UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Copy to:

Report of:

SA JOE C. HESTER April 11, 1969 Office:

MEMPH IS

Field Office File #:

Memphis 44-1987

Bureau File #: 44-39861

Title:

JAMES EARL RAY:

Dr. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. - VICTIM

Character:

CIVIL RIGHTS - CONSPIRACY

Synopsis:

On 3/10/69, subject appeared before Judge W. PRESTON BATTLE, Division III, Criminal Court, Shelby County, Memphis, Tenn., and entered plea of guilty to murder in the first degree for which he was sentenced to 99 years imprisonment. On 3/13 and 3/14/69, efforts made by FBI Agents to interview RAY at Tennessee State Penitentiary, Nashville, Tenn., were unsuccessful. On 4/7/69, subject filed in Criminal Court of Shelby County, Tenn., a motion for a new trial.

- P -

DETAILS:

On March 10, 1969, the subject and his attorney, PERCY FOREMAN, appeared before Judge W. PRESTON BATTLE, Division III, Criminal Court of Shelby County, Memphis, Tennessee, and entered a plea of guilty to murder in the first degree for having murdered Dr. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. RAY was sentenced to minety nine years imprisonment, this having previously been agreed to by RAY, by the District Attorney General, and by Judge BATTLE.

On March 13, 1969, and again on March 14, 1969, the subject RAY, then incarcerated at the Tennessee State Penitentiary, Nashville, Tennessee, declined to be interviewed by Special Agents of the FBI.

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.

ME 44-1987

On April 7, 1969, the subject through his attorneys, RICHARD J. RYAN, J. B. STONER, and ROBERT W. HILL, JR., filed in the Criminal Court of Shelby County, Tennessee, a motion for a new trial. The subject asks that the Court set aside his waiver, his plea of guilty, and his conviction and that he be granted a new trial. Subject states that his waiver, plea, and conviction were the results of his being deprived of legal counsel, in violation of the 14th and 6th Amendments to the U.S. Constitution. The subject states he will show that he and his two prior attorneys, ARTHUR HANES and PERCY FOREMAN, entered into contracts with the author WILLIAM BRADFORD HUIE while the subject was awaiting trial, and that these contracts established a conflict of interest between the subject and his two prior attorneys. The subject therefore asks that the judgment heretofore entered be set aside and that his case be restored to the trial calendar.



REPORTING OFFICE	OFFICE OF ORIGIN	DATE	INVESTIGATIVE PERIOD	
STATE OF THE STATE	WALL DESTRUCTION	4/11/69	3/10/69 - 4/7/69	
TITLE OF CASE		REPORT MADE BY	JAP	
James Babl R. Dr. Martin Li Victin	AY, aka: VIMB KING, JR	CHARACTER OF		
		CR - CONS	PIRACT	

REFERENCE:

Report of SA JOE C. HESTER dated 12/18/68, at Momphis.

/ elh

LEADS:

HEMPHIS DIVISION

AT MEMPHIS, TERNESSEE Will maintain contact with the District Attorney General's Office, and will report further developments regarding subject's motion for a new trial.

					VVL	PAGE	A.W			
				NC NC	NE	ACQUIT-	CASE HAS BEEN:			
CONVIC	AU TO	FUG.	FINES	SAVINGS	RECOVERIES		TALS			
)	PENDING PROSECUTION		
							ll	OVER SIX MONTHS	s X 110	
APPROVED SPECIAL AGENT IN CHARGE					DO NOT WRITE IN SPACES BELOW					
COPIES	MADE:					1	101	0~ 1.0		
		in the same of	(44-3886)	8		44	-198	7-Seeb - A-7		
			(44-198)			S	Ē ćs.			
	١	•					E SS	· ··· · · ·		
,	CON		•			2	(30) (10)			
(1						NDE	~		
	V	,	*					100	loh-	
							Mint.			
	Diss	emination	Record of Attac	ched Report		Notation	ıs			
Agency								•		
Request	Recd.					1				
Date Fv	/d.			_		}				
How Fw	d.]				
By										

GPO : 1968 O - 299-885

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Copy to:

Report of: Date: SA JOE C. HESTER

April 11, 1969

Office:

MEMPHIS

Field Office File #:

Memphis 44-1987

Bureau File #: 44-38861

Title:

JAMES EARL RAY:

Dr. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. - VICTIM

Character:

CIVIL RIGHTS - CONSPIRACY

Synopsis:

On 3/10/69, subject appeared before Judge W. PRESTON BATTLE, Division III, Criminal Court, Shelby County, Memphis, Tenn., and entered plea of guilty to murder in the first degree for which he was sentenced to 99 years imprisonment. On 3/13 and 3/14/69, efforts made by PBI Agents to interview RAY at Tennessee State Penitentiary, Nashville, Tenn., were unsuccessful. On 4/7/69, subject filed in Criminal Court of Shelby County, Tenn., a motion for a new trial.

- P -

DETAILS:

On March 10, 1969, the subject and his attorney, PERCY FOREMAN, appeared before Judge W. PRESTON BATTLE, Division III, Criminal Court of Shelby County, Memphis, Tennessee, and entered a plea of guilty to murder in the first degree for having murdered Dr. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. RAY was sentenced to minety nine years imprisonment, this having proviously been agreed to by RAY, by the District Attorney General, and by Judge BATTLE.

On March 13, 1969, and again on March 14, 1969, the subject RAY, then incarcerated at the Tennessee State Penitentiary, Nashville, Tennessee, declined to be interviewed by Special Agents of the FBI.

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.

ME 44-1987

On April 7, 1969, the subject through his attorneys, RICHARD J. RYAN, J. B. STONER, and ROBERT W. HILL, JR., filed in the Criminal Court of Shelby County. Tennessee, a motion for a new trial. The subject asks that the Court set aside his waiver, his plea of guilty, and his conviction and that he be granted a new trial. Subject states that his waiver, plea, and conviction were the results of his being deprived of legal counsel, in violation of the 14th and 6th Amendments to the U.S. Constitution. The subject states he will show that he and his two prior attorneys, ARTHUR HANES and PERCY FOREMAN, entered into contracts with the author WILLIAM BRADFORD BUIE while the subject was awaiting trial, and that these contracts established a conflict of interest between the subject and his two prior attorneys. The subject therefore asks that the judgment heretofore entered be set aside and that his case be restored to the trial calendar.