April 29, 2016

Subject: CROWLEY, ARTHUR J.

The enclosed documents were reviewed under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), Title 5, United States Code, Section 552. Deletions have been made to protect information which is exempt from disclosure, with the appropriate exemptions noted on the page next to the excision. In addition, a deleted page information sheet was inserted in the file to indicate where pages were withheld entirely. The exemptions used to withhold information are marked below and explained on the enclosed Explanation of Exemptions:

Section 552

☐ (b)(1)
☐ (b)(2)
☐ (b)(3)
☐ (b)(4)
☐ (b)(5)
☐ (b)(6)
☐ (b)(7)(A)
☐ (b)(7)(B)
☐ (b)(7)(C)
☐ (b)(7)(D)
☐ (b)(7)(E)
☐ (b)(7)(F)
☐ (b)(7)(G)
☐ (b)(9)
☐ (d)(5)
☐ (j)(2)
☐ (k)(1)
☐ (k)(2)
☐ (k)(3)
☐ (k)(4)
☐ (k)(5)
☐ (k)(6)
☐ (k)(7)

20 pages were reviewed and 18 pages are being released.

☐ A document was located which originated with, or contained information concerning, another government agency [OGA].

☐ This information has been referred to the OGA(s) for review and direct response to you.

☐ We are consulting with another agency. The FBI will correspond with you regarding this information when the consultation is completed.

☐ In accordance with standard FBI practice and pursuant to FOIA exemption (b)(7)(E) and Privacy Act exemption (j)(2) [5 U.S.C. § 552/552a (b)(7)(E)/(j)(2)], this response neither confirms nor denies the existence of your subject's name on any watch lists.

For your information, Congress excluded three discrete categories of law enforcement and national security records from the requirements of the FOIA. See 5 U.S. C. § 552(c) (2006 & Supp. IV (2010). This response is limited to those records that are subject to the requirements of the FOIA. This is a standard notification that is given to all our requesters and should not be taken as an indication that excluded records do, or do not, exist. Enclosed for your information is a copy of the Explanation of Exemptions.

For questions regarding our determinations, visit the www.fbi.gov/foia website under “Contact Us.”
The FOIPA Request Number listed above has been assigned to your request. Please use this number in all correspondence concerning your request. Your patience is appreciated.

You have the right to appeal any denials in this release. Appeals should be directed in writing to the Director, Office Information Policy (OIP), U.S. Department of Justice, 1425 New York Ave., NW, Suite 11050, Washington, D.C. 20530-0001, or you may submit an appeal through OIP’s eFOIA portal at http://www.justice.gov/oip/efoia-portal.html. Your appeal to OIP must be postmarked or transmitted within sixty (60) days from the date of this letter in order to be considered timely. The envelope and the letter should be clearly marked “Freedom of Information Appeal.” Please cite the FOIPA Request Number in any correspondence to us for proper identification of your request.

☐ The enclosed material is from the main investigative file(s) in which the subject(s) of your request was the focus of the investigation. Our search located additional references, in files relating to other individuals, or matters, which may or may not be about your subject(s). Our experience has shown when ident, references usually contain information similar to the information processed in the main file(s). Because of our significant backlog, we have given priority to processing only the main investigative file(s). If you want the references, you must submit a separate request for them in writing, and they will be reviewed at a later date, as time and resources permit.

☑ See additional information which follows.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

David M. Hardy
Section Chief
Record/Information Dissemination Section
Records Management Division

Enclosure(s)

In response to your Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request, enclosed is a processed copy of the FBI Los Angeles Field Office file 62-LA-6664.

The enclosed documents represent the first interim release of information responsive to your FOIA request.

Some of the responsive material is exempt from disclosure and marked "OTHER Settlement and Dismissal dated 10/13/89" pursuant to the following protective court order: United States District Court, Southern District of New York, National Lawyers Guild v. Attorney General, 77 CIV-999.

As previously indicated, documents was located which originated with, or contained information concerning another government agency [OGA]. We are consulting with that OGA and are awaiting their response. Our office has processed all other information currently in our possession. Upon the completion of the outstanding consultation by our office, the FBI will correspond with you regarding those documents.

This material is being provided to you at no charge.
EXPLANATION OF EXEMPTIONS

SUBSECTIONS OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 552

(b)(1) (A) specifically authorized under criteria established by an Executive order to be kept secret in the interest of national defense or foreign policy and (B) are in fact properly classified to such Executive order;

(b)(2) related solely to the internal personnel rules and practices of an agency;

(b)(3) specifically exempted from disclosure by statute (other than section 552b of this title), provided that such statute (A) requires that the matters be withheld from the public in such a manner as to leave no discretion on issue, or (B) establishes particular criteria for withholding or refers to particular types of matters to be withheld;

(b)(4) trade secrets and commercial or financial information obtained from a person and privileged or confidential;

(b)(5) inter-agency or intra-agency memorandums or letters which would not be available by law to a party other than an agency in litigation with the agency;

(b)(6) personnel and medical files and similar files the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy;

(b)(7) records or information compiled for law enforcement purposes, but only to the extent that the production of such law enforcement records or information (A) could reasonably be expected to interfere with enforcement proceedings, (B) would deprive a person of a right to a fair trial or an impartial adjudication, (C) could reasonably be expected to constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy, (D) could reasonably be expected to disclose the identity of confidential source, including a State, local, or foreign agency or authority or any private institution which furnished information on a confidential basis, and, in the case of record or information compiled by a criminal law enforcement authority in the course of a criminal investigation, or by an agency conducting a lawful national security intelligence investigation, information furnished by a confidential source, (E) would disclose techniques and procedures for law enforcement investigations or prosecutions, or would disclose guidelines for law enforcement investigations or prosecutions if such disclosure could reasonably be expected to risk circumvention of the law, or (F) could reasonably be expected to endanger the life or physical safety of any individual;

(b)(8) contained in or related to examination, operating, or condition reports prepared by, on behalf of, or for the use of an agency responsible for the regulation or supervision of financial institutions; or

(b)(9) geological and geophysical information and data, including maps, concerning wells.

SUBSECTIONS OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 552a

(d)(5) information compiled in reasonable anticipation of a civil action proceeding;

(j)(2) material reporting investigative efforts pertaining to the enforcement of criminal law including efforts to prevent, control, or reduce crime or apprehend criminals;

(k)(1) information which is currently and properly classified pursuant to an Executive order in the interest of the national defense or foreign policy, for example, information involving intelligence sources or methods;

(k)(2) investigatory material compiled for law enforcement purposes, other than criminal, which did not result in loss of a right, benefit or privilege under Federal programs, or which would identify a source who furnished information pursuant to a promise that his/her identity would be held in confidence;

(k)(3) material maintained in connection with providing protective services to the President of the United States or any other individual pursuant to the authority of Title 18, United States Code, Section 3056;

(k)(4) required by statute to be maintained and used solely as statistical records;

(k)(5) investigatory material compiled solely for the purpose of determining suitability, eligibility, or qualifications for Federal civilian employment or for access to classified information, the disclosure of which would reveal the identity of the person who furnished information pursuant to a promise that his/her identity would be held in confidence;

(k)(6) testing or examination material used to determine individual qualifications for appointment or promotion in Federal Government service he release of which would compromise the testing or examination process;

(k)(7) material used to determine potential for promotion in the armed services, the disclosure of which would reveal the identity of the person who furnished the material pursuant to a promise that his/her identity would be held in confidence.
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
FOI/PA
DELETED PAGE INFORMATION SHEET
FOI/PA# [REDACTED]

Total Deleted Page(s) = 2
Page 6 ~ Referral/Consult;
Page 11 ~ Referral/Consult;

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
X Deleted Page(s) X
X No Duplication Fee X
X For this Page X
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
TO: FILE (62-6664)  
DATE: July 10, 1968

FROM: FILE REVIEW AND SUMMARY CLERKS

SUBJECT: ARTHUR J. CROWLEY  
aka Arthur/Crowley

The following is a summary of information obtained from a review of all references to the subject in the Los Angeles files under the names listed above. All references under the above names containing data identical or possibly identical with the subject have been included.

This summary is designated to furnish a synopsis of the information set out in each reference.
Memo to the SAC from SA LOGAN J. LANE dated 8/5/58.

SUBJECT: JACK NORMAN HOLCOMB

Excerpt from memo states that JACK NORMAN HOLCOMB, FBI #38721A operated for a number of years as a "private eye" in Los Angeles. He became involved in a wire tapping investigation, was indicted in State Court along with two others, but subsequently was acquitted.

Memo further states that JACK N. HOLCOMB, a physician named Dr. ALBERT N. ZDENEK, and an attorney, MORTON J. SALSBERG, were indicted by the County Grand Jury for wire tapping on 5/11/55. The case arose out of divorce proceedings between Dr. ZDENEK and his wife. HOLCOMB entered plea of not guilty on 6/13/55. On 8/23/55, after five hours of deliberation, the jury returned a verdict of not guilty against HOLCOMB, who was defended by attorney ARTHUR CROWNLEY.

Date furnished: 8/4/58
Agent: LOGAN J. LANE
Informant: 
Original: furnished telephonically

SA FRANK H. TOWNSEND memo to SAC, Los Angeles, dated 9/20/56, Re: INFORMATION CONCERNING.

Memo states, in part, that on 9/19/56, provided information regarding who, as reported in a previous memorandum, has been in touch with this source, to whom has protested his innocence of charges brought against him by the District Attorney, on which charges he was recently found guilty.

Source stated that told him that an attorney named had gone to the office of attorney, and had offered to have prosecution's only witness against repudiate his testimony. .... continued that on about 9/17/56, FRED OTASH had gone to making a similar offer and mentioning the sum of to be paid by.
OTASH's proposition was that [redacted] would post the money with Attorney ARTHUR CROWLEY until the affidavit was delivered by Attorney [redacted] who would take the affidavit from [redacted] the prosecution's witness.

Informant wondered if this alleged proposition could be simply a shakedown. Source provided the information to Lt. [redacted] Los Angeles Police Department, who indicated he did not believe the Los Angeles Police Department should look into this since the case was investigated by the Beverly Hills Police Department.

Date furnished: 9/19/56
Agent: Frank H. Townsend
Informant: [redacted]
Original: [redacted]

Los Angeles report by SA EDWARD L. OLSEN dated 11/20/50, Re: UNSUB; ABRAHAM DAVIDIAN, Victim; OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE.

Excerpt from report under breakdown "Investigation of Defendants", information is set out concerning DANNY APPLE, which states in part:

Information is set out concerning [redacted] who was found guilty on 5/18/50 in Federal Court at Los Angeles for impersonating a Federal officer. A review of [redacted] file reflects that the Los Angeles Police Department advised that [redacted] had been arrested after he had attempted to shake down [redacted] of the Southern California Glass Company. ...

On 2/27/50, SA [redacted] contacted ARTHUR CROWLEY, attorney for [redacted] at 6425 Hollywood Boulevard, who declined to permit [redacted] to make any statements regarding the circumstances of the attempted extortion of [redacted] CROWLEY, however, related the facts surrounding this affair as they had been told to him by [redacted]
told that she met COHEN about a month previous. At that time she was on a date with ARTHUR CROWLEY, prominent Los Angeles attorney, who had offices with BEN LEVIN in the Taft Building, Hollywood and Vine Streets in Hollywood.

was a dancer, singer and actress and she had worked in Las Vegas under the stage name of

Date furnished: 12/16/58
Agent: 
Informant: SA IRS
Original: furnished orally

Los Angeles report by SA WILLIAM JOHN NOLAN dated 10/8/60, Re: MEYER HARRIS COHEN, was., ANTI-RACKETEERING.

Details of report sets out information concerning COHEN's association with JOHN STOMPANATO who was slain by CHERYL CRANE, daughter of LANA TURNER.

Excerpt from report states that information was received by Lt.[ ] of the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Office, indicates that on the evening of 4/16/58, Attorney ARTHUR CROWLEY, who has represented CHERYL CRANE's father, STEPHEN CRANE, was at the Mocambo Restaurant in the company of "Miss Damon Runyon of 1958," who is employed by WALTER WINCHELL to popularize the cancer fund which he has made nationally famous.

Date furnished: 4/24/58
Agent: W. J. NOLAN
Informant: Lt. LASO, Intelligence Detail
Original: probably oral

SA GEORGE E. BLAND memo to SAC, Los Angeles dated 11/30/61,

MICKEY COHEN was released on bond on 11/28/61, and informant went to JERRY ROTHCHILD's barber shop, in the event COHEN would be there.
At about 5:20 pm MICKEY COHEN arrived, and informant talked to him, after a short time COHEN went to a phone booth and made three telephone calls.

The third call was to ARTHUR CROWLEY. COHEN asked CROWLEY "if he could hold that thing off until after the first of the year. COHEN would guarantee to make it good and if CROWLEY wanted, he would give him a postdated check or the ice cream parlor. COHEN said it was very important to him, and he hoped CROWLEY could see his way clear to assist. ... COHEN then said that he could not do that, that apparently a piece of property already had a lien on it, and then said something else was under bond already. COHEN said if CROWLEY could just hold off until the first of the year again, and then repeated that he was doing it for a friend. COHEN then said 'perfect, perfect, thanks a million,' and then hung up."

Date furnished: 11/29/61
Agent: GEORGE E. BLAND
Informant Original:

Newspaper clipping from the LOS ANGELES MIRROR-NEWS, 4/14/58. Article captioned: "Police Find Cache of STOMPANATO - Gigolo's Family Threatens to Sue LANA Over Death!", states in part:

CHERYL (CRANE) held in Juvenile Hall, was visited by her mother ... and her father, STEVE CRANE. ... ARTHUR CROWLEY, attorney for CRANE and his daughter, said he will seek CHERYL's outright release without Juvenile Court supervision at her April 24 hearing before Santa Monica Juvenile Court. ...
Los Angeles report by SA EMMETT B. DOHERTY dated 12/26/62, Re: ALLEN SMILEY, true name AARON SMEHOFF, aka: AR

Synopsis of report reflects that personal history and background information on ALLEN SMILEY, FBI #1306281 set out in report.... Subject's telephone calls and possible contacts listed. SMILEY is close associate of movie actor RORY CALHOUN. CALHOUN's brother-in-law is described as having been one of the leading figures in prostitution and vice in Ventura, California..... Portions of SMILEY's testimony before INS, Los Angeles, in regard to his "misdemeanor" conviction for falsely claiming citizenship set out. ....

Details of report under heading TELEPHONE CALLS states that the identities of the subscribers of telephone numbers out of the Los Angeles area were obtained from which information was furnished on a confidential basis and can only be made public through the issuance of a subpoena duces tecum.

1/10/62 Credit card call from Las Vegas, Nevada, RE 5-9111 (Sands Hotel) to North Hollywood, California, PO 6-4323, which is listed to ARTHUR J. CROWLEY, an Attorney, 3458 Wrightview Drive, North Hollywood, California.

1/18/62 Credit card call from Phoenix, Arizona, to Los Angeles, California, number HO 2-6561, which is listed to and ARTHUR J. CROWLEY, Attorneys, 1680 Vine Street, Los Angeles, California.

Section of report headed POSSIBLE CONTACTS OF SMILEY, states that information obtained from which can only be produced by issuance of a subpoena duces tecum, and information furnished by LA T-52 reflects SMILEY has apparently been in contact with the following persons or businesses:

HO 2-6561 ARTHUR J. CROWLEY, Attorney
1680 Vine Street
Hollywood, California
In May, 1960, telephone toll calls charged to KORSHAK's telephone numbers, which are GR 61937 and GR 61938, for the dates set out below, were obtained. The subscribers to these numbers were obtained from informant during July and August, 1960, and the numbers and the dates called and the subscribers are set out below:

List set out includes:

(Reviewer's note: file reflects that SIDNEY R. KORSHAK was the subject of a top hoodlum investigation in Los Angeles during 1960; the case has been closed since April 1961)
Los Angeles letter states in part that brief summaries on the individuals mentioned for the Los Angeles are as being in contact with the subject are set forth below.

Included in information set out is the following:

ARTHUR CROWLEY
3458 Wrightwood Drive
North Hollywood, California

He appears to be identical to ARTHUR J. CROWLEY, Attorney, 1680 North Vine Street, Hollywood, California, telephone 462-6561. CROWLEY is not known to be connected with organized gambling, although he has represented such persons as ALLEN SMILEY and the owners of "Confidential" Magazine in civil law suits and prosecutions. CROWLEY has been observed in court wearing fancy dress shirts which were obviously custom made.

No documentation set forth.
This serial is a GENERAL INVESTIGATIVE INTELLIGENCE FILE OF LOS ANGELES DIVISION dated July 1, 1954 to December 31, 1954.

The report was prepared by Special Agents FRANK H. TOWNSEND and LOGAN J. LANE. The contributions of the various Resident Agents are indicated in the appropriate sections of the report. This is an administrative report.

In this report under the heading of POLICE EFFICIENCY, LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT is the following information:

"In spite of the salaries paid police officers here, and the police take pride in the fact that Los Angeles officers are receiving top pay in the country, the Department still finds that officers claim they need off-duty employment. This was brought to a head in October when a test case was prepared to challenge Chief PARKER's authority to control off-duty employment of policemen. The decision will no doubt affect hundreds of officers.

Attorney ARTHUR J. CROWLEY charged that PARKER permits high-ranking officers to augment their incomes through such opportunities as acting as technical advisors for movie and TV. The issue involves Police Officer FRED OTASH whose work permit to act as store detective in a Hollywood market was revoked after being in effect for five years. OTASH's attorney charges that the withdrawal was without explanation and was, therefore, "arbitrary, discriminatory and illegal--and not valid."

The outcome of this controversy has not yet been learned but there has been no announced change in policy regarding the right of officers to maintain outside off-duty employment."
Airtel from SAC LOS ANGELES to DIRECTOR dated 6/30/59 entitled CRIMDEL-CRS.

Caption on this page is "Hollywood Fight?"

"The 'Los Angeles Examiner' reports that filmland barrister ARTHUR CROWLEY has a judo duel on his docket for tomorrow night as a result of an altercation at the home of dime-store heir LANCE REVENTLOW. CROWLEY, bald, 5'9", 34-year-old student of a Japanese wrestling method, claims to hold a second degree "black belt" rating in judo, which is supposed to connote considerable proficiency. CROWLEY had an argument at REVENTLOW's party with WAYDE PRESTON, star of the Colt-45 TV series. CROWLEY claimed that PRESTON had informed him at the party that he had taught judo in the Army and won his "black belt" in Tokyo. CROWLEY further claimed that he and PRESTON had a $1,000,00 bet on the outcome of their judo match.

CROWLEY is best known for his defense of "Confidential" and "Whisper" magazines against criminal liable and obscenity charges in a celebrated trial here last year."

Airtel from SAC LOS ANGELES to DIRECTOR dated 2/2/59 entitled CRIMDEL-CRS.

Excerpts from the airtel set forth:

**Race fix Case**

"For about three weeks now in the Los Angeles County Superior Court a sensational trial has been in progress against six men charged with horse doping and race fixing. Originally, the Grand Jury indicted eight, but two of the men won a guarantee of immunity from prosecution if they would testify for the state.

The two who were excused from prosecution are RICHARD GACH, 29-year-old jockey's agent, and DON WELLS, 30-year-old horse trainer. GACH, as the state's chief witness against the well known Hollywood private detective FRED OTASH and the others, has insisted in court that he gave false testimony to the Grand Jury on the advice of OTASH.

He, according to the running news accounts of the trial, testified in court that OTASH
gave him two typewritten pages outlining what he should say to the Grand Jury and told him, "If you want to, you can go in there and clean me up."

Under cross examination by OTASH's attorney, ARTHUR J. CROWLEY, the witness admitted he had doped horses on numerous occasions, but denied he had set up suckers for fixed races at tracks in this area."

Reviewer's Note: Remaining portion of airtel not set forth in this memo as it is not pertinent to the subject of ARTHUR J. CROWLEY.
COMPLAINT


"Mr. is Manager of the Radio Station KBLA. He reported that he thought CROWLEY was a Communist because of his association with as said two known Communists. and said these Communists were with whom CROWLEY is associated.

Advised CROWLEY has been very prone to protect minority groups and will argue on this matter at great length. At one time stated radio station KBLA had to much religion.

said he knew nothing definite in regard to CROWLEY's activities, but he associated with who testified before the HCUSA and from his very argumental attitude on social and religious questions.

Date furnished: 4/22/53
Agent:
Informant: Telephonically

Bulky Exhibit consisting of two rolls of film of CRC records. Actually the photographs printed from the film. Appearing on page 16 of the photographs is the following information:

ARTHUR J. CROWLEY
311 6425 Hollywood Blvd.
Los Angeles 28

Date furnished: 10/15/50
Agent:
Informant: Photos of original records.
Original

Reviewer's Note: CRC stands for CIVIL RIGHTS CONGRESS
Letter from SAC LOS ANGELES to DIRECTOR dated 11/21/55 entitled CRIMINAL INFORMANT.

"On November 15, 1955, met SAC and SA at Coffee Dan's Restaurant, Hollywood Boulevard and Cahuenga Street, Los Angeles, California.

The informant was interviewed by the above Agents first in Coffee Dan's Restaurant and later in the informant's car which was parked in the immediate vicinity. The informant furnished the following information:

"CONFIDENTIAL MAGAZINE" INFORMATION CONCERNING GIIF, LA 62-2469.

The informant advised that in August or September, 1955, an article appeared in the "Confidential Magazine" concerning LIZABETH SCOTT, Hollywood movie star, being a Lesbian.

She said the article, in effect, stated that SANDRA BETTS, (et al., SANDRA BETTS, et al-VICTIMS, WST, et al) after being arrested by the Los Angeles Police Department on a vice charge in 1954, admitted the name and telephone number of LIZABETH SCOTT found by Los Angeles Police Dept. in her call book was, in fact, LIZABETH SCOTT, the movie star. This article indicated that BETTS knew SCOTT and also indicated that SCOTT was a Lesbian.

The informant stated that she had given the call book in question to BETTS prior to her arrest, and that BETTS and the other persons arrested with her did not know LIZABETH SCOTT personally, and, therefore, were not in a position to know whether or not SCOTT was a Lesbian.

The informant then stated that about the first week in September, 1955 before she went to the Los Angeles County Hospital, an Los Angeles County prostitute, Los Angeles County Sheriff's Office number and friend of the informant, asked the informant if she wanted to make a few dollars regarding the article in "Confidential Magazine" concerning LIZABETH SCOTT. Stated that FRED O'TASH, (white; male; born January 6, 1922 at Lawrence,
Massachusetts; address, 1342 North Laurel, Los Angeles, California). A former vice squad officer for the Los Angeles Police Department, was presently working as a private detective for Los Angeles attorney, ARTHUR J. CROWLEY, whose office is located at 1680 North Vine Street, Los Angeles, California, said that he had been working with O'TASH in Hollywood for "Confidential Magazine" and that O'TASH had learned that the call book mentioned by BETTS had actually belonged to the informant and that BETTS and the other persons arrested with her had not known LIZABETH SCOTT personally. He stated that O'TASH wanted to talk with the informant about this matter.

The informant said she met O'TASH on or about September 15, 1955 and that he told her that he had learned that BETTS had misrepresented the fact that the call book belonged to her (BETTS), and that she and the other persons arrested with her had not known LIZABETH SCOTT personally. He stated that since the informant was the only person who could refute this part of the story, he would give her $500 if the informant would subsequently sign a statement that she would not testify in behalf of LIZABETH SCOTT in the event that SCOTT sued "Confidential Magazine."

(Reviewer's Note: The entire letter was not set forth only that part which was felt pertinent to CROWLEY.)
A Negative of ARTHUR CROWEY and Wife and la is a Photograph of ALLEN SMILEY, ARTHUR CROWEY and his wife taken at JERRY LEWIS Restaurant on or about 2/9/63.

Date furnished: 2/15/63
Agent: JOHN P. COSTIN, JR
Informant: Picture and Negative is the original.

Memo from AMEDEE O. RICHARDS to SAC LOS ANGELES dated 5/16/66 entitled:

"On 4/26/66, informant was contacted telephonically and advised that since he had not talked with agents on 4/7/66, that he had not seen but had referred him to attorney Source stated that he had done this at the request of the brother of Also since last contact source stated that he had heard no further information concerning the individual by the name of who allegedly had access to large sums of money to lend out to individuals for business investments.

On 5/9/66, source was contacted at his office telephonically, and arrangements were made to meet source on 5/10/66. Source stated that he had been very busy of LLOYD H'AND, who is running for Lt. Governor of the State of California. Source stated that there had recently been a party for LLOYD H'AND at the home of attorney ARTHUR CROWEY, and also there had been a dinner for H'AND at the home of JOE SHEHAB, who is an automobile dealer in the San Fernando Valley.

$100.00-a-plate dinner for H'AND at the Ambassador Hotel on May 25, 1966."

Etc.
(Reviewing Note: Remaining part of memo not pertinent to CROWEY, therefore not setting forth here.)
This is an FD-302 regarding interview with Mr. JACK HOLCOMB, Private Investigator, on 9/5/57.

Mr. JACK HOLCOMB, Private Investigator, currently associated with the investigative firm of VIRGIL K. SCOTT and Associates, 1540 North Highland Avenue, Hollywood, California, who now maintains his permanent residence at 10723 Garber Lane, Houston, Texas, was interviewed by SA-s PETER J. MEANEY at his Los Angeles Office on September 5, 1957, regarding his alleged employment by ROBERT HARRISON, publisher of "Confidential" and "Whisper" Magazines.

In this interview HOLCOMB advised his ATTORNEY is ARTHUR CROWLEY, who is the defense council in the present trial involving "Confidential" Magazine.

Date furnished: 9/5/57
Agent: MEANEY, PETER J.
Informant: JACK HOLCOMB
Original FD-302

Las Vegas report of SA dated 4/22/64 entitled DERBY SPORTS SERVICE LAS VEGAS, NEVADA ITW.

Following information taken from SYNOPSIS:

New Orleans, Louisiana, phone 831-2341, denies wagering or telephonic contact with subject book. Los Angeles area telephone 766-4323 is that of North Hollywood criminal attorney ARTHUR J. CROWLEY. Telephone toll checks reveal no long distance calls to Las Vegas from above with exception of BEULAH BROWN who has called Golden Nugget Casino.

It has previously been determined that Telephone No. 766-4323 is assigned to ARTHUR J. CROWLEY, 3458 Wrightview Drive, North Hollywood.

ARTHUR J. CROWLEY is a noted criminal attorney practicing in the Los Angeles area.

Information regarding CROWLEY's phone number was obtained from by whom or what date not given.
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Squad

Extension

File No.

2-5-68

(date)
**Indices Search Slip**

FD-160 (Rev. 10-1-59)

TO: CHIEF CLERK

Subject

Aliases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Birth Date</th>
<th>Birthplace</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**File & Serial Number**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File &amp; Serial Number</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>92-1724-99.9</td>
<td>I = c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92-1217-134 pg.10</td>
<td>I = c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92-652-193</td>
<td>I = c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.11.12.17.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92-126-662-p.12</td>
<td>I = c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-142-34-p.11</td>
<td>I = c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-5-8-2-1</td>
<td>I = c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-184-5-1324</td>
<td>Restricted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-184-5-1325</td>
<td>NT age 58 in the 90's NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92-27-2200-1.3</td>
<td>I = c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-556-4-184-10.12</td>
<td>I = c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-23577-71</td>
<td>I = c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-23717-1314-2</td>
<td>I = c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92-2850-1-149-8.35</td>
<td>I = c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92-2-3045-3190.1</td>
<td>I = c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Requested by**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Squad</th>
<th>Extension</th>
<th>File No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Searched by**

7-5-68

**Consolidated by**

(date)

**Reviewed by**

(date)

**File Review Symbols**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>Identical</th>
<th>?</th>
<th>Not Identifiable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NI</td>
<td>Not Identical</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Unavailable reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>