistant, Claude Raymer, told WSM that if Morton had received such a writ, he probably would not release it to the public before making a decision.

But Raymer told the station he had no personal knowledge of any communications from Ray to the court in recent weeks.

One federal court source said that as of closing time Wednesday, no such document had been filed in the civil division.

	(Indicate page, name of newspaper, city and state.)
	— PAGE <b>3</b>
	COMMERCIAL APPEAU
	MEMPHIS, TENN.
The second second second	<del></del>
	Date: 12-27-73 Edition: Author: Editor: GORDAN HANNA Title:
	Character:
	Classification:
	Submitting Office: MEMPHIS
	Being Investigated

ENCLOSURES TO BUREAU BUFILE 44-38861 MEFILE 44-1987

Re Memphis airtel to Bureau 12/27/73

Encs: Original and one copy of newspaper clipping from 12/27/73 édition of "Commercial Appeal", daily Memphis, Tenn., newspaper