

NR_key_name: 6C136B7452200C05852563FC00177F7E

SendTo: CN=Eileen Sullivan/O=ARRB @ ARRB

CopyTo:

DisplayBlindCopyTo:

BlindCopyTo: CN=R ecord/O=ARRB

From: CN=Tom Samoluk/O=ARRB

DisplayFromDomain:

DisplayDate: 12/09/1996

DisplayDate_Time: 11:17:08 PM

ComposedDate: 12/09/1996

ComposedDate_Time: 11:16:40 PM

Subject: Lt. Day and the Palm Print
Please write back and tell him I am no longer there. Thanks. TOMTO: tom_samoluk@jfk-arrrb.gov (Tom Samoluk) @ Internetcc: (bcc: Tom Samoluk/ARRB)From: 74274.650 @ CompuServe.COM ("Michael T. Griffith") @ Internet @ WORLDCOM Date: 12/09/96 02:41:09 PM CSTSubject: Lt. Day and the Palm PrintMr. Samoluk,In my last message to you, I stated that one of the times when Oswald's palmprint could have been placed on the Mannlicher-Carcano was when Oswald was asleep at the police station. I misspoke. What I had in mind was the possibility that he was manipulated into handling the barrel (and hence into leaving the palm impression) shortly before the assassination. Please find below an article I recently wrote on the subject, which was based in part on my previous message to you.-----Begin Included Text----- WAS OSWALD'S PALM PRINT PLANTED ON THE ALLEGED MURDER WEAPON? SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT THE LATENT PALM PRINT Michael T. Griffith 1996 @All Rights Reserved Revised and Expanded on 12/2/96 Lieutenant J. C. Day, the man who claimed he discovered and lifted Oswald's palm print off the barrel of the Mannlicher-Carcano rifle that was found on the sixth floor of the Texas Book Depository Building, was not properly questioned by the Warren Commission (WC). Years after the WC disbanded, it came to light through an internal WC memo that the Commission was suspicious of the manner in which the palm print was obtained. When Day appeared before the Commission, the questioning to which he was subjected can politely be called unproductive and overly friendly. Later on in the investigation, when the Commission's doubts about the palm print began to come to a head, chief counsel J. Lee Rankin asked the FBI to secure more information from Lt. Day about the palm print. Day refused to make a sworn statement regarding his handling of the print, and there the matter has rested ever since. Basically, here are some of the questions that the Commission failed to ask, much less resolve: 1. Lt. Day said he could still see the print on the barrel AFTER he lifted it. In fact, he said it was so visible that he thought it was the FBI's "best bet" in terms of fingerprint evidence on the rifle (4 H 261). Yet, when the rifle was examined just hours later by the FBI's Sebastian Latona, not only did Latona find no prints on the barrel, partial or otherwise, but he found no evidence that the barrel had even been PROCESSED for prints. So, what happened to the print that Day said remained visible on the rifle after lifting? And why did Latona find no evidence that the barrel had even been processed for prints? 2. Lt. Day had the rifle from 1:25 till 11:45 P.M. on November 22 and took photos of the partial prints on the trigger guard. Why, then, did he not take a single photograph of the palm print before or after he supposedly lifted it? It was, as Day admitted, standard procedure to photograph a print before lifting it. At the very least, Day could have photographed the print after he lifted it, since he said it was still visible. Why didn't he take a single picture of the palm print on the Record

Body:

recstat:

DeliveryPriority: N

DeliveryReport: B

ReturnReceipt:

Categories: