MR. JOHN GREENEWALD JR.

FOIPA Request No.: 1366169-000
Subject: DOUGLAS, WILLIAM O

Dear Mr. Greenewald:

Records responsive to your request were previously processed under the provisions of the Freedom of Information Act. Enclosed is one CD containing 26 pages of previously processed documents and a copy of the Explanation of Exemptions. This release is being provided to you at no charge.

Please be advised that additional records potentially responsive to your subject may exist. If this release of previously processed material does not satisfy your information needs for the requested subject, you may request an additional search for records. Submit your request by mail or fax to – Work Process Unit, 170 Marcel Drive, Winchester, VA 22602, fax number (540) 868-4997. Please cite the FOIPA Request Number in your correspondence.

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.

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 may file an appeal by writing to the Director, Office of Information Policy (OIP), United States Department of Justice, Suite 11050, 1425 New York Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. 20530-0001, or you may submit an appeal through OIP’s FOIAonline portal by creating an account on the following web site: https://foiaonline.regulations.gov/foia/action/public/home. Your appeal must be postmarked or electronically transmitted within ninety (90) days from the date of this letter in order to be considered timely. If you submit your appeal by mail, both the letter and the envelope should be clearly marked “Freedom of Information Act Appeal.” Please cite the FOIPA Request Number assigned to your request so that it may be easily identified.
You may seek dispute resolution services by contacting the Office of Government Information Services (OGIS) at 877-684-6448, or by emailing ogis@nara.gov. Alternatively, you may contact the FBI's FOIA Public Liaison by emailing foipaqquestions@ic.fbi.gov. If you submit your dispute resolution correspondence by email, the subject heading should clearly state “Dispute Resolution Services.” Please also cite the FOIPA Request Number assigned to your request so that it may be easily identified.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

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

Enclosure(s)
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 if 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.
UPI-193

(DOUGLAS)

A REQUEST BY SUPREME COURT JUSTICE WILLIAM DOUGLAS TO BE CLEARED FOR TRAVEL TO RED CHINA AS A NEWSPAPERMAN HAS BEEN TURNED DOWN BY THE STATE DEPARTMENT. OFFICIALS SAID THEY DECIDED DOUGLAS DID NOT MEET THE CRITERIA OF OTHERS WHO HAVE BEEN GIVEN PERMISSION TO MAKE THE TRIP—NAMELY THAT HE IS NOT A BONA FIDE FULL-TIME NEWS CORRESPONDENT. THE REQUEST FOR DOUGLAS HAD BEEN PLACED BY THE NATIONAL GEOGRAPHIC SOCIETY, WHICH IS ONE OF THE 30 NEWS ORGANIZATIONS ATTEMPTING TO GAIN ADMITTANCE TO COMMUNIST CHINA

6/24-N793P

file
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REC-36

NOT RECORDED 126 JUN 30 1959

62 JUL 1 1959

WASHINGTON CAPITAL NEWS SERVICE
Douglas Red China Trip
Faces Policy Denial

By the Associated Press

Assistant Secretary of State Walter Robertson strongly hinted yesterday that the State Department will reject Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas' request for permission to visit Communist China as a newsmen.

Mr. Robertson made it clear he did not believe Justice Douglas qualifies as a full-time professional newsmen even though former New York Gov. Harriman got a go-ahead to undertake a similar trip.

In reply to questions after a speech at the National Press Club, Mr. Robertson reported he had many reservations about Mr. Harriman's qualifications but finally signed.

Clever Operation

Mr. Harriman pressed his case through a "very clever lawyer who was former Secretary of State Dean Acheson but Mr. Robertson did not mention him by name."

The lawyer argued, said Mr. Robertson, that Mr. Harriman was now employed full time as a working newsmen and had no other job.

Mr. Robertson said the implication was that "this poor fellow (Mr. Harriman) might starve to death" until the Department validated his passport for travel to Red China as a newsmen.

In discussing Justice Douglas' plea for similar permission, Mr. Robertson said the Department's policy was: "If a Supreme Court Justice or a high official can qualify as a full-time news correspondent, I am sure Mr. Loy Henderson (Deputy Undersecretary of State) will give him a passport."

Passport Policy

But, Mr. Robertson stressed, the department's policy of allowing only full-time newsmen to visit Red China is not "a device to set up a facade behind which (tramp) newsmen can visit Communist China."

Justice Douglas, reached by a reporter, declined specific comment about the passport matter.

But he said the National Geographic Magazine had requested him to do a picture story on the Chinese mainland this summer. The Justice said that he had represented that magazine previously in doing picture stories abroad.
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Inside Washington

By Robert S. Allen

The list of U.S. notables who want to visit Red China in the next few months is growing.

In addition to Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas, whose application for a passport validation is pending before the State Dept., others who propose making such a trip include Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Adlai Stevenson, Sen. Magnuson (D-Wash.), chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee; Sen. Engle (D-Calif.), California's Gov. Brown; and former Sen. William Benton (D-Conn.).

Justice Douglas plans to do a series of picture articles on Red China for the National Geographic magazine. Mrs. Roosevelt, Benton and Stevenson would also represent publications during their tours of Red China.

Whether they get permission to go to Red China will be determined by Secretary Harrison. The State Dept. chief personally made that decision in the case of Averell Harriman, who was recently given State Dept. clearance to Red China to do a series of syndicated articles.

Uncle Sam himself would be one of the biggest gainers from an increase in interest rates on government bonds.

Of the $7,600,000,000 the Treasury paid out in interest on such securities last year, 30 odd "government investment accounts" received a total of $1,500,000,000—equal to the second largest amount of nine different investor "classes" holding these bonds.

The other two top-interest-receiving groups are: individuals, $1,500,000,000; commercial banks, $1,500,000,000.

Largest of the "government investment accounts" are the Old Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund, the Disability Insurance Trust Fund, Railroad Retirement Fund, and the Highway Trust Fund.

Ways and Means Committee insiders are saying that the most likely decision on the Administration's two interest-rate proposals will be 3% per cent rate on savings bonds, but rejection of the move to abolish the 40-year-old 4% per cent limit on marketable government-securities.
Estes Criticizes
Press Visit Ban

By Carroll Kliepatrick

CLEVELAND, Sept. 15—Dem-Court decision on integration of
the races in the public schools

In reply to a question on this, Estes Kefauver said today that he was "sorry" the State Department, "backed by the President himself," had refused to permit a dozen American newspapermen to visit Communist China.

"The world needs more than a free flow of ideas," Kefauver told a Cuyahoga County Democratic steak roasts at Euclid Beach Park here in opening his campaign for the Buckeye State's 25th electoral votes.

Kefauver flew in here this morning from Orlando, Fla., to be met by the Democratic candidate for Governor, Michael Y. D'Isalle, former director of the Office of Price Stabilization under the Truman Administration, and other party leaders.

Gov. Frank Lausche, Democratic nominee for the Senate seat held by Sen. George Bender, (R) was not present. The state Democratic organization planned Kefauver's one-day visit here, and Lausche is not a regular organization supporter. After a trip to the Northwest, Kefauver will campaign again in Ohio stops at church

Kefauver kept his campaign in "low gear" today because it was a Sunday. On the way into town from the airport, he stopped at the West Park Baptist Church. But services were ending as he drove up. He got out of his car and shook hands with the minister, the Rev. Ernest Dayka, who in turn introduced him to the congregation as "Mr. Kefauver." After a luncheon with more than 50 party leaders, Kefauver began a round of handshaking at the ox roast. One police officer estimated 19,000 persons were present; and D'Isalle said about $45,000 was taken into party coffers.

Kefauver read from a morning edition of the Tampa Tribune report on his remarks last night in Orlando, "We must be guided by the Supreme
To: SAC, Los Angeles (58 - NEW)
From: Director, FBI (58 - NEW)
ABRAHAM LINCOLN WIRIN, AKA., A. L. WIRIN;
SUPREME COURT JUSTICE
WILLIAM O. DOUGLAS
BRIbery
OC: LA

Rel A airtel and LHM dated 8-31-64.

Rel HM is not being disseminated by the Bureau at this time pending receipt of certain clarifications noted hereafter.

On Page 3, Paragraph 2, it is indicated that Deputy District Attorney Harry Woods is handling appeal of his local conviction. It would appear that this may refer to the appeal of the manslaughter charges which were dismissed by a local judge. Los Angeles should clarify the nature of the appeal as well as Woods's connection with the appeal.

Paragraph 3 on Page 3 indicates that Judge Schweitzer appealed conviction to the State of California Supreme Court. It would seem that attorney and not Judge Schweitzer appealed the conviction to the Supreme Court of California. Los Angeles should further clarify this. Page 4, Paragraph 3, Line one, fourth word should be "Communist" rather than "Community."

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED
Airtel to SAC, Los Angeles

It is noted that re LEM contains a "Group 1" and "Confidential" classification, however, the cover airtel sets forth no justification for the use of these classifications. Los Angeles should furnish the Bureau justification for these classifications.

By return airtel Los Angeles furnish the Bureau amended pages for insertion in re LEM clarifying the previous items. No further action is to be taken by Los Angeles in absence of specific instructions from the Bureau. Form errors should be charged responsible personnel in the Los Angeles Office.
TO: DIRECTOR, FBI
FROM: SAC, LOS ANGELES (58)
RE: ABRAHAM LINCOLN WIRIN, aka., A. L. Wirin;
SUPREME COURT JUSTICE WILLIAM O. DOUGLAS
BRIBERY

Enclosed for the Bureau are four copies of a self-explanatory letterhead memo.

Los Angeles is conducting no investigation in this matter pending advice of Bureau who may desire to discuss these allegations with the Department. The U. S. Attorney's Office at Los Angeles has not been contacted regarding information furnished by and

Bureau case in which the Bufile is 46-42796, and Los Angeles file 46-6687, which is discussed in the letterhead memo.

WIRIN is SI of Los Angeles Office, Bufile 100-17242, and Los Angeles file 100-4876.
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

In Reply, Please Refer to
File No.

Los Angeles, California
August 31, 1964

CONFIDENTIAL

ABRAHAM LINCOLN WIRIN,
also known as A. L. Wirin;
SUPREME COURT JUSTICE WILLIAM O. DOUGLAS

Bureau case entitled, FALSE CLAIMS - CIVIL.

He was indicted on local charges of manslaughter and conspiracy to commit acts injurious to public health. The manslaughter count was dismissed by a local judge which dismissal is now on appeal by the Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office in the California Supreme Court. He was convicted on the conspiracy charge and on August 31, 1963, was sentenced to serve one to five years in State Prison by Superior Court Judge HAROLD W. SCHWEITZER, Long Beach, California. He appealed this conviction to the California Supreme Court, which denied his appeal and is presently appealing this conviction to the U. S. Supreme Court.

He was freed on an appeal bond by Judge SCHWEITZER and one of the conditions being that voluntarily

In the current Bureau case regarding allegations were made that investigation is being conducted at the request of the Office of the United States Attorney, at Los Angeles, to determine whether and to determine whether it is economically feasible for

DECLASSIFIED BY SP-1(GSK/WC) ON 4/1/81
APPROPRIATE AGENCIES
AND FIELD OFFICES
ADvised BY ROUTING
SLIP (S) DEC. 5-20-81

CONFIDENTIAL

GROUP 1
Excluded from automatic decontrol and ENCLOSURE
the U. S. Attorney's Office to file a civil action against regarding these allegations.

On August 28, 1964, of the Village Center, and of Village Center, advised that since conviction they have been attempting to cancel lease on this as has not been paying his rent. Stated that on three separate occasions since his conviction has told her that he was going to get his license back and that he did not want to cancel the lease as he wanted a place after the recovery of his license. On each occasion, told that he had retained the services of Attorney A. L. WIRIN to appeal his conviction and loss of his license to the U. S. Supreme Court, told her that he had given $7,500 to WIRIN who was going to pay $5,000 of that money to Supreme Court Justice WILLIAM O. DOUGLAS who was going to set aside the order of Judge SCHWEITZER which suspended license. An attorney, advised that he was present on one of the occasions when made these statements.

and advised that they were shocked when they recently learned that Justice DOUGLAS did issue an order setting aside the order of Judge SCHWEITZER and reinstating license. In addition, they have learned that is once again

Both and described as a "loudmouthed braggart" and expressed disbelief that Justice DOUGLAS would accept money to assist
They noted, however, that statements which they had discounted as "just talk" did become a reality.

On August 31, 1964, Deputy District Attorney HARRY WOODS, Appellate Division of the Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office, advised that he is representing the County of Los Angeles concerning appeal of his local conviction, and also he is representing the County of Los Angeles in appealing the dismissal of the manslaughter count against

WOODS advised that at the time of sentencing, Judge SCHWEITZER remanded to jail as Judge SCHWEITZER did not feel that it was safe to allow to be voluntarily surrendered his license to the State after which appealed his conviction to the State of California Supreme Court, which appeal was denied.

then retained the services of A. L. WIRIN who filed an appeal with the U. S. Supreme Court. WOODS stated his office then received a notice from the Clerk of the U. S. Supreme Court that WIRIN had filed a request that all arguments in this matter be heard before Supreme Court Justice DOUGLAS at Santa Barbara, California.

WOODS stated the next thing he heard was that on August 10, 1964, Justice DOUGLAS issued an order staying Judge SCHWEITZER's order regarding the suspension of license. WOODS stated that his office was not given the opportunity to argue this matter prior to Justice DOUGLAS' taking this action.

WOODS noted that Judge SCHWEITZER has been on vacation and that he discussed this matter with Judge SCHWEITZER on August 31, 1964, who issued an order ordering to appear before Judge SCHWEITZER at 10:00 a.m., on September 2, 1964. WOODS advised that Judge SCHWEITZER told him that at that time he is going to remand to the custody of the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Office as it is his opinion that is a menace to society.
Sources, who have furnished reliable information in the past, have furnished the following information regarding ABRAHAM LINCOLN WIRIN:

WIRIN is a member of the law firm of Wirin, Rissman, Okrand, and Posner, 257 South Spring Street, Los Angeles, California.

WIRIN was a Communist Party (CP) member as early as 1935 and in 1936 was an Organizer of the CP in the Imperial Valley of California. WIRIN was a member of the CP Club of Los Angeles in 1940, but was dropped from the CP during that year. He was criticized by the CP for his legal defense of Japanese aliens in that he advocated their civil rights.

WIRIN has acted as defense attorney for leaders of the CP under trial for violation of the Smith Act. He has consistently defended the CP and CP members and has appeared before the House Un-American Activities Committee hearings as counsel for numerous CP members who had been subpoenaed as witnesses.

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.
CONFIDENTIAL

The Deputy Attorney General

Director, FBI

ABRAHAM LINCOLN WIRIN, ALSO
KNOWN AS A. L. WIRIN
SUPREME COURT JUSTICE WILLIAM O. DOUGLAS
BRIBERY

Enclosed is a copy of a memorandum dated August 31, 1964, at Los Angeles, California, which sets out information received by our Los Angeles Office concerning an alleged payment of $5,000 to Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas by attorney Abraham Lincoln Wirin on behalf of his client

No investigation concerning this matter will be conducted by this Bureau in the absence of a specific request from the Department.

Upon removal of classified enclosure, this transmittal letter becomes UNCLASSIFIED

Enclosure

NOTE: See memorandum Rosen to Belmont dated 9/11/64 EFK: jds

EKF: jds

(b6)

SEP 11 1964
Date: 9/8/64

Transmit the following in

(Via) AIRTEL AIR MAIL -(REGISTERED) (Priority)

TO: DIRECTOR, FBI
FROM: SAC, LOS ANGELES (58-564)
RE: ABRAHAM LINCOLN-WIRIN, aka., A. I. WIRIN;
SUPREME COURT JUSTICE WILLIAM OF DOUGLAS
BRIbery

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED

DATE 4/9/61 BY SP-16SK/D.

Re Bureau airtel to Los Angeles 9/4/64.

Enclosed for the Bureau are amended pages 3 and 4 for Los Angeles letterhead memorandum dated 8/31/64.

The letterhead memorandum is classified confidential inasmuch as it contains information from who furnishes information on a continuing basis and any disclosure of this information may tend to expose the informant. Informant related information to SA ROBERT H. CLAUDIUS of the Los Angeles Office on 8/31/64.

8 enclosures attached & filed
9-16-64

ENCLOSURE

Bureau (Enclos. 5-8)
1 - Los Angeles

79 SEP 15 1964
Memorandum

To: Mr. Belmont  
From: A. Rosen  
Date: September 10, 1964  

Subject: ABRAHAM LINCOLN WIRIN  
SUPREME COURT JUSTICE WILLIAM O. DOUGLAS  
Bribery

Two individuals, who described Abraham Lincoln Wirin as a "loudmouthed braggart," advised claims to have given $7,500 to his attorney, Abraham Lincoln Wirin, $5,000 of which was to be paid by Wirin to Supreme Court Justice Douglas to set aside a California court order which suspended license. This California court order reportedly was stayed by Justice Douglas 8/10/64 and is said to again be.

By way of background is who was convicted in California court on charges of and sentenced to serve one to five years in State Prison by California Superior Court Judge Harold W. Schweitzer, Long Beach, California. was freed on appeal by Judge Schweitzer voluntarily surrendering his license. This appeal was denied by California Supreme Court and appealed to U. S. Supreme Court.

According to Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office, Justice Douglas, on 8/10/64, issued an order staying Judge Schweitzer's order regarding suspension of license. District Attorney's Office reportedly was not given an opportunity to argue the matter before Justice Douglas took this action.

Above information was developed during civil investigation conducted at the request of U. S. Attorney (USA), Los Angeles, to determine extent of Purpose of this investigation, which has been completed, was to determine whether it is economically feasible for USA to file civil action against with respect to his alleged

Reliable sources have reported that attorney Wirin was a Communist Party (CP) member and organizer in the 1930s who was dropped from CP in 1940. However, he has defended CP and CP members since that time. Wirin is on the Security Index at the present time (100-17242).
Memorandum to Mr. Belmont
RE: 

RECOMMENDATION:

Attached for approval is a memorandum to the Deputy Attorney General furnishing him details of the foregoing. The Deputy Attorney General is being advised that no investigation concerning this matter will be conducted by this Bureau in the absence of a specific request from the Department.
The Deputy Attorney General

Director, FBI

September 15, 1964

1-Mr. DeLoach
1-Mr. Belmont
1-Mr. Rosen
1-Mr. Malley

I

ABRAHAM LINCOLN WIRIN, ALSO KNOWN AS A. L. WIRIN; SUPREME COURT JUSTICE WILLIAM O. DOUGLAS BRIEF

Reference is made to my memorandum of September 11, 1964, which furnished you information received from Mr. and Miss Wilmington, California, concerning statements which allegedly were made to them by a California

These individuals advised that claimed to have given $7,500 to his attorney, Abraham Lincoln Wirin, who, in turn, was to give $5,000 to Justice Douglas to set aside the order of California Superior Court Judge Harold W. Schweitzer, which suspended license

On September 14, 1964, Deputy District Attorney Harry Woods, Los Angeles County, California, advised our Los Angeles office that a hearing would be held that morning in Judge Schweitzer's court at which time Mr. and Miss would testify in open court regarding the statements which allegedly were made to them by Mr. Woods requested that the Special Agent of this Bureau to whom these individuals had reported these statements be available to testify at this hearing. Mr. Woods withdrew this request when he was informed it would be necessary to obtain authority for the Special Agent's appearance and testimony. Mr. Woods advised further that the hearing concerned an attempt to have appeal bond exonerated and remanded to the custody of the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Office. The hearing was based on affidavits of Mr. and Miss which were filed with the California Superior Court on September 11, 1964.

Mr. Woods also stated that reporters of the Los Angeles Times and Los Angeles Herald-Examiner newspapers had written articles regarding this matter but, as of that time, such articles had not been printed in these newspapers.
The Deputy Attorney General

Our Los Angeles Office ascertained that Mr. testified at the hearing on September 14, 1964. On cross-examination by Attorney Wirin, Mr. testified that he had reported remarks to a Special Agent of this Bureau.

On the afternoon of September 14, 1964, Deputy District Attorney Harry Sunheim, Los Angeles County, advised that as a result of this hearing was remanded to the custody of the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Office. However, a stay until September 25, 1964, was granted in order to provide an opportunity for Justice Douglas to review this action. Mr. Sunheim stated no further testimony would be given and that the hearing was held for the purpose of creating a written record for the use of Justice Douglas in reviewing this matter as it related to the alleged statements of

As you were advised in my memorandum of September 11, 1964, no investigation concerning this matter will be conducted by this Bureau in the absence of a specific request from the Department. The Director, Administrative Office of the U. S. Courts, has not been advised of this matter.

NOTE: Information herein which was received by our Los Angeles Office on September 14, 1964, was furnished to the Bureau by Los Angeles by teletype dated September 14, 1964.
RE BUREAU AIRTTEL BATED, SEPTEMBER FOUR, LAST, AND LOS ANGELES LETTERHEAD MEMORANDUM DATED AUGUST THIRTYONE, LAST.

DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY HARRY WOODS, LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CONTACTED SAA ALBERT A. HUSTEDT OF THE LOS ANGELES OFFICE AT EIGHT FORTY A.M. TODAY AND ADVISED THAT THIS MORNING AT NINE A.M., A HEARING WOULD BE HELD IN THE COURT OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE SCHWEITZER, LOS ANGELES COUNTY, LOS ANGELES, AT WHICH TIME ___________________ WOULD TESTIFY IN OPEN COURT TO REMARKS MADE TO THEM BY ___________________ THAT HE HAD GIVEN SEVEN THOUSAND, FIVE HUNDRED DOLLARS TO ATTORNEY VIRIN, WHO WAS TO PAY FIVE THOUSAND DOLLARS OF THAT MONEY TO SUPREME COURT JUSTICE DOUGLAS. WOODS REQUESTED TODAY THAT SAA HUSTEDT BE AVAILABLE TO TESTIFY AT THIS HEARING TODAY, THAT ___________________ HAD PREVIOUSLY MADE THEIR STATEMENTS TO SAA HUSTEDT. WOODS TOLD BY SAA ___________________
PAGE TWO

HUSTEDT HE COULD NOT APPEAR WITHOUT SECURING PROPER AUTHORITY AND WOODS SAID HE UNDERSTOOD AND APPEARANCE THEREFORE WOULD NOT BE NECESSARY.

WOODS SAID PURPOSE OF HEARING IS AN ATTEMPT TO HAVE APPEAL BOND EXONERATED AND REMAND TO CUSTODY LOS ANGELES COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE. WOODS ADVISED HE FILED AFFIDAVITS OF AND WITH THE SUPERIOR COURT ON FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER ELEVEN, LAST, SETTING FORTH THE FOREGOING STATEMENTS OF AND AS BASIS FOR HEARING, AND THAT REPORTERS OF THE QUOTE "LOS ANGELES TIMES" UNQUOTE AND QUOTE "LOS ANGELES HERALD EXAMINER" UNQUOTE WROTE STORIES REGARDING THIS MATTER. HOWEVER, FOR SOME UNKNOWN REASON TO WOODS THE STORIES DID NOT GET INTO THE PAPERS AS YET. WOODS STATED HE PERSONALLY KNOWS THAT STORIES WERE WRITTEN INASMUCH AS THE REPORTERS ALLOWED HIM TO READ THEIR STORIES BEFORE FILING SAME WITH THEIR PAPERS.

TESTIFIED TODAY IN OPEN COURT AT THIS HEARING AND ON CROSS EXAMINATION BY ATTORNEY WIRIN RELATED HIS ADVISING SA HUSTEDT OF THE STATEMENTS MADE BY CONCERNING HIS PAYMENT OF SEVEN THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED DOLLARS TO ATTORNEY WIRIN AND THAT FIVE THOUSAND DOLLAR PAYMENT TO GO TO JUSTICE DOUGLAS.

END PAGE TWO
PAGE THREE

THIS AFTERNOON DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY HARRY SUNHEIM, LOS ANGELES, ADVISED THAT [ ] HAS BEEN REMANDED TO THE CUSTODY OF THE LOS ANGELES SHERIFF, HOWEVER, HE WAS GRANTED A STAY UNTIL SEPTEMBER TWENTYFIVE, NEXT, IN ORDER THAT JUSTICE DOUGLAS WOULD HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO REVIEW THIS ACTION. SUNHEIM ADVISED THAT NO FURTHER TESTIMONY WOULD BE GIVEN IN THIS MATTER AND THAT THE PURPOSE FOR THE HEARING WAS TO CREATE A WRITTEN RECORD FOR THE USE OF JUSTICE DOUGLAS IN REVIEWING THIS MATTER CONCERNING THE ALLEGED STATEMENTS MADE BY [ ].

THE ABOVE IS FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE BUREAU SHOULD INQUIRY BE RECEIVED CONCERNING THIS MATTER.

END

NHH

FBI WASH. DC

P

CC - Mr. Rosen
TO: DIRECTOR, FBI
FROM: SAC, LOS ANGELES (58-564)
RE: ABRAHAM LINCOLN-WIRIN, aka.
      SUPREME COURT JUSTICE
      WILLIAM O'DOUGLAS
      BRIbery

Re Los Angeles teletype 9/14/64.

Enclosed for the Bureau is a news article which
appeared in the "Los Angeles Herald Examiner" 9/14/64 and
four copies of a letterhead memorandum with news article
attached concerning the subject matter of referenced teletype.

The Bureau may wish to disseminate the letterhead
memorandum to the Department.
Los Angeles, California
September 15, 1964

ABRAHAM LINCOLN WIRIN, also
known as A. L. Wirin;
SUPREME COURT JUSTICE WILLIAM O. DOUGLAS

Reference is made to my memorandum dated August 31,
1964, captioned as above.

There is attached hereto for your information a
copy of a news article which appeared in the "Los Angeles
Herald Examiner" on page one of Section D of the eighth

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.

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED
HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED

DATE_4/9/67 BY SP-1GSK/mc
agrei 11-29-29
7781 T.L.8186

58-578-16
ENCLOSURE
Bribe to Justice
Claimed at Trial

Testimony that Wilmington Dr. Jerome Rehman had claimed he paid a $5000 bribe to U.S. Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas for "favorable treatment" in the doctor's criminal case was given today before Los Angeles Superior Judge Harold O. Schweitzer.

But the witnesses who gave the testimony, one of them a lawyer, said they did not believe the statements of the osteopathic physician and considered them "ridiculous."

STAY ORDER

Dr. Rehman, convicted last year in Long Beach of conspiracy to perform unnecessary operations, has asked the Supreme Court to modify Judge Schweitzer's order that he stop practicing medicine while on bail pending appeal.

Justice Douglas on Aug. 10 granted a temporary stay of the no-practice order until a hearing by the full court next month.

The lawyer-witness, Tobias Coskey, part owner of the medical building where Rehman has a clinic, testified the doctor informed him about the alleged bribe on Aug. 6 during an argument over unpaid rent.

"I paid $7500 to Mr. Wirin (A. L. Wirin, his attorney), of which $5000 was to be paid to Justice Douglas for a favorable decision," Coskey quoted Rehman as saying.

However, last Tuesday Rehman denied to Coskey he had made such statements, according to the testimony. Rehman said he had made no remarks about a "payoff," but only had said he paid Wirin $7500.

Wirin has denied receiving $7500 from Rehman for any purpose.

The other witness to the purported payoff remark was Miss Leona Van Lanigan, co-owner of the medical building with Coskey. She was present at the conversations, she said.
BACKGROUND

GENERAL INVESTIGATIVE DIVISION

and advised our Los Angeles Office that told them he gave $7,500 to his attorney, Wirin, $5,000 of which was to be paid to Supreme Court Justice Douglas to set aside order of California Superior Court Judge Schweitzer which suspended medical license, following conviction and sentence 8/31/63 to serve time in California prison. freed on appeal bond; appeal denied by California Supreme Court and appealed to U.S. Supreme Court. On 8/10/64, Justice Douglas issued order staying California court order suspending medical license. This information was furnished to Deputy Attorney General by our memorandum dated 9/11/64 with advice no investigation would be conducted in absence of request from him. No such request received to date.

Memorandum will be sent to Deputy Attorney General setting out information in attached teletype.
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BRIbery

OO: Los Angeles

UACB, Los Angeles is taking no action in this matter and is considering the matter closed.
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