

Associate Attorney General is "federal government's Chief FOIA Officer"?! ---

Brady Eames <ibuncle@yahoo.com>

Nov 12, 2014 1:29 PM

Posted in group: FOIA Advisory Committee

Dear agents of the United States, Published on a webpage of the DOJ is notification to the public that the **ACTING Associate Attorney General Stuart Delery** is the "federal **government's Chief FOIA Officer**" (see <http://www.justice.gov/asg/meet-acting-associate-attorney-general>). Please confirm. Thank you, Brady Eames

Is 16 YEARS long enough for the DOJ to update its FOIA regulations!!!

Brady Eames <ibuncle@yahoo.com>

Nov 12, 2014 2:06 PM

Posted in group: FOIA Advisory Committee

Dear agents of the United States, With respect to the egregious outdated FOIA regulations of the DOJ, the OIP's FOIA Public Liaison named Laurie Day assured me today by telephone (202-516-3642) that albeit the OIP is trying to update such regulations, "it takes a long time". According to the dates of certain such regulations published under *Part 16 of Title 28 of the CFR*, the DOJ is more than **SIXTEEN YEARS behind** in such update! Please explain. Brady Eames

Some computers are incompatible with online FOIA request form of the OIP!

Brady Eames <ibuncle@yahoo.com>

Nov 12, 2014 2:24 PM

Posted in group: FOIA Advisory Committee

Dear agents of the United States, According to information disclosed by telephone (202-514-3642) to me today by the **FOIA Public Liaison of the OIP named Laurie Day**, some computers are **incompatible** with the electronic submission of a FOIA request via the **online FOIA request form "portal" of the OIP**. Notice of such incompatibility is NOT published by the OIP at <http://www.justice.gov/oip/submit-and-track-request-or-appeal> or <http://www.foia.gov/report-makerequest.html> and is **NOT** codified under *28 CFR 16.3*. One would assume then that one must contact the OIP to ascertain a computer is compatible with such **online FOIA request form "portal" of the OIP**. Members of the public, such as myself, who experience failure due to "**request validation**" when they attempt to do take advantage of such convenient "**portal**" must therefor resort to the **ancient** method of submitting of PAPER FOIA requests to either the OIP's fax number (202-514-1009) or to its physical address published at <http://www.justice.gov/oip/contact-office> or at <http://www.foia.gov/report-makerequest.html>. Please take note that the **codified FOIA regulations of the DOJ do NOT provide for the faxing of FOIA requests and do NOT publish a valid physical address of the OIP!** (see *28 CFR 16.3* and the *Appendix of Part 16*). Sincerely, Brady Eames

SPAM issues with the email system of the OIP!

Brady Eames <ibuncle@yahoo.com>

Nov 12, 2014 3:10 PM

Posted in group: FOIA Advisory Committee

Dear agents of the United States, Revealed to me today by telephone (202-514-3642) by the **FOIA Public Liaison of the OIP named Laurie Day** is that the **OIP** prohibits the convenient submission of a FOIA request to an **electronic mail address** of the OIP because of **SPAM** issues. Upon my request for the email address of the OIP's "Chief of Staff" named "Carmen Mallon" who is authorized to receive a FOIA request (see <http://www.foia.gov/report-makerequest.html>), such Laurie Day responded "you **don't need to know it**". Consequently, until and unless I'm able to submit a FOIA request via the OIP's online FOIA request form "portal ", I must resort to the antique method of faxing or sending a PAPER request to a physical address of the OIP. Sincerely, Brady Eames

ACUS neglects to notify of right to appeal adverse FOIA adjudication

Brady Eames <ibuncle@yahoo.com>

Nov 12, 2014 8:22 PM

Posted in group: FOIA Advisory Committee

Dear agents of the United States, In an initial adjudication made on October 30, 2014 with respect to my FOIA Request filed under ACUS' *FOIA Case 2015-6*, I was NOT notified of my right to appeal its adversity. Upon my receipt of such adjudication, I was burdened with immediately having to request such notification from the ACUS. Considering the gravity of such administrative malfeasance, I bring it to your attention. (see *Thomas V. HHS*, 587 F. Supp. 2d 114 (D.D.C. 2008) *Nurse v. Sec'y of the Air Force*, 231 F. Supp. 2d 323 (D.D. C. 2002), *Ruotolo v. DOJ*, 53 F3.3d 3 (2d Cir. 1995), *Oglesby v. United States Dep't of Army*, 920 F.2d 57 (U.S. App. D.C. 1990) Certainly one should expect the ACUS to comply with the law under 5 USC 552(a)(6)(A)(i) and justifiably be shocked if ACUS does **NOT**.

Sincerely, Brady Eames