

NR_key_name: D6B341A982A1A4F9852563A0003FCDB9
SendTo: CN=Jeremy Gunn/O=ARRB @ ARRB
CopyTo:
DisplayBlindCopyTo:
BlindCopyTo: CN=R ecord/O=ARRB
From: CN=Phil Golrick/O=ARRB
DisplayFromDomain:
DisplayDate: 09/09/1996
DisplayDate_Time: 7:48:17 AM
ComposedDate: 09/09/1996
ComposedDate_Time: 7:36:54 AM
Subject: response to most recent FBI letter to leary

Two thoughts (for whatever their worth):(1) In framing the procedural/proper understanding of the "informal agreement" point, we should bear in mind that the FBI has "noticed for appeal" the privacy record. Pressing the point that records that do not fit squarely in the FCI mold of the first two appeals should be briefed separately and considered immediately would invite the FBI to draw attention to this record, which may be to our tactical disadvantage.(2) We should (once again) state, clearly and emphatically, that we are not accepting a burden of proving that the information that the FBI wishes to redact is already in the public record, nor does the JFK Act put anything like that burden on the Review Board. The FBI continues to put forward for Presidential resolution records that they have no factual, legal or policy basis whatsoever for redacting under the JFK Act -- by doing so, they should not put themselves in a position of being credited for "giving up something" when they finally (as I still think they will) agree to release these three records in full. (That last sentence is not really related to the preceding one, or what I really had to say, but it felt good typing it.)

Body:
recstat: Record
DeliveryPriority: N
DeliveryReport: B
ReturnReceipt:
Categories: