

13 DEC 75 03 13Z

~~S E C R E T~~ 122227Z DEC 75 STAFF

CITE DIRECTOR

TO: IMMEDIATE TEHRAN.

FOR AMBASSADOR HELMS FROM WARNER

RYBAT EYES ONLY

REF: A. TEHRAN   
B. TEHRAN

1. I HAVE DISCUSSED YOUR SUGGESTIONS IN REF A WITH DONNENFELD AND TOM KARAMESSINES. MR. DONNENFELD REQUESTED AND TOM KARAMESSINES AND I AGREE WITH FOLLOWING APPROACH: WOULD ASK YOU CHANGE YOUR SUGGESTED APPROACH IN REF A PARA 1. PLEASE UNDERSTAND PURPOSE OF PLAINTIFFS INTERROGATORIES IS TO ASCERTAIN WHAT PERSONAL KNOWLEDGE EACH DEFENDANT HAS CONCERNING MATTER UNDER LITIGATION. IT IS NOT RESPONSIBILITY OF EACH DEFENDANT TO EDUCATE PLAINTIFFS. THUS, AN APPROPRIATE ANSWER WOULD BE THAT YOU DO NOT REMEMBER OR YOU DO NOT HAVE FILES AVAILABLE TO ASCERTAIN NECESSARY INFORMATION. THE IMPORTANT CONSIDERATION IS THAT THESE ARE YOUR ANSWERS TO BEST OF YOUR KNOWLEDGE.

2. STATEMENT FOR COURT CONTAINED IN PARA 2 REF A IS EXACTLY WHAT DONNENFELD NEEDED FOR PURPOSES REQUESTED. WE HAVE BEEN ADVISED THAT JUDGE IN PROVIDENCE ON 11 DECEMBER AGREED TO POSTPONE ALL ACTION OF FILINGS IN DRIVER CASE UNTIL AFTER MEETING IN PROVIDENCE ON JANUARY 5 TO BE ATTENDED BY ALL COUNSEL TO OUTLINE A TIMETABLE. I MIGHT ADD THAT DONNENFELD HAS SENT YOU A 5-PAGE LETTER WHICH SHOULD EXPLAIN MANY DETAILS TO YOU.

3. TOM KARAMESSINES HAD REQUESTED A MEETING WITH DONNENFELD AT 1300 HOURS, FRIDAY, 12 DECEMBER. AFTER MR. ASQUITH ADVISED DONNENFELD OF POSTPONEMENT UNTIL JANUARY 5, DONNENFELD RAISED QUESTION WITH ASQUITH, WHO IS TOM KARAMESSINES' LAWYER IN THIS CASE, WHETHER ASQUITH HAD ANY PROBLEMS WITH DONNENFELD INTERVIEWING KARAMESSINES. ASQUITH SAID HE PREFERRED NOT TO HAVE DONNENFELD INTERVIEW KARAMESSINES AT THIS TIME. YOU SHOULD UNDERSTAND THESE AITOR-

PAGE 2 DIRECTOR  ~~SECRET~~

NEYS ARE MOVING WITH EXTREME CAUTION TO KEEP ANY ELEMENT OF CONFLICT OR EVEN APPEARANCE OF CONFLICT OUT OF LITIGATION. DONNENFELD HAS INDICATED HE WILL SEND YOU LETTER EXPLAINING HIS THOUGHTS ON THE MATTER.

4. REF B CHANDLER CASE--THERE IS NOTHING FOR YOU TO DO WITH MARSHAL'S SERVICE COPY. THE QUESTION OF WHETHER YOU HAVE BEEN SERVED PROPERLY IS A PROBLEM TO BE HANDLED BY YOUR LAWYER. IT MAY BE A VALID DEFENSE.

5. I DID RECEIVE COPY OF YOUR LETTER TO ATTORNEY GENERAL DATED 23 NOVEMBER. I DISCUSSED WITH DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE THEIR INTENTION AS TO REPRESENTATION IN THIS CASE. THEY DO NOT HAVE A DECISION AS YET. AN ANSWER BY U.S. IS DUE TO BE FILED ON 30 DECEMBER. IT IS MY PERSONAL OPINION THAT SINCE THIS CASE INCLUDES A COURT OF MAIL INTERCEPTION JUSTICE DEPARTMENT SHOULD LET DONNENFELD DEFEND YOU IN THIS CASE. WE HAVE NOT YET RECEIVED A RULING FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE. THEREFORE, NO ADDITIONAL STEPS FOR YOU TO TAKE AT THIS TIME AND WE WILL ADVISE YOU FURTHER WHEN DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE MAKES DECISION. REGARDS. E2 IMPDET.

~~SECRET~~