Exhibit 2

31 May 1985

Mr. Eugene A. Laurenzi
Atty. at Law
100 N. Main Bldg.
Memphis, TN. 38103.

James E. Ray # 65477
station-A
Nashville TN 37219.

Dear Mr. Laurenzi:

Thank you for a copy of Judge Williams opinion. I'm glad he didn't sit on it for another several months. Yes I would appreciate it if you would go ahead and file the appeal.

While it probably isn't important, the Judge is in errow on about everything he wrote. To mention a few which may pertain to an appeal:

1. at p. 2 he talks about the issues that should have been previously risen he say's, Obviously issue like the "canale papers" could not have been raised previously since they were suppressed.

2. at p. 3 he say's Percy Foreman requested that Stanton sr. be appointed because Foreman was recovering from an injury in a wreck. Foreman had been injured in a wreck years before but it had nothing to do with the Stanton appointment. Rather Foreman told the Judge (Battle), that there was no money to finance an investigation of the case (see Dec. 18, 1968 tr of the Foreman oral motion). Further, Foreman has testified he didn't want Stanton's help and it was a surprise to him that Judge Battle appointed him. See p. 103 of Foreman deposition in , Ray v. Rose, 392 F. supp. 601 (W.D. Tenn. 1975), where Foreman say's "I didn't ask to associate Mr. Stanton, the court did not give me any option. The court, out of the blue, decided that himself".

3. at p. 4 the Judge say's Stanton played in effect a minor rôle in the case and thus had no type supervisory authority. This is also false since Foreman testified in the aforementioned deposition at p. 227 "... I remember just telling Hugh Stanton sr and Hugh Stanton jr...do whatever, just like it was his own case, and continue to work on it as such". (Also, when Judge Battle appointed Stanton and during a subsequent court appearance on or around January 17, 1969, he gave Stanton full authority in the case.) So I am sure that under United States v. Uzzi, 549 F. supp. 979, 983 (1982), Stanton would qualify as having sufficient authority in the case as to influence a guilty plea.

4. In referring to Stanton sr., in the conflict of interest, Stanton's first representation of Charles Quitman Stephens, The Judge at p. 4 say Stanton represented Stephens in a "mental competency hearing". This is false, Stanton represented Stephens in a "material witness" hearing--a witness against me. United States v. Uzzi at 983 also deal with conflcit-of-interest.

Concluding, I wouldn't go to anymore trouble than necessary, eg., oral argument before appeals court. Mainly I would like to preserve all the issues I raised in a manner that I can take them into federal court: my alleging issues cited were if true violated US Const. Possibly by the time I arrive at the federal level information will develope that will help the court decide for a trial. (I have various FOIA suits in fed. ct.

Sincerely:

J. Ray