Dear Mr. Greenewald:

The enclosed documents were reviewed under the Freedom of Information/Privacy Acts (FOIPA), Title 5, United States Code, Section 552/552a. Below you will find check boxes under the appropriate statute headings which indicate the types of exemptions asserted to protect information which is exempt from disclosure. The appropriate exemptions are noted on the enclosed pages next to redacted information. In addition, a deleted page information sheet was inserted to indicate where pages were withheld entirely and identify which exemptions were applied. The checked exemption boxes used to withhold information are further explained in the enclosed Explanation of Exemptions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 552</th>
<th>Section 552a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(b)(1)</td>
<td>(d)(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)(2)</td>
<td>(j)(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)(3)</td>
<td>(k)(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)(4)</td>
<td>(k)(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)(5)</td>
<td>(k)(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)(6)</td>
<td>(k)(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 U.S.C., Section 3024 (i)(1)</td>
<td>(b)(7)(D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(k)(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(k)(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(k)(7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

149 page(s) were reviewed and 123 page(s) are being released.

Please refer to the enclosed FBI FOIPA Addendum for additional standard responses applicable to your request. “Part 1” of the Addendum includes standard responses that apply to all requests. “Part 2” includes additional standard responses that apply to all requests for records about yourself or any third party individuals. “Part 3” includes general information about FBI records that you may find useful. Also enclosed is our Explanation of Exemptions.

For questions regarding our determinations, visit the [www.fbi.gov/foia](http://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.
If you are not satisfied with the Federal Bureau of Investigation’s determination in response to this request, you may administratively appeal by writing to the Director, Office of Information Policy (OIP), United States Department of Justice, 441 G Street, NW, 6th Floor, Washington, D.C. 20530, or you may submit an appeal through OIP’s FOIA STAR portal by creating an account following the instructions on OIP’s website: https://www.justice.gov/oip/submit-and-track-request-or-appeal. Your appeal must be postmarked or electronically transmitted within ninety (90) days of the date of my response to your request. 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 it may be easily identified.

You may seek dispute resolution services by contacting the Office of Government Information Services (OGIS). The contact information for OGIS is as follows: Office of Government Information Services, National Archives and Records Administration, 8601 Adelphi Road-OGIS, College Park, Maryland 20740-6001, e-mail at ogis@nara.gov; telephone at 202-741-5770; toll free at 1-877-684-6448; or facsimile at 202-741-5769. Alternatively, you may contact the FBI’s FOIA Public Liaison by emailing foipaprocess@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 it may be easily identified.

☑ See additional information which follows.

The enclosed documents represent the final release of information responsive to your Freedom of Information/Privacy Acts (FOIPA) request.

This material is being provided to you at no charge.

Duplicate copies of the same document were not processed.

Records which may have been responsive to your request were destroyed. Since this material could not be reviewed, it is not known if it was responsive to your request. Record retention and disposal is carried out under supervision of the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA), Title 44, United States Code, Section 3301 as implemented by Title 36, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 1228; Title 44, United States Code, Section 3310 as implemented by Title 36, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 1229.10.

Sincerely,

Michael G. Seidel
Acting Section Chief
Record/Information
Dissemination Section
Information Management Division

Enclosure(s)
As referenced in our letter responding to your Freedom of Information/Privacy Acts (FOIPA) request, the FBI FOIPA Addendum provides information applicable to your request. Part 1 of the Addendum includes standard responses that apply to all requests. Part 2 includes standard responses that apply to requests for records about individuals to the extent your request seeks the listed information. Part 3 includes general information about FBI records, searches, and programs.

Part 1: The standard responses below apply to all requests:

(i) 5 U.S.C. § 552(c). Congress excluded three categories of law enforcement and national security records from the requirements of the FOIPA [5 U.S.C. § 552(c)]. FBI responses are limited to those records subject to the requirements of the FOIPA. Additional information about the FBI and the FOIPA can be found on the www.fbi.gov/foia website.

(ii) Intelligence Records. To the extent your request seeks records of intelligence sources, methods, or activities, the FBI can neither confirm nor deny the existence of records pursuant to FOIA exemptions (b)(1), (b)(3), and as applicable to requests for records about individuals, PA exemption (j)(2) [5 U.S.C. §§ 552/552a (b)(1), (b)(3), and (j)(2)]. The mere acknowledgment of the existence or nonexistence of such records is itself a classified fact protected by FOIA exemption (b)(1) and/or would reveal intelligence sources, methods, or activities protected by exemption (b)(3) [50 USC § 3024(i)(1)]. This is a standard response and should not be read to indicate that any such records do or do not exist.

Part 2: The standard responses below apply to all requests for records on individuals:

(i) Requests for Records about any Individual—Watch Lists. The FBI can neither confirm nor deny the existence of any individual’s name on a watch list pursuant to FOIA exemption (b)(7)(E) and PA exemption (j)(2) [5 U.S.C. §§ 552/552a (b)(7)(E), (j)(2)]. This is a standard response and should not be read to indicate that watch list records do or do not exist.

(ii) Requests for Records about any Individual—Witness Security Program Records. The FBI can neither confirm nor deny the existence of records which could identify any participant in the Witness Security Program pursuant to FOIA exemption (b)(3) and PA exemption (j)(2) [5 U.S.C. §§ 552/552a (b)(3), 18 U.S.C. 3521, and (j)(2)]. This is a standard response and should not be read to indicate that such records do or do not exist.

(iii) Requests for Records for Incarcerated Individuals. The FBI can neither confirm nor deny the existence of records which could reasonably be expected to endanger the life or physical safety of any incarcerated individual pursuant to FOIA exemptions (b)(7)(E), (b)(7)(F), and PA exemption (j)(2) [5 U.S.C. §§ 552/552a (b)(7)(E), (b)(7)(F), and (j)(2)]. This is a standard response and should not be read to indicate that such records do or do not exist.

Part 3: General Information:

(i) Record Searches. The Record/Information Dissemination Section (RIDS) searches for reasonably described records by searching systems or locations where responsive records would reasonably be found. A standard search normally consists of a search for main files in the Central Records System (CRS), an extensive system of records consisting of applicant, investigative, intelligence, personnel, administrative, and general files compiled by the FBI per its law enforcement, intelligence, and administrative functions. The CRS spans the entire FBI organization, comprising records of FBI Headquarters, FBI Field Offices, and FBI Legal Attaché Offices (Legats) worldwide; Electronic Surveillance (ELSUR) records are included in the CRS. Unless specifically requested, a standard search does not include references, administrative records of previous FOIPA requests, or civil litigation files. For additional information about our record searches, visit www.fbi.gov/services/information-management/foipa/requesting-fbi-records.

(ii) FBI Records. Founded in 1908, the FBI carries out a dual law enforcement and national security mission. As part of this dual mission, the FBI creates and maintains records on various subjects; however, the FBI does not maintain records on every person, subject, or entity.

(iii) Requests for Criminal History Records or Rap Sheets. The Criminal Justice Information Services (CJIS) Division provides Identity History Summary Checks – often referred to as a criminal history record or rap sheet. These criminal history records are not the same as material in an investigative “FBI file.” An Identity History Summary Check is a listing of information taken from fingerprint cards and documents submitted to the FBI in connection with arrests, federal employment, naturalization, or military service. For a fee, individuals can request a copy of their Identity History Summary Check. Forms and directions can be accessed at www.fbi.gov/about-us/cjis/identity-history-summary-checks. Additionally, requests can be submitted electronically at www.edo.cjis.gov. For additional information, please contact CJIS directly at (304) 625-5590.

(iv) National Name Check Program (NNCP). The mission of NNCP is to analyze and report information in response to name check requests received from federal agencies, for the purpose of protecting the United States from foreign and domestic threats to national security. Please be advised that this is a service provided to other federal agencies. Private Citizens cannot request a name check.
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 sources, 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 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 the 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.

FBI/DOJ
This document is made available through the declassification efforts and research of John Greenewald, Jr., creator of:

The Black Vault

The Black Vault is the largest online Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) document clearinghouse in the world. The research efforts here are responsible for the declassification of hundreds of thousands of pages released by the U.S. Government & Military.

Discover the Truth at: http://www.theblackvault.com
Total Deleted Page(s) = 21
Page 12 ~ Duplicate;
Page 13 ~ Duplicate;
Page 33 ~ Duplicate;
Page 36 ~ Duplicate;
Page 37 ~ Duplicate;
Page 39 ~ Duplicate;
Page 43 ~ Duplicate;
Page 45 ~ Duplicate;
Page 49 ~ Duplicate;
Page 50 ~ Duplicate;
Page 56 ~ Duplicate;
Page 61 ~ Duplicate;
Page 64 ~ Duplicate;
Page 65 ~ Duplicate;
Page 73 ~ b6; b7C; b7D;
Page 77 ~ b6; b7C; b7D; b7E;
Page 94 ~ b6; b7C; b7D;
Page 95 ~ b6; b7C; b7D;
Page 96 ~ b6; b7C; b7D;
Page 98 ~ b6; b7C; b7D;
Page 99 ~ b6; b7C; b7D;

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
X Deleted Page(s)  X
X No Duplication Fee  X
X For this Page  X
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
Re: SAC Letter 54-53 dated 10/5/54, Section K, captioned "ROBERT A. MAHEU ASSOCIATES."

The "Los Angeles Times" on 6/13/59 contained an article dated Corona Del Mar reporting that a Hollywood bit player named SAMUEL RAND, 28, accidentally shot and critically wounded himself 6/12/59 at the West Coast Gun Club at Corona Del Mar. The article noted that doctors at Santa Ana Community Hospital said the bullet from the .22 caliber revolver lodged in RAND's brain. It added that RAND, of 1773 Plaza Drive, Los Angeles, was shooting with a friend, and is now a singer, according to the "Times" piece which described the accident saying that the revolver failed to fire when pulled the trigger. When RAND picked up the gun to see what was wrong, it discharged and the bullet entered the right side of his head, according to Orange County Deputy Sheriffs as reported in the article.

On Sunday the "Times" in a short back-page article date lined Santa Ana, reported that SAMUEL RAND of Hollywood died in the Santa Ana Community Hospital on the 13th of an head wound inflicted accidentally on the previous day at a target range.

This incident and events leading to it have been discussed by Lieutenant [redacted] of the Los Angeles Police Department, Intelligence Division, with SA [redacted]. According to [redacted], she has been under contract to HOWARD HUGHES for about four years. She is classed as an actress, but according to [redacted]
she is more than just that. He said information coming to his office indicates that five other young girls constitute a sort of stable of girl friends for HUGHES and are very jealously guarded by him.

HUGHES, in fact, retains the services of the private investigating organization known as and Associates of Burbank to maintain an almost perpetual surveillance on these girls.

In the Los Angeles area recently has been under close surveillance by a group of four private investigators, three of whom are believed by to be former FBI Agents. The individuals he could name are MAHEU, and . On this job MAHEU has also used the name BOB MARSHALL and his address has been determined by police as 112D-19th Street Southwest, Washington, D.C. used the address when he was interrogated by Intelligence Division Officers on or about 6/7/59 as the result of a disturbance arising during bumper-to-bumper surveillance of who was in the company of SAMUEL RAND, the man who died last Saturday.

was first handled by police Patrol Officers who called in Intelligence when identified himself as a former FBI Agent. To Intelligence Officers he claimed to have been in the FBI for eight years, resigning about 1954, after service in San Francisco, Portland and the seat of Government. was driving a Hertz rental car and said he was a representative of the Stunk Realty Company, Tucson, Arizona, since 6/5/58. He said he has resided at the Bel-Air Hotel in West Los Angeles. This is an expensive establishment and Room 253, according to , is a very expensive room which contributed to police thinking that a shakedown racket was in progress.

made some sort of claim that he and others were working this surveillance as a confidential mission for HOWARD HUGHES.

Police investigation revealed that ROBERT MAHEU was also resident of the Bel-Air Hotel and they determined that whose antecedents are unknown, is the principal in Mike Conrad and Associates, a licensed detective agency.

residence was found to be
Intelligence Officers interviewed and SAMUEL RAND. They learned that and RAND had been keeping company for a period of a few weeks. revealed that HUGHES knew of her association with RAND and she said he had personally called her on the telephone telling her to stay away from RAND. She said HUGHES stated that if she didn't, RAND might "have his face fixed" so she wouldn't want to look at him again.

From RAND police officers reportedly learned that MAHEU, using the name BOB MARSHALL, made an approach on or about May 29. MAHEU, as MARSHALL, struck up a friendly conversation, according to RAND's story, and the next day he invited RAND to visit him at his Bel-Air Hotel suite. RAND appeared for the appointment at which time MAHEU's true name came out. This was on May 29, according to Lieutenant who added that RAND said while he was in MAHEU's suite, MAHEU received a call from the lobby. He invited the caller up and then casually mentioned to RAND that the man coming to the room was Undersheriff of Los Angeles County, HAROLD MARLOWE. Very soon, according to RAND's story, two men appeared MAHEU's suite and were introduced to him as Undersheriff MARLOWE, a huge man with a deep voice, and a Lieutenant presumably of the Sheriff's West Los Angeles station. MARLOWE took off his coat, thus revealing a side arm in a shoulder holster. He seemed very familiar in the room and he suggested to RAND that RAND stay away from. Also, according to RAND's story, as relayed through Lieutenant MARLOWE mentioned that the Los Angeles County Sheriff has a great many prisoners in jail and "there is always room for one more." RAND obtained the definite opinion that he was being told to stay away from or go to jail. The man known as Lieutenant again saw RAND on June 4, according to police information.

Somewhere in the conversation between MAHEU and RAND, the name of attorney was dropped by MARLOWE or MAHEU, is in Los Angeles files numerous times, including 1942 when he was an unsuccessful applicant for the position of Special Agent. He was characterized at that time as a playboy attorney with excellent contacts in the movie industry. Currently is a member of the law firm Undersheriff MARLOWE, as the Bureau is aware, was a Special Agent until his resignation when he returned to the Los Angeles Sheriff's Department as a sergeant or lieutenant a few years ago.
The Los Angeles Police Department said, had become convinced that they were mistaken in their original assessment of this matter. Rather than a shakedown racket, their investigation had convinced them that the private detectives were conducting surveillance and harassing RAND at the expense and for the personal purposes of industrialist HOWARD HUGHES, a man long reputed for his elaborate and extreme sex life. No action is underway and none is contemplated by the Los Angeles police, even as a result of RAND's unexpected death last week end. However, Captain [REDACTED] of the Intelligence Division, did direct a letter outlining part of this story to the Orange County Sheriff after RAND died in that county. The purpose was to alert the Sheriff and at least cause an autopsy to be performed, according to [REDACTED] had learned that the story of accidental death had been accepted by Orange County authorities and that the only evidence to back up the assertion that the death was accidental was X-ray pictures taken at the hospital. [REDACTED] said that they have no real reason to believe that the death weapon was other than the one in RAND's hand, but he thought the FBI should have the advantage of this information inasmuch as the story involves former Bureau employees.

Subsequently, on 6/17/59, SA [REDACTED] learned from Orange County Sheriff Lieutenant [REDACTED] that an autopsy has been performed on RAND and it proved the death was caused by a bullet from the gun accidentally discharged by RAND.

A review of Los Angeles indices reveals references to ROBERT AIME MAHEU, former Special Agent, but nothing of a derogatory nature. No identifiable record could be found on SAMUEL RAND, according to correspondence in this office, resigned from the Bureau's service 9/11/53 while assigned at the seat of Government. He corresponded with the SAC here indicating intention of settling in California to practice law. Further, he hoped to obtain temporary employment with the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department through then Undersheriff PETER J. PITCHESS, former Special Agent. It cannot be shown positively that this is the same as the one pertinent to this matter involving the surveillance of RAND and [REDACTED].

It should be noted the police had only the word of RAND that Undersheriff MARLOWE participated in this affair. There is no discreet way to determine if the Undersheriff was impersonated.
Bob Mathew
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P 3
Director, FBI  
6/16/59

SAC, Phoenix (30-0-802)  

ROBERT A. MAHEU ASSOCIATES  
MISCELLANEOUS-INFORMATION CONCERNING  
CRIMINAL SECTION, INVESTIGATIVE DIVISION  

Re: Buairtel 5/22/59.  
Re: PX airtel 6/2/59.  

Assistant Manager, Arizona Inn, Tucson, Arizona, advised this date that while ROBERT A. MAHEU ASSOCIATES reserved at a cost of $1000 a month a cabin at the Arizona Inn all during the winter season no one actually occupied the cabin. The $1000 per month was paid promptly.

MAHEU ASSOCIATES have now rented the same cabin during the summer season while the Inn is closed at the rate of $600 per month, from 6/16/59 - 11/1/59, when the winter season starts. They have an option to rent the cabin during the next winter season at the rate of $1000 per month.

Mr. [____] has been operating as MAHEU's agent in this matter. He arrived on 6/10/59 to arrange for the rental. On 6/13/59 he telephonically advised that he had been alerted that his clients would come to Tucson momentarily and on 6/16/59 [____] arrived personally at the cottage to make sure that all arrangements were in order. The clients have not arrived. [____] told [____] that their conditions of rental would be that no one was to go near the cabin and that included maids, bellhops, night watchmen, and gardeners. He also wanted no lights in the area. [____] told him that they were watering a new lawn in that area and [____] insisted that while they could water the lawn up to the time of the arrival of the clients thereafter they should even cease watering.

When [____] advised that he would have to have the names of the clients on his register under the Arizona State law,
stated that they would take that up when the
time comes and in the meantime only ROBERT MAHEU,
himself, could give the names of the clients and he,
would not reveal the same.

advises that he will insist upon the clients'
registering when they arrive and will keep this office
advised.
July 8, 1959

AIRTEL

To: SACs Phoenix
Los Angeles (66-1700)

Enclosure

From: Director, FBI (62-101375)

ROBERT A. MAIEU ASSOCIATES
MISCELLANEOUS - INFORMATION CONCERNING CRIMINAL SECTION, INVESTIGATIVE DIVISION

There are enclosed herewith for the Phoenix Division a copy of a memorandum from the Los Angeles Division dated June 18, 1959, and for the Los Angeles Division a copy of a memorandum from the Phoenix Division under date of June 16, 1959.

For the information of both offices, no open active investigation is desired concerning these matters. Additional information should be developed, however, both by the Phoenix and Los Angeles Divisions through very discreet inquiry and checks with established sources. Additional information developed should be promptly furnished to the Bureau.

The Phoenix Division, as instructed in Buairtel of June 25, 1959, should develop further information concerning the cabin reserved at the Arizona Inn and should furnish any background information available concerning [ ] who is not identifiable in the Bureau's indices. As previously instructed, Phoenix should settle by July 15, 1959.

The Los Angeles Division should furnish any additional information developed concerning the matter related in reports from Los Angeles. In this connection, it is noted that Bureau files disclose only one former Special Agent named [ ] who entered on duty January 5, 1948, served in San Francisco, Seattle, and Washington Field...
Airte1 to Phoenix
Los Angeles
Robert A. Maheu Associates
62-101375

Offices and resigned effective June 3, 1954. Following his resignation he was part owner of a bar and grill in Washington, D. C., and Maheu reportedly loaned $1500 in connection with this venture. There is also a former Special Agent named [___], who entered on duty August 22, 1949, and resigned September 11, 1953, after service in San Francisco, Los Angeles, and S.O.G. Subsequent to his resignation, he was employed by Richfield Oil Corporation. It should be ascertained which former Special Agent [___] was involved in the incident with Los Angeles police officers as described in relet. The Bureau should also be advised of any further details concerning Maheu's activities. For the information of Los Angeles, Bureau indices and Identification Division files contain no reference to [___]. His identity should be determined. Los Angeles sulet by July 25, 1959.
For the information of Los Angeles this office has learned that the operations of [redacted] and [redacted] in Tucson are apparently in behalf of the HOWARD HUGHES INDUSTRIES who plan to move a sizeable portion of their operations to Tucson, Arizona, and are having the MAHEU ASSOCIATES take options on various properties on a very confidential basis so that there will not be any economic repercussions at this time. This should be kept very confidential as it was given to our agents in confidence by Chief of Police Garmire of the Tucson Police Department who had been approached by MAHEU.

During the past week two guards appeared at the Arizona Inn to stand guard over the cabin which is still rented by [redacted]. These guards did not identify themselves and thus had a run in with the night watchman at the Arizona Inn to the point where they had to identify themselves. [redacted] was contacted and he advised the manager that these were off-duty Tucson Policemen hired by him to guard the cabin. The manager stated that while it was possible someone might have stayed in the cabin, he found no evidence of it.

[redacted] has, in addition to leasing the cabin at Arizona Inn, leased a large house on the outskirts of Tucson which has both indoor and outdoor swimming pool, which is very elaborate and this house is used to house various attorneys and employees coming to Tucson on behalf of the HOWARD HUGHES interests to study the situation with regard to the proposed move.

The newspapers apparently are getting close to this situation since a newspaper article stated that the Tucson Airport authorities had recently rented some land to the HOWARD HUGHES INDUSTRIES and quoted a lawyer...
for HOWARD HUGHES as refusing to make any comment.

The Bureau will be advised further when and if additional information is received regarding the true identity of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. It is noted, however, that Chief Carmine is of the opinion that [REDACTED] is also a former agent of the FBI.
DIRECTOR, FBI (62-101375)  

SAC, LOS ANGELES (66-1766)  

ROBERT A. MAHEU ASSOCIATES'  

MISCELLANEOUS - INFORMATION CONCERNING  

CRIMINAL SECTION, INVESTIGATIVE DIVISION  

July 27, 1959  

Re Bureau airtel, 7/8/59.  

[Redacted], one of those named as an associate of ROBERT A. MAHEU, and presumed by Los Angeles police who were investigating MAHEU's activities here, to be a former FBI Agent, is not represented in Los Angeles files under that name.  

Records of the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) and the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Office, searched by [SE redacted] on July 17, 1959, failed to identify [SE redacted] and records of the Los Angeles Retail Merchants Credit Association, searched on July 16, 1959, by [SE redacted] are likewise negative on that name, which is not found in the various Los Angeles telephone directories.  

Lieutenant[SE redacted], LAPD Intelligence Division, stated to SA[SE redacted] on July 10, 1959, that his office has developed no information on the activities of MAHEU, having lost interest when SAMUEL RAND accidentally shot and killed himself June 12, 1959. RAND was the man on whom surveillances had been conducted by MAHEU and the others on behalf of HOWARD HUGHES.  

On July 24, 1959, Lieutenant[SE redacted] stated that officers in his division are acquainted with[SE redacted], former SA presently employed by Richfield Oil Corporation in Los Angeles. [SE redacted] knows it is not this[SE redacted] of the Richfield Company who was involved in the incident with Los Angeles police officers as described in my letter June 18, 1959.
LA 66-1700

To the best of Lieutenant [redacted] knowledge, former SA [redacted] who was involved in that incident is a tall, ruddy-faced individual who exhibited papers reflecting his residence at Tucson, Arizona.

RUC.
DIRECTOR, FBI (62-101375) 8/17/59

SAC, PHOENIX (62-694)

ROBERT A. MAHEU ASSOCIATES
MISCELLANEOUS - INFORMATION CONCERNING CRIMINAL SECTION, INVESTIGATIVE DIVISION

For the information of the Bureau, Chief of Police BERNARD L. GARMIRE, NA, Tucson, Arizona Police Department, recently advised SA[___________] that the [___________] who was in the Tucson area working for captioned organization is no longer working in that area due to his having incurred the displeasure of MAHEU because of some indiscretions on the part of [_______] in his actions in the Tucson area, particularly in connection with reports that he had been known to have frequented local taverns and after considerable drinking talked too much.

Chief GARMIRE ascertained that [___________] who has also been working for captioned organization in the Tucson area, is not a former employee of this Bureau.

For the further information of the Bureau, the Arizona Inn has been and is considered in the Tucson area as a very reputable, expensive winter resort. Their rates are much higher than the average in the area and their guests include many very prominent individuals. During the past winter season among the guests staying here during their visit in Tucson, Arizona, were the Duke and Duchess of Windsor.

No information has been received to establish the positive identity of the [___________] referred to above.

According to Chief GARMIRE, MAHEU was in the Tucson area recently in connection with the operations of his group on behalf of their client, the Howard Hughes Industries.

Inasmuch as information received thus far indicates the MAHEU group's activities in the Tucson area are re-
PX 62-694

ported to be legitimate, this matter is being closed in the Phoenix Office; however, any additional information coming to the attention of the Phoenix Office concerning the activities of MAHEU and his associates will be furnished to the Bureau.

A copy of this letter is being furnished to the Los Angeles Office for information due to the activities of this group in that area.
DIRECTOR, FBI (62-101375)  
November 2, 1959

SAC, LOS ANGELES (62-4677)

ROBERT A. MAHEU ASSOCIATES

MISCELLANEOUS - INFORMATION CONCERNING
CRIMINAL SECTION, INVESTIGATIVE DIVISION


Referenced Los Angeles letter provided information regarding ________, a 20-year-old Hollywood beauty, described by Lieutenant ________ of the Intelligence Division, Los Angeles Police Department, as one of industrialist HOWARD HUGHES' stable of paramours.

The Bureau instructed Los Angeles to provide any additional information developed concerning the matter.

Although what follows may not precisely be in accord with those instructions, it is believed of sufficient interest to bring to the Bureau's attention.

Sometime over the weekend of October 3-4, 1959, the West Hollywood apartment of ________ was burglarized and jewelry valued, according to her, at $31,530 was taken.

This event was publicized with the Los Angeles Times of October 5, 1959, stating that West Hollywood Sheriff's Detectives reported entrance was gained to ________ apartment at ________, through the removal of two panes of glass from the front window.

Among the jewelry taken, according to this article, was a 14-carat gold diamond bracelet, a 14-carat gold rope necklace with platinum and diamond clasp, an 18-carat gold necklace with ten diamonds and 20 emeralds, and a Ceylon sapphire gold link bracelet.

In accord with Bureau policy relating to Major Jewel Thefts, SAs, on October 5, 1959, interviewed West Hollywood Sheriff's Detective ________, who

2 - Bureau
1 - Los Angeles
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was investigating the theft for the West Hollywood Sheriff's Office.

Thereafter, the SAs conducted a routine neighborhood investigation and incidental to it, they went to the [_____] apartment. [_____] was alone there and was uncooperative, but she did claim, angrily, that the burglary had been perpetrated at the behest of HOWARD HUGHES. She would give no particulars and referred the SAs to Captain [____], Commander of the Los Angeles Police Department Intelligence Division.

Subsequently, Lieutenant [____] of the Los Angeles Police Department, Intelligence Division, told SA [____] on October 15, 1959, that [_____] had complained to Captain [____] and had flatly accused HOWARD HUGHES of arranging the burglary of her apartment because he was angry with her. [_____] said the jewelry taken had been given to [_____] by HOWARD HUGHES. Admittedly without proof, Captain [____] and Lieutenant [____] are convinced that the burglary was performed by HUGHES' private investigators, which to them means ROBERT A. MAHEU ASSOCIATES.

[____] reiterated his previous statement that HUGHES keeps under constant surveillance the stable of young paramours he maintains, even to the point of having them under surveillance when they travel. [_____] added he believes HUGHES keeps beautiful young girls such as [_____] in various locations about the country for his pleasure when he visits their cities.
SAC, LOS ANGELES (87-10662)  

October 26, 1959

SA

UNSUB; Theft of $31,530 Worth of Jewelry  

ITSP - VICTIM

This case is predicated upon information which appeared in the Los Angeles Times on October 5, 1959, to the effect that jewelry valued at $31,530 was taken from the West Hollywood apartment of singer [name not legible] age 20, while she was visiting her parents in Santa Ana over the week end.

This article indicated that investigation by the West Hollywood Sheriff's Office determined that entrance to the apartment of [name not legible] at [address not legible] was gained through removal of two panes of glass from the front window.

The article continued that among the jewelry taken was a 14 carat gold diamond bracelet valued at $1,380; a 14 carat gold rope necklace with a platinum and diamond clasp valued at $1,540; an 18 carat gold necklace with 10 diamonds and 20 emeralds valued at $1,980; and a Ceylon sapphire gold link bracelet valued at $1,650.

The following investigation was conducted by SAs [name not legible], and [name not legible].

On October 5, 1959, SAs [name not legible] and [name not legible] entered the West Hollywood Sheriff's Office in order to keep an appointment with Detective [name not legible] to whom this investigation was assigned.

1 - 87-10662  
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Upon entering the West Hollywood Sheriff's Office, was observed by the two above agents to be talking with a young attractive girl in the hallway of the Sheriff's Office.

Agents and proceeded to the detective's room and there awaited arrival. Approximately 10 minutes later entered the detective's room and after an exchange of pleasantries was asked about the burglary of

stated that investigation by the West Hollywood Sheriff's Office had determined that the apartment of at in was entered by an unknown individual or individuals on either October 3 or 4, 1959. advised that entry was made by removing two glass louvers from the front window of apartment, thereby gaining access into the apartment. stated that the burglar then removed a jewel case containing approximately $31,530 worth of jewelry and left the apartment by way of the front door. stated an examination of the apartment by the West Hollywood Sheriff's Office failed to reflect any clues and stated that the apartment was also processed for latent fingerprints and the thorough examination failed to determine that there were any latent prints.

stated that the West Hollywood Sheriff's Office received a call from the victim, on the late afternoon of October 4, 1959. The victim stated that upon arriving at her apartment from her parents' home in Santa Ana she discovered that the front door of her apartment was ajar. She then proceeded to examine the interior of her apartment and discovered the loss of the jewelry, then made the theft report to the West Hollywood Sheriff's Office.

stated that the victim, because she was afraid that the burglar might come back, left the apartment and again went to join her parents in Santa Ana.
was then asked if he had since interviewed the victim to which he replied that he had not. He stated that the victim was going to give him a call when she arrived back at the apartment and he at that time intended to interview her. was then asked if when the victim called if he would get in touch with Agent and they could interview the victim together, to which request was agreeable.

was then asked for a copy of the theft report made by the victim. stated that he did not have another copy of the theft report and at that time advised Agent not to worry about this case, that if anything developed in this case including a violation over which the FBI had jurisdiction he would immediately alert the interviewing agent.

At this time it is noted that in prior dealings with he has been most cooperative in working with agents of the FBI in investigation of jewel theft matters.

was then asked if a neighborhood investigation had been conducted in the vicinity of victim's apartment, to which question stated that a neighborhood investigation had been conducted by their department and not with negative results.

The agents then prepared to leave and prior to their departure SA stated that it was the intent of he and Si to go to victim's apartment and conduct a neighborhood investigation. At this time again stated "Don't bother with it. We will advise you if anything pertinent is developed".

Agents and then proceeded to the vicinity of victim's apartment at Upon passing victim's apartment SAs and noted that there was a young girl in victim's apartment and it was determined that this girl was the same girl who was being interviewed by Sergeant at the time Agents and entered the West Hollywood Sheriff's Office.
Agents and then knocked on victim's door and determined that the girl in the apartment was the victim.

After had explained to her the FBI's interests in jewel matters and after identification was shown to her, became very antagonistic and demanded to know why the agents had not interviewed her during the time she was in the West Hollywood Sheriff's Office. It was then explained to Miss that the agents were not advised of her identity during the time they were in the West Hollywood Sheriff's Office and furthermore had been told that she was out of town.

It is noted that the remainder of the interview was conducted in a most hostile fashion by the victim. She was very evasive in answering any questions regarding the burglary and, in fact, refused to answer most questions. Upon being asked if she had any suspects, the victim stated "yes, HOWARD HUGHES and associates." Victim was then asked if she meant the HOWARD HUGHES who was a motion picture executive and she replied "yes, I mean him" and "you can talk to Captain of the Intelligence Division of the Los Angeles Police Department regarding this matter. I have nothing further to say."

With that, the agents left and conducted a neighborhood investigation at which time the following individuals were contacted and no information of value obtained.

Mr. and Mrs. Apartment 211
Mr. and Mrs. Apartment 213
Apartment 214
Agents ______ and ______ then proceeded back to the West Hollywood Sheriff's Office and for the second time talked with Sergeant [blank]. He was asked why he had not told the agents that he was interviewing the victim at the West Hollywood Sheriff's Office at the time the agents passed him in the hallway. He was also questioned as to why he had not told the agents that the victim was in Los Angeles and was, in fact, at her apartment. To these questions [blank] replied that he was only a sergeant, that he had always worked close with the agents of the FBI in the past, and that it was his intention to cooperate fully with them in the future. He stated that he received orders from higher up in the Sheriff's Office to keep his investigation confidential, to notify neither the press nor any other investigative agency. [blank] stated confidentially to SA BARKON that it was his belief that he was given this case in order to soft peddle it. He stated that he did not wish to discuss the matter further and advised that should he learn in the future that any of the jewelry taken in instant burglary had been transported interstate of a value of $5,000 or more, he would immediately advise SA [blank].

In case entitled "ROBERT A. MAYHEW ASSOCIATES, MISCELLANEOUS - INFORMATION CONCERNING, CRIMINAL SECTION INVESTIGATIVE DIVISION" Los Angeles file 62-4577, is contained information relevant to this investigation. The information in this file is not being set forth in captioned matter because it is being treated as confidential.

On October 21, 1959, SA [blank] again talked with Sergeant [blank] of the West Hollywood Sheriff's Office at which time [blank] stated that their department had not developed any significant information regarding instant case.

In view of the attitude of the West Hollywood Sheriff's Office not to cooperate with the FBI and victim's apparent lack of cooperation and the information contained in the file referenced above, no further investigation is being conducted in this matter and this case is recommended to be closed administratively.
Re Phoenix letter to Bureau dated 8/17/59.

For the information of the Bureau and Los Angeles, the information set out hereinafter is furnished to bring up to date the activities in the Tucson area of captioned organizations.

On 2/27/60 while agents of the Tucson Resident Agency were conducting a jewel robbery investigation at the Arizona Inn in Tucson, [__________], Manager of the Arizona Inn, advised that a cottage at that exclusive establishment is still reserved for Mr. and Mrs. ROBERT MAHEU. He said that at the beginning of the current winter resort season he had called MAHEU and gave him the benefit of the "first refusal" on the cottage. He told MAHEU that he could have a week to think it over. MAHEU stated that he did not need any time to think it over but that he would take the cottage.

During the season[_________] advised he received a check in the amount of $2,500.00 on MAHEU's account. It came from a company in California, the name of which he could not recall. [_________] said at the present time (as of 2/27/60) MAHEU owes the Arizona Inn $8,000.00. [______] said the rate on this particular cottage is $100.00 per day during the season. He also added that so far as is known to him no one has occupied the cottage.

It should also be noted that for the past several months[__________] has handled the arrangements with the Tucson Chief of Police, BERNARD L. GARMIRES (NA) and Sgt. [______] (NA) for the latter to furnish a security detail for guarding a very nice house located in the foothills of the Catalina Mountains north of Tucson.
This house is reported to be under lease by MAHEU ASSOCIATES although no investigation has been conducted to verify or to determine the name of the lessee, and according to information furnished SA on a very confidential basis by officers working on this security detail, the house is completely furnished but no one has occupied it so far as these officers know.

Chief of Police GARMIRE and Sgt. have not told the rank and file officers of the Tucson PD who work on this security detail anything about the nature of the business being conducted by the captioned company in the Tucson area. The officers who have worked on this security detail have confided in SA that if it were not for the fact that they have complete confidence in the judgment of Chief GARMIRE and Sgt. they would be extremely suspicious of this particular operation.

It was explained to SA the reason for this suspicion is the manner in which KAYS gave orders for the handling of this security detail. He has given orders to that under no circumstances is the officer on the watch to park his car or to walk on any part of the property but is to conduct the surveillance from any point just off of the particular property.

On one occasion one of the officers indicated that time was hanging heavily on his hands and he walked up to the house and he observed that the concrete patio had accumulated debris and dirt and seeing a hose attached to a spigot nearby he thought he would clean it off. He said the following day Sgt. admonished him regarding Mr. orders that he, did not want anything done around the property which would leave any tracks or indication whatsoever that anybody had been up to the house.

This particular officer has advised SA on several occasions during the month of February and thus far in March that the longer the operation continues the more he is beginning to doubt it is legitimate. He said Sgt. has furnished only an explanation that the house is under lease by a very prominent and wealthy individual on the west coast who will no doubt sometime move into the house but prior to his taking possession he must be assured that nothing happens and no prying eyes are able to make any survey of the property or possibly put in some "bug".
This officer indicated this explanation might be logical if it were not for the fact that on several occasions [_____] has called off the security detail guard for perhaps a day or two at a time and the most recent incident was when he advised [_____] that the money to pay the officers had not yet arrived, thereby necessitating calling off the guard until the money arrived. This officer said he has tried to rationalize the actions of the type person who would be so wealthy he could afford this sort of thing or perhaps a corporation but each time arrives at the conclusion that it was a fantastic, expensive operation for which there is no logical explanation.

Agent [______], who was advised previously by Chief GARMIRE of the nature of captioned company's operations in the Tucson area, has of course said nothing to any of these officers indicating that he is in possession of any knowledge of the explanation of what this company is doing. Agent [______] has followed this procedure for the reason that GARMIRE indicated to [______] that only ranking officers in the top echelon of the Tucson PD are in on the explanation as given GARMIRE by MAHEU, which has been reported previously to the Bureau.

One of the officers has advised SA [______] that over the period of the past several months he would estimate that [_____] has paid out to Tucson police officers in the neighborhood of three to four thousand dollars or more for their work on this detail. The officers handling the detail do so on their off-duty hours and receive as compensation $2.50 per hour.

SA [______] has ascertained from conversation with Tucson PD officers that [_____] has been in Tucson continuously and for the past several months, extending back into at least the summer of 1959, has been residing by himself in another palatial home under lease by captioned company and located in the vicinity of Firth Street and Dodge Avenue in Tucson, which is equipped with both an inside and outside swimming pool and this house is of the size and so appointed that under the going rates in the Tucson area the rental would be very high.

-3-
During the month of February, 1960, [redacted] apparently made the statement to some police officer that his mode of living in the house had been somewhat changed due to the fact that MAHEU's mother was staying there temporarily as were some other guests. So far as has been reported [redacted] apparently has not had any family with him and it is not known whether he has any family.

One of these officers also advised SA [redacted] that from conversations with Sgt. [redacted] he gathered that MAHEU or [redacted] possibly have some other places in the Tucson area under lease. Also, it has been reported that Chief GARMIRE frequently is in contact with [redacted] as also with MAHEU when the latter is in the Tucson area.

Due to the fact that Chief GARMIRE and Sgt. [redacted] are both considered extremely reliable and are very cooperative with the agents in the Phoenix Division, the above information and the manner in which it was obtained should remain strictly confidential and not be disseminated to anyone outside this Bureau. If it were to get out that officers of that department have been discussing this matter with SA [redacted] it would result in getting them into trouble as well as disrupting relations with Chief GARMIRE and Sgt. [redacted]. It is to be noted that Sgt. [redacted] has at no time discussed this operation in any manner with SA [redacted] and it is believed the reason for his secrecy is because of his loyalty to his chief, who has no doubt bound him to secrecy.

It would appear that even though in the early stages in this operation the explanation given Chief GARMIRE by MAHEU with reference to the confidential plans of west coast industrialist HOWARD HUGHES, it would seem that such wasteful expenditure of money as has been apparent in the operations of this group would hardly be tolerated by any corporation. It would also appear that inasmuch as the reports are that these expensive places under lease are not actually being used that the possibility of the operation being a "tax" dodge would hardly be plausible.

It is contemplated that as soon as possible discreet inquiry will be made to obtain the number of any telephones.
installed in these houses so that a check can be made of the
toll calls, if such can be made in a discreet manner.

If the Los Angeles Division has received any current
information concerning this operation the Bureau and Phoenix
should be advised.
April 6, 1960

AIRTEL

To: SACs, Phoenix (62-694)  
Los Angeles (66-1700)

From: Director, FBI (62-101375)

ROBERT A. MAHEU ASSOCIATES  
MISCELLANEOUS - INFORMATION CONCERNING  
CRIMINAL SECTION, INVESTIGATIVE DIVISION

Re Phoenix letter 3/29/60.

Phoenix closely follow this matter with Mr. Manager of the Arizona Inn. Endeavor to secure identifying information re check for $2,500. Also maintain close contact with Manager of Arizona Inn for any information concerning occupants of cottage rented by Maheu and, in the event Maheu submits a check covering his indebtedness, complete identifying data should be secured. Phoenix maintain close contact with Chief of Police, Tucson, for any information he may be able to furnish.

Los Angeles advise the Bureau of any information developed concerning Maheu's tie-in or work for the Howard Hughes Industries. Also furnish any information concerning Maheu's operation in renting a cottage at the Arizona Inn and a house in the foothills of the Catalina Mountains.

Both offices keep the Bureau advised of developments.
TO : DIRECTOR, FBI (62-101375)
FROM : SAC, PHOENIX (62-694)

SUBJECT: ROBERT A. MAHEU ASSOCIATES
MISCELLANEOUS - INFORMATION CONCERNING
CRIMINAL SECTION, INVESTIGATIVE DIVISION

Re: Airtel dated 4/6/60.

During the week of 4/4/60, SAC ascertained that beginning 1:00 a.m. 4/4/60 MAHEU's representative who lives in Tucson, arranged with the Tucson PD to have a security detail start watching the hangars and fenced-in area which was formerly operated by the Douglas Aircraft Company. This property is at the edge of the Tucson Municipal Airport. The April 9th, 1960 issue of The Arizona Daily Star carried a news story that the Tucson Airport Authority's latest proposal to the Hughes Tool Co. for lease of the former Douglas facilities is still being considered. It said that speculation that the final contract may have been signed was heightened 4/8 and 9/60 when it was reported that HOWARD HUGHES was in Tucson.

BOB SCHMIDT, Tucson Airport Authority Director, was quoted as saying that Hughes Tool Co. began inquiring about leasing the three large hangars at the Municipal Airport early last year but it wasn't until the Douglas Aircraft Co. moved out 1/31/60 that the negotiations began in earnest. The article stated that a Washington, D. C. attorney, GILLIS LONG, is handling the negotiations for Hughes.

The newspaper article also stated that the former Douglas Company facilities at the Tucson airport occupies
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2,180,000 square feet with 705,049 square feet of space in the three larger hangars.

SA ascertained that the security detail of Tucson off-duty police officers working at the former Douglas facilities is comprised of three men on each of three eight hour shifts making a total of nine officers at a cost of $180.00 per day.

SA also ascertained that the security detail is still being maintained on an intermittent basis at the house located at and at the cottage at the Arizona Inn.

SA ascertained at the office of the Recorder, Pima County Court House, Tucson, 4/11/60 that the above property at was sold on contract 11/25/59 which is recorded in book 1527, page 550. This record reflects that HOWARD and husband and wife, sold this property to ROBERT A. MAHEU on contract for a total price of $73,500.00 with the purchaser paying $4500.00 down and the balance to be paid at the rate of $1000.00 per month starting 12/25/59 and each month thereafter until 12/25/64 when the balance due is to be paid in full. The document provides that if the buyer defaults and the seller has to take action to repossess the buyer must pay to seller the sum of $10,000.00. The instrument is signed by the sellers and by Attorney in fact for ROBERT A. MAHEU.

Additional information will be obtained and the Bureau will be advised. The latest development would appear to indicate the possibility that it is some sort of a Hughes operation.
April 15, 1960

AIRTEL

TO: SACs, Phoenix (62-694)
    Los Angeles (66-1700)

From: Director, FBI (62-101375)

ROBERT A. MAREU ASSOCIATES
MISCELLANEOUS - INFORMATION CONCERNING
CRIMINAL SECTION, INVESTIGATIVE DIVISION

Re Phoenix airtel 4-13-60.

Phoenix discretionately ascertain identity and
background information concerning [redacted].

Advise Bureau and Los Angeles results.

b6
b7C
April 21, 1960

AIRTEL

AIR MAIL

TO: DIRECTOR, FBI (62-101375)

FROM: SAC, LOS ANGELES (62-4677) DO NOT DISSEMINATE

RE: ROBERT A. MAHEU ASSOCIATES

MISCELLANEOUS - INFORMATION CONCERNING CRITICAL SECTION, INVESTIGATIVE DIVISION

Re Bureau airtel to Phoenix and Los Angeles dated 4/6/60.

Mr. [Blank] in charge of the personal secretarial staff for HOWARD HUGHES, recently mentioned ROBERT MAHEU, incidental to a social conversation with SA [Blank].

[Blank] indicated HOWARD HUGHES has personally great confidence in MAHEU who [Blank] referred to as a former Bureau Agent. Further, he said MAHEU Associates represents a large segment of the maritime shipping industry in the field of public and labor relations, and have almost unlimited funds from the shipping industry at disposal. To aid in control and administration of world-wide labor and public relations problems, the shippers, according to [Blank], have recently created 10 zones, called Conferences, around the world. Of these, Maheu Associates is responsible for seven or eight, and consequently MAHEU is expanding his operation considerably.

Ex SA ROBERT L. KING (former assistant to Vice President NIXON) has now joined the MAHEU operation, per this source, as a full partner, and the firm of Maheu and King now has a San Francisco office. In addition to
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the shipping industry, they are handling public relations for Hughes Industries, Northrup Aircraft Company and United Steel Workers Union, according to whose discussion could prove embarrassing to him and to SA if disseminated outside the Bureau.

Additionally, in late 1956, soon after the Egyptian seizure of the Suez Canal, SA chance to meet ROBERT MAHEU in a gas station here. They had worked together years ago in the Phoenix Office, and MAHEU chatted about his current business, mentioning that his firm was on a substantial retainer from HOWARD HUGHES, and indicating that their job was to do whatever HUGHES ordered done. MAHEU did not particularize on this, but the incident involving the girl previously reported, may serve as an example.

MAHEU said he had recently made a trip to Egypt to survey the Suez situation for ARISTOTLE ONASSIS, the Greek shipping magnate. As a result, he said, he was able to predict that NASSER's Government would take over the Canal. ONASSIS, believing him, routed his fleet to avoid the Suez, and this saved him about a million dollars. MAHEU said his firm was paid a handsome fee, recalled by as $5,000 or more, and was placed on retainer with the grateful ONASSIS promising bigger rewards to follow. This current public relations work for the shipping industry may be founded on this incident.

When seen here by MAHEU was making a survey of politics and politicians in suburban Culver City where the Hughes Aircraft Plant is located. It was an election year, and HUGHES had ordered MAHEU to learn which side would present the best tax break for Hughes Aircraft. SA had not seen MAHEU since 1941 and has had no contact with him since the chance meeting in 1956.

No information has been developed here concerning the cottage at Arizona Inn nor the house in the foothills of the Catalina mountains mentioned in referenced article.

The Bureau will be kept advised of information which may be developed here.
AIRTEL

TO : DIRECTOR, FBI (62-101375)
FROM : SAC, PHOENIX (62-694)
SUBJECT: ROBERT A. MANEU ASSOCIATES
MISCELLANEOUS - INFORMATION CONCERNING
CRIMINAL SECTION, INVESTIGATIVE DIVISION

Re Phoenix airtel to the Bureau dated 4/13/60. On 4/20/60, a confidential source of the Phoenix Division, advised SA [omitted], in Tucson, Arizona, that a big business operation involving HOWARD HUGHES was in the offing. The source stated that [omitted].

3 - Bureau (AI)
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RTN: 1234 (0)

5/25/60
R/15
It was announced recently in the Tucson, Arizona newspapers that the Hughes Tool Company of Texas has leased the facilities at the Tucson Municipal Airport, which were used previously by Douglas Aviation Company. No announcement has been made as to the type of operation the Hughes Company plans for the Tucson facility.

Sergeant [redacted], NA, Intelligence Unit, Tucson Police Department, who has been handling the assignment of off duty police officers for guard duty at the various places captioned group has leased or purchased, advised [redacted] recently that he understands that the new Hughes Company operation in Tucson will employ upwards of five thousand employees. Off duty police officers are still guarding the old Douglas Company hangars at the Tucson Municipal Airport, but are no longer guarding the house in [redacted] north of Tucson. MAIEU's employee, [redacted] is still residing at Fifth and Dodge Boulevard in Tucson, Arizona.

There has been speculation in the Tucson press that the Hughes Company may manufacture helicopters at Tucson, but no definite plans have been announced by the Hughes Company.

2 - Bureau
2 - Los Angeles (66-1700)
2 - Phoenix
TO: SAC (62-4677)

FROM: SA

SUBJECT: ROBERT A. MAHEU ASSOCIATES
Info. Concerning
Phoenix -00

Bureau instructions currently are to provide to the Bureau and Phoenix any additional information developed re the above.

Since no information has come to the attention of this office since submission of LA airtel 4-21-60, and there are no specific leads outstanding, it is suggested that this case be closed administratively, subject to re-opening upon receipt of anything new, or further Bureau instructions.

FHT
Complaint Form

Subject's name and aliases

Address of subject

Character of case

Misc.

Info Concerning

Complainant

Complainant's address and telephone number

Complaint received

Personal [X] Telephonic

Date 9/26/60 Time 5:40pm

Race Sex Height Hair Build

Age Weight Eyes Complexion

Birth date and Birthplace

Scars, marks or other data

Facts of complaint

C operates the guard services, etc. Has contract to patrol a housing development being constructed by the Lemert Development Co., and the Hollywood Granit Co. Development is located on Bluejaw Way, reached in the Hollywood Hills area by continuing up Sunset Plaza Dr., Rising Glenn, and Thrasher Sts.

At approximately 10:30pm, 9/25/60, one of C's partolman XXXXX observed a vehicle parked near the contractor's office. The office had been burglarized in the past. Guard inspected the vehicle under possibility another burglary may be in the making. While doing so, subjects approached him, and inquired as to his business. Guard identified himself, and made same inquiry of subjects. Subjects stated they were on an extremely vital, highly secret, operation, which they could not discuss. Guard radioed XXXX, inquiring as to next course of action. C notified Hollywood division of LAPD. LAPD dispatched a cruiser occupied by one Officer [ ], who spoke with XXXXX subjects individually, and then advised the guard that "you are dismissed." Guard, officer, and subjects, latter in individual cars, departed the area.

At 2:00am, instant date, guard made second round, and observed subjects back at same location. He endeavored to question them more thoroughly. They showed business cards, identifying selves as above, and showing them as representatives of Mahen & King Associates, Inc., 1125 - 19th St., N.W., Wash. D. C., telephone [ ]. Additional addresses on the card were [ ], telephone [ ], and telephone [ ]. Subjects again refused to discuss nature of their business, other than to state and add that they were on a highly secret mission, guarding someone, and that they could say no more even though they might be jailed.

Action Recommended

Index. File [ ]

Signed [ ]

Addressed to [ ]

256 S. (Sunset Blvd., B [ ])

[ ]
C pointed out the peculiar circumstances of Subjects claiming they were on a highly secret mission, allegedly guarding someone in an area which C describes as being completely uninhabited. C could not understand subject's being able to observe anyone from that location. C stated one of the subjects indicated having recently arrived in this area from Washington, D. C.

C called the Crestview number above this date. Female answered, and advised C could contact subjects at [redacted]. C called that number, and spoke with one of the Subjects. Subject advised him their operation would take place again tonight, but that he would clear with the contractors and developers. C furnished subject with names of individuals in charge. C called these individuals shortly before calling writer, and was advised that Subjects had not contacted either of the developers. Subject told C that tonight [redacted] AND [redacted] would replace the [redacted] at the site.

C stated the [redacted] are brothers, and assumes the [redacted] are too.

C furnished license numbers of vehicles used by [redacted] at time of above incident, as [redacted] appearing on a Mercury, and [redacted] on a late model Chevrolet.

Writer contacted DMV to obtain following:

- [redacted] registered to a 1954 Mercury in name of [redacted],


Writer contacted Officer [redacted] LAPD, 9/26/60, telephonically to learn that [redacted] had interviewed subjects on 9/25/60 as a routine shakedown. He recalled subjects were extremely non-commital as to nature of their business, stating it was highly confidential. [redacted] inquired if business was in nature of private investigators. One of the subjects replied "that's getting pretty close". Subjects told they could not discuss their business, but suggested that if [redacted] cared to resolve their identity, he could do so by phoning an unrecalled telephone number. As subjects had committed no violation, [redacted] did not phone the number, and dismissed the matter completely. Subjects had identified selves to [redacted] as they had to the guard, and furnished their residence phone as [redacted].

C and [redacted] agreed that subjects [redacted] did not make statements to the effect they were government employees or otherwise indicate a possible violation within Bureau's jurisdiction.

C was advised that subjects were not agents of this office, nor connected therewith in any capacity. In reply to his inquiry, writer advised C that FBI could make no recommendation as to any action should Subjects be at site tonight, and that any actions he takes are his own.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject's name and aliases</th>
<th>Address of subject</th>
<th>Character of case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complainant</td>
<td>Complainant's address and telephone number</td>
<td>Complaint received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Personal □ Telephonic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Date __________ Time __________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Height</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Male</td>
<td>□ Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>Eyes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scars, marks or other data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facts of complaint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Recommended</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DIRECTOR, FBI (62-101375) 9/27/60

SAC, LOS ANGELES (62-4677)

ROBERT A. MAHEU ASSOCIATES
MISCELLANEOUS - INFORMATION
CONCERNING
CRIMINAL SECTION, INVESTIGATIVE
DIVISION

Reference is made to SAC Letter #54-53
dated 10/5/54, which instructed that any information
coming to the attention of the field concerning
captioned organization be furnished to the
Bureau immediately. The following information is
furnished in compliance therewith:

On 9/26/60 [name redacted] contacted the
Los Angeles Office telephonically to advise that
he described his business as [location redacted] for various business establishments in the Los
Angeles area. He stated that he currently holds a
contract to patrol an extensive construction project
being developed by the Lemert Development Company
and the Hollywood Granite Company, the housing project
being located in the Hollywood Hills section of
Los Angeles.

[Name redacted] stated that at approximately
10:30 P.M. on 9/25/60 one of his patrolmen observed
a vehicle parked near the field contractor's office
at the construction project site. The contractor's
office had been burglarized in the past and the guard
was inspecting the automobile in view of another
burglary possibly being committed. As he was doing
so he was approached by two individuals who identified
themselves as [names redacted] brothers. They explained that they were on a highly secretive
operation which they could not discuss with the guard.
under strict orders from their superior. The guard radioed his superior who dispatched a cruiser of the Hollywood Division, Los Angeles Police Department to the area. The police officer interviewed both of the individually but took no further action. The the guard, and the police officer then departed the area. At 2:00 A.M. on 9/26/60 the guard was making another round of the construction project and again observed the same two individuals near the construction office. At this time he demanded identification which was produced in the form of a business calling card identifying both of the as being representatives of "Maheu and Associates, Inc.," 1125 - 19th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. Additional addresses imprinted on the card were shown as

The again refused to discuss the exact nature of their business other than to state that it was highly secretive and made indications that their duties involved guarding an unknown individual.

furnished the license numbers of two automobiles used by the. One of the licenses, according to files of the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) at Los Angeles, is registered to a 1954 Mercury sedan in the name of . According to DMV records, California license furnished by is registered to a 1960 Chevrolet in the name of the Standard Car Leasing Company, 8621 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, California.

advised that there was no indication that either of the had endeavored to impersonate themselves other than as private investigators.

Attention is invited to the apparently new identification of captioned organization as the Maheu and Associates, Inc. Previous correspondence in the possession of the Bureau indicates that one , a former Special Agent of the Bureau, had joined the MAHEU operation in the past.
Contact with the Hollywood Division of the Los Angeles Police Department determined that the [_____] were merely considered as routine shakedown suspects, had identified themselves properly to the investigating officer, and no further attention is being given them by that department.

Los Angeles indices contain no information identifiable with either of the [_____] or [_____] . The Los Angeles Office contemplates no further inquiry in this matter and the above is being furnished the Bureau for its information.
Complaint Form
FD-71 (10-20-55)

Note: Hand print names legibly; handwriting satisfactory for remainder.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject's name and aliases</th>
<th>Address of subject</th>
<th>Character of case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT A. MAHEU ASSOCIATES</td>
<td></td>
<td>MSC - INFO CONCERNING CRIMINAL SECTION INVESTIGATIVE DIVISION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complainant</th>
<th>Complainant's address and telephone number</th>
<th>Complaint received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Personal [x] Telephonic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Date: 9/27/60 Time: 5:21pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Hair</th>
<th>Build</th>
<th>Birth date and Birthplace</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Eyes</th>
<th>Complexion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scars, marks or other data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facts of complaint</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C contacted writer this date, to add to the information he had furnished writer on 9/26/60.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C stated that no representatives of subject organization appeared at the site patrolled by C, described in writer's complaint form of 9/26/60, throughout the night of 9/26-27/60.

C added that on instant date, he contacted telephone number [redacted], a number furnished as being that of [redacted]. C was referred to one [redacted]. C stated [redacted] that in a [redacted] very devious manner, [redacted] felt there was no need for C to have concern with regard to the incident of 9/26/60. [redacted] suggested that both [redacted] and C are engaged in similar lines of endeavor. When pushed by C, [redacted] stated operation of 9/26/60 involved "a little starlet", and they desired to "play it down". In his conversation, [redacted] suggested that both he and C are [redacted] acquainted with [redacted] "Captain" in the sheriff's office. C stated he does not know [redacted] adding that [redacted] obviously assumed he did.

In reply to C's inquiry as to possible Bureau interest in this matter, writer stated our only possible interest would have been from the point of view of a possible impersonation. As there appeared to be no such violation, this office would take no action and has no further official interest in the matter.

[redacted] indicated complete confusion concerning the operational methods of subject organization, and implied the possibility he would take steps to identify it further.

Writer is of opinion above does not add materially to information furnished the Bureau by his letter of 9/27/60, and sees no need for another communication on this basis.

Action Recommended

File in 62-4677

(Agent)

[Redacted]
DIRECTOR, FBI (62-101375)  
10/31/60

SAC, LOS ANGELES (62-4677)

ROBERT A. MAHEU ASSOCIATES
MISCELLANEOUS - INFORMATION CONCERNING
CRIMINAL SECTION, INVESTIGATIVE DIVISION

Referlet 9/27/60.

Referlet provides information from the owner of a private patrol company regarding contact by one of his patrolmen with individuals representing themselves as representatives of captioned organization. As related, the patrolman intercepted the MAHEU men late in the evening of 9/25/60 when their car was found parked near a contractor's field office on a construction project patrolled by the private company. The MAHEU employees were in no apparent violation of law, and their explanation to the patrolman indicated only that their duties involved guarding an unknown individual.

Subsequent to preparation of referenced letter, the Phoenix letter of 8/17/60 shows that [redacted] was then working for MAHEU Associates at Tucson, Arizona and that he is not a former employee of the FBI. In Phoenix letter 3/29/60, additional is provided on [redacted] who is shown as the man handling arrangements with the Tucson police officials for a special security detail provided by the department for guarding properties under control of MAHEU, apparently in behalf of industrialist HOWARD HUGHES. That letter

2 - Bureau
1 - Phoenix (62-694)(Info)
1 - Los Angeles

FMT: SCH
(4)
indicated a Phoenix SA had ascertained that [ ] had been in Tucson continuously for several months, residing alone in a palatial home under lease by ROBERT A. MAHEU Associates.

[ ] reported that in a very devious manner [ ], let him know that there was no need for concern over the incident of 9/25/60. [ ] suggested that both he and [ ] are engaged in similar lines of endeavor.

Pushed for explanation, [ ] stated the operation of his men involved "a little starlet", and he and his associates desired that it be played down. In his conversation [ ] mentioned that both he and [ ] are acquainted with "Captain [phenetic]" in the Sheriff's Office. [ ] told SA [ ] that he does not know any [ ] despite [ ]'s assumption.

Reference to "a little starlet" is reminiscent of a situation reported to the Bureau in my letters of 6/13/59 and 11/2/59 regarding a 20-year-old Hollywood beauty named [ ], who by her own admission, and supporting information, had been one of HOWARD HUGHES' paramours. It came out that HUGHES apparently retains the services of private investigators to maintain perpetual surveillance of his girls, and Miss [ ] after she fell out of the HUGHES favor, even alleged that the industrialist caused her apartment to be burglarized by hirelings who took only jewelry previously given her by HUGHES.

Allegedly Los Angeles County Undersheriff HAROLD MARLOWE was used by MAHEU and his associates to intimidate persons posing a threat to HOWARD HUGHES' domination over the young woman in his 'stable'.

Analysis of the 9/25/60 incident and resultant conversation, while speculative, seems reasonable in light of [ ] reference to "a little starlet" when the [ ] story and the general reputation of HUGHES in this regard are considered.
1. REPORT ON: SOGG JAY D (DONALD)

2. RESIDENCE ADDRESS: 229 SPALDING BLVD BEVERLY HILLS CALIF
   (Street Number) (City) (State)

   (Street Number) (City) (County)

   (Street Number) (City) (County) (State)

3. Number of years covered: A. In file B. In Investigation
   A. 1-60
   B. 

4. A. Age (If near 21, confirm) B. Racial extraction (White, Black, Red, Yellow, Brown)
   A. 40
   B. 

5. A. Marital status B. Number of dependents?
   A. MARRIED
   B. TWO CHILDREN

6. A. Name of employer B. Type of business
   A. WESTERN BRUSH & ROLLER CO.
   B. 5618 W. PICO BLVD, LA, CAL

7. A. How long so employed B. Position held
   A. 2-60
   B. PARTNER (CONF 3-60)

8. A. Does applicant have record of steady employment? B. Any recent employment change? (If yes, explain in remarks)
   B. YES

9. Any suits, Judgments or bankruptcies? (If yes, explain in remarks)
   B. NO

10. Is applicant well regarded as to character, habits and morals?
    B. YES

11. Is applicant favorably regarded by employer?
    B. YES

12. Any suspicion of illegal practice past or present?
    B. NO

13. A. Estimate monthly income from present employment B. Estimate other income such as rentals, Investments, etc.
    B. C. Estimate income of others in household
    C. 

14. Own home, rent or board?
   C. 

CREDIT RECORD: (If feasible include whether subject has satisfactory bank checking account.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trade Line</th>
<th>How Long Selling</th>
<th>Date of Last Sale</th>
<th>Highest Credit</th>
<th>Terms of Sale</th>
<th>Amount Owing</th>
<th>Amount Past Due</th>
<th>Manner of Payment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BANK</td>
<td>11-59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10-59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEVELAND, OHIO: 1-60 (KNOWN TO FILES SINCE 1946)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>YRS</td>
<td>296</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>RECORDS NOT AVAILABLE.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISC</td>
<td>YRS</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BANK</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>1037</td>
<td>30 @ 35</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>451</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPT</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REMARKS: A. Give brief word picture of subject's history, explaining any unusual condition.
B. Amplify any incomplete or adverse information in answers above. Use other side also for full details.
C. Include estimate of net worth if possible.

SUBJECT PREV. WITH THE CHAMPION PLATING CO, 2129 PROSPECT AVE, CLEVELAND, OHIO, AS PARTNER FROM 1947; CONF 1-60

1-60, SUBJECT STATED SOLD FORMER BUSINESS AND LOOKING FOR NEW OPPORTUNITY TO BUY

Report for SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF

Date 5-20-60 CF Prepared by

The confidential information given in this report is in answer to a request for same. This report is compiled strictly based on the propriety of extending credit, or the value of condition of an existing credit and is based upon information obtained from sources deemed reliable. This accuracy of which, however, is in no manner guaranteed. The inquirer, in accepting this report, agrees to hold same in STRICT CONFIDENCE for his own exclusive use, never to be communicated, and to be personally responsible for any damage arising from a violation of any of the above provisions.

B/A, WILSHIRE & SPAULDING, LA
Memorandum

TO: SAC, Los Angeles (62-4677)  
FROM: Director, FBI (62-101375)  
DATE: November 8, 1960

SUBJECT: ROBERT A. MAHEU ASSOCIATES  
MISCELLANEOUS - INFORMATION CONCERNING  
(CRIMINAL SECTION, INVESTIGATIVE DIVISION)

Re Los Angeles letter 10/31/60.

Referenced letter was received at the Bureau 11/7/60. It sets forth information apparently obtained by the Los Angeles Office in the latter part of September, 1960. Los Angeles letter 9/27/60 furnished information to the effect that two individuals who represented themselves as being connected with "Maheu and King Associates, Incorporated," had been observed in a vehicle near a construction project site. Referenced letter of 10/31/60 filled out the story and furnished the motive for the presence in the area by representatives of Maheu and King.

It is requested that when information such as was set forth in this letter is received and information obtained concerning Robert A. Maheu that this information be promptly furnished to the Bureau by airtel in order that it may be available soon after it is received.

2 - Phoenix (62-694)
TO: DIRECTOR, FBI (62-101375)
FROM: SAC, PHOENIX (62-694)

SUBJECT: ROBERT A. MAHEU ASSOCIATES
MISCELLANEOUS - INFORMATION CONCERNING CRIMINAL SECTION - INVESTIGATIVE DIVISION

ReBureau to Phoenix and LA 4/15/60.

AT TUCSON, ARIZONA

Records Merchants Association Credit Bureau and University of Arizona show JOSEPH HOMER RILEY, white male American, born Brooklyn, New York 10/11/04, graduated University of California, Berkeley, California, date not shown, and Law School, University of Arizona 5/30/34. Practiced law Tucson since graduation except three years served U. S. Air Force; discharged as Major, 1946. Presently resides 2201 Prince Road, Tucson. Partner with in law firm Riley and Riley, Tucson.

[ --------- ] AUSA, whose husband, [ --------- ]
[ --------- ] is a practicing attorney in Tucson, Judge [ --------- ] Superior Court, former AUSA this district and his brother, [ --------- ], a practicing attorney, advised SA [ --------- ] on a strictly confidential basis on 7/25/60, that they have been acquainted with RILEY as an attorney here for several years, that they do not consider him reliable, that they do not trust him and that he has been suspected of engaging in questionable practices.

3. - Bureau
(2) - Los Angeles (66-1700)
1 - Phoenix
OEM:1ss
(6)

AIRTEL
On the same date, AUSA, advised he has had no personal contact with, knows only that he has been a practicing attorney in Tucson for a number of years and that he has heard rumors suggesting that he might not be entirely trustworthy. He said he had no personal knowledge of this and he could furnish no details or further information.

On 7/25/60, College of Law, University of Arizona, advised SA that he has known RILEY as a practicing attorney in Tucson for a number of years. He said he knew nothing of his background, that he always considered him decent and respectable and that he knows nothing derogatory relative to him.
3/1/61

TO: DIRECTOR, FBI
FROM: SAC, LOS ANGELES (139-77)
RE: UPUC
CC: Las Vegas

Re Buairtel 2/27/61 and Salt Lake City airtel 2/7/61.

[Blank line]

[Blank line]

[Blank line]

Interviewed today by SAs , and , He is in partnership with his father and brother in what appears to be an affluent practice. has represented Los Angeles Top Hoodlum and he has engaged in business ventures with Los Angeles Top Hoodlum and an associate, , a former Chicago bookmaker with big-time Chicago hoodlum connections. He invested with the latter two in the Westside Holding Corporation in Las Vegas, a firm formed to complete construction of the Carver House Hotel there.

said his first knowledge of this matter came with a phone call to him from a man in custody at Las Vegas. He claimed inability to recall the man's name and said he had never before heard of him. Given the name acknowledged that that was probably correct, but he advised he had no knowledge of prior to the call which came, he said, from the office of a Lieutenant in either the Clark County SO or

3 - Bureau
2 - Las Vegas
(2) - Los Angeles (1) - 62- ROBERT MARHE ASSOCIATES)

SEARCHED
INDEXED
SERIALIZED
FILED

62- 4677- 24
LA 139-77

or the Las Vegas City Jail. He declined to relate any of the conversation with [redacted] claiming privilege. He did say he referred the caller to Attorney [redacted] in Las Vegas and that he then phoned [redacted] about the matter. He believes he talked to [redacted] regarding this a week later in person at Las Vegas while there on unrelated business.

[redacted] volunteered that he had thought the case against [redacted] involved simply a microphone installation rather than a telephone tap. He said he never did learn the disposition of the case but did hear from [redacted] that charges had been reduced and that authorities in Las Vegas had kept [redacted] equipment. He maintained he does not know DAN ROWAN. When first called from Las Vegas he thought [redacted] was referring to another ROWAN, one of the casino owners in Las Vegas and the thought struck him "Boy he must have some jicy tapes."

[redacted] said he knows ROBERT MAHUE and he admittedly sees MAHUE in Beverly Hills. He denied phoning or otherwise contacting MAHUE in Washington, D.C. or elsewhere to ask for men to perform surveillance of DAN ROWAN or for any other purpose having to do with this matter. He denied knowing any person named [redacted].

Report by SA [redacted] incorporating above to follow.
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Reporting Office | Office of Origin | Date | Investigative Period
--- | --- | --- | ---
LOS ANGELES | LAS VEGAS | 3/6/61 | 2/3 - 3/1/61

Investigative Period

Report form

UNSID, aka.

UPUC

REFERENCES:

Report SA [ ] at Miami, 1/28/61.
Report SA [ ] at Salt Lake City 2/3/61.
WFO airtel to the Bureau 1/30/61.
Salt Lake City airtel to Bureau 2/4/61.
Report SA [ ] at Miami 2/14/61.
WFO airtel to the Bureau 2/13/61.
Salt Lake City letter to the Bureau and
Los Angeles 2/13/61.
Bureau airtel to Los Angeles 2/27/61.
Las Vegas airtel to the Bureau and Los Angeles 3/1/61.
Los Angeles airtel to the Bureau and Las Vegas 3/1/61.

- P -

INFORMANTS REGARDING LISTING
OF TELEPHONE NUMBERS

Approved

Special Agent
in Charge

Do not write in spaces below

Copies made:

2 - Bureau (139-1201)
3 - Las Vegas (139-1)
3 - Los Angeles (139-7)

(1) 62-ROBERT KANE
ASSOCIATES

62-467725

SEARCHED
INDEXED
SERIALIZED
LA LIC-77

FEDERAL

AIR MARLIE

Date

2. Will interview ********* Attorney, and ********* Attorney, both having Public address at ********* telephone number ********* These interviews are for the same purpose as the interview of ********* Attorney, as set out above.

AT WOODLAND HILLS, CALIFORNIA, will consider, after determining background information, interview of ********* to determine if he has any connection in instant case. The purpose of the interview being the same as set out for interview of Attorney *********

AT TERRIT** CALIFORNIA, will also consider, after determining background information, interview of ********* to determine if he has any connection with instant case.
UNAUTHORIZED PUBLICATION AND USE OF COMMUNICATIONS

Synopsis: Telephone listing for Los Angeles number called by immediately after arrest of , Las Vegas, Nevada, set out. Telephone listings for Los Angeles numbers called by ROBERT A. MAHEU and from Miami Beach, Florida 10/11/60 to 10/30/60 set out. , Attorney, Los Angeles, California, advised on 3/1/61 that he received call from when in custody of Las Vegas authorities and as result referred to . , Attorney, Las Vegas, Nevada. denies any other knowledge of instant case, denies knowing DAN ROWAN or , but knows ROBERT MAHEU.

--- P ---
On February 10, 1961

These records are confidential and can be obtained only by a subpoena duces tecum. The subpoena should be directed to

On 2/10/61 at Los Angeles, California File # Los Angeles 139-77

by SA [Signature] Date dictated 2/10/61

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.
These records are confidential and can be obtained only through a subpoena duces tecum directed to

On 2/23/61 at Los Angeles, California File # Los Angeles 139-77

by SE [Signature] Date dictated 3/3/61

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.
Mr. [redacted], was advised that he was not required to furnish any information and any information that he did provide would be voluntarily on his part. He related the following:

His first knowledge of the microphone incident in Las Vegas, Nevada came with a telephone call to him from a man in custody at Las Vegas. He claimed inability to recall the man's name and said he never before heard of him. When given the name [redacted] acknowledged that name was probably correct, but he advised he had no knowledge of [redacted] prior to the call which came from the office of a lieutenant in either the Clark County Sheriff's Office or the Las Vegas City Jail. He declined to relate any of the conversation with [redacted], claiming privilege. He did say he referred the caller to Attorney [redacted] in Las Vegas, Nevada and that he telephoned [redacted] about the matter. He believed he talked to [redacted] regarding this a week later in person at Las Vegas while there on unrelated business.

He had thought the case against [redacted] involved simply a microphone installation rather than a telephone tap. He said he never did learn the disposition of the case but did hear from [redacted] that charges had been reduced and that authorities in Las Vegas had kept telephone equipment. He mentioned he does not know DAN ROWAN. When first called from Las Vegas, he thought [redacted] was referring to another ROWAN, one of the casino owners in Las Vegas and the thought struck him, "Boy, he must have some juicy tapes."

He said he knew ROBERT MAHEU and he admittedly sees MAHEU in Beverly Hills, California. He denied telephoning or otherwise contacting MAHEU in Washington, D.C., or elsewhere, to ask for him to perform surveillance of DAN ROWAN or for any other purpose having to do with this matter. He denied knowing any person named [redacted].

On

3/1/61 Beverly Hills, California File # Los Angeles 139-77

by

SA

[redacted] /sgt

Date dictated 3/3/61
Memorandum

TO: SAC, LOS ANGELES

FROM: SA

SUBJECT: ROBERT A. MAHEU

INFORMATION CONCERNING

DATE: 9/15/67

On 10/31/60, __________ was arrested at the Riviera Hotel, Las Vegas, Nevada. __________ admitted that he had received instructions from __________ Miami, Florida, to surveill and record telephone conversations of DAN ROWAN. ROWAN is a partner in the Rowan and Martin comedy team that was at that time appearing at the Riviera Hotel.
It is noted that [Redacted] claimed he was paid $1,000 and the man who gave him the money was [Redacted] of the New Frontier Hotel, Las Vegas, Nevada, (139-77).

There are numerous references to MAHEU in 92-113 which is [Redacted] file, all of which indicate frequent telephonic contact between [Redacted] and MAHEU.

File 62-3085 makes reference to the fact that [Redacted] was employed by ROBERT MAHEU in 1962 to do some work at the May Flower Hotel, Washington, D.C. [Redacted] is a notorious, unscrupulous electronics expert and private detective whose speciality is detecting wire taps and microphone installations. He has been employed by the LCN and other hoodlums in this capacity.

SAC letter 54-53 dated 10/5/54 advised that MAHEU, a former Special Agent, had initiated a private investigative agency which was going to do investigative work for congressional committees on a contractual basis. The Bureau requested that if any field division received any information concerning MAHEU or his organization or if any office contacted by them, the Bureau be advised. In accordance with this SAC letter, information has been furnished to the Bureau from time to time, copies of which are maintained in file 62-4677.

In June 1959 the Bureau was advised of activities by MAHEU and his investigators which included other former Special Agents of the FBI in their employ by HOWARD HUGHES to surveill certain of his girl friends. At that time one SAMUEL RAND, 28, a Hollywood bit player, was accidentally shot at the West Coast Gun Club at Corona del Mar and subsequently died. His companion at that time was [Redacted] was then under contract to HOWARD HUGHES and was reported by the LAPD Intelligence Division to be one of HUGHES' girl friends who had been under surveillance by MAHEU and his investigators. There was no reason to believe the shooting was other than accidental; however, there was no actual proof that it was an accident.
By letter dated 11/2/59, the Bureau was advised that sometime over the weekend of 10/3-4/59, the West Hollywood apartment of [_________] was burglarized and jewelry valued, according to her, at $31,530 was taken. Reportedly the only items taken was jewelry given to [_________] by HUGHES. When interviewed by agents she was uncooperative but did claim the burglary had been perpetrated at the request of HOWARD HUGHES. LAPD Intelligence officers advised they were convinced the burglary was performed by ROBERT A. MAHEU Investigators on behalf of HOWARD HUGHES.
Memorandum

TO: FILE# 
FROM: FILE REVIEW AND SUMMARY CLERK

DATE: 2/24/71

SUBJECT: ROBERT A. MAHEU, aka.
ROBERT MAHEU, BOB MAHEU
BOB MAHEW, ROBERT MAHEW,
ROBERT MAHNE, ROBERT MAYHEW,
BOB MAYHEW, ROBERT MAYHUGH,
ROBERT A. MAHEU ASSOCIATES:

The following is a summary of information obtained from a review of all references to the subject in the Los Angeles files under the name and aliases listed above. All references under the above names containing data identical or possibly identical with the subject have been included.

This summary is designated to furnish a synopsis of the information set out in each reference.

(1)
CRIMINAL SUMMARY

NAME: ROBERT A. MAHEU
Aliases: Robert Maheu, Bob Maheu, Bob Mahew, Robert Mahew, Robert Mayhew, Robert Mahue, Bob Mayhew, Robert Mayhugh

DESCRIPTION:
- Sex: Male
- Race: White
- POB: 
- DOB: age 52 in 1970
- Ht.: 
- Wt.: 
- Hair: 
- Eyes: 

RELATIVES:
- Wife: Yvette
- Children: 
- Mother: Mrs. Ephrem Maheu

RESIDENCES:
- 1961 155 S. Bristol, Brentwood, Calif.
- 1963 - 642 Toyopa Drive, Pacific Palisades, Calif.
- 1964 642 Papaya Drive, Pacific Palisades, Calif.

OCCUPATION:
- 1941 Special Agent, FBI
- 1947 Started a brokerage firm in Maine
- 1950 Joined Small Business Administration, Washington, D.C.
- 1955 Chief Executive of Hughes-Nevada Operations

ASSOCIATES:
- Samuel Giancana
Salt Lake City report by SA[ ] dated 9/9/59. TITLE: [ ], aka. et al
ANTI RACKETEERING

From Synopsis:

[ ] continues to reside at the Desert Inn Hotel, Las Vegas, Nevada, contacts set forth, no unusual activities noted. [ ] SHOULD BE CONSIDERED ARMED AND DANGEROUS BECAUSE HE HAS CARRIED A GUN IN THE PAST.

On 7/20/59 Confidential Informant [ ] of known reliability advised SA[ ] that

INFORMANT: Salt Lake City Office
Teletype from SAC, Washington Field Office to the DIRECTOR and SAC, Los Angeles, Dated 5/25/62. SUBJECT: ALLEGED DISCOVERY OF EAVESDROPPING EQUIPMENT BY INVOLVING BUREAU PERSONNEL, INFORMATION CONCERNING.

Private Detective was reportedly retained by an unidentified client to search for electronic eavesdropping equipment he believed was placed in his room. Allegedly located transmitter in clients room and determined location of monitoring equipment. Has allegedly identified two FBI agents working at the monitor. Stated that the two individuals are not former agents but presently employed at local FBI office and working part time at monitor. Does not know city involved or location of local office. Allegedly has a reputation as successful locator of wiretap equipment and is called in for this purpose by many private investigators. Was in the Mayflower Hotel, Washington D.C., March 28th last, employed by ROBERT A. MAHEU ASSOCIATION, Washington D.C., former Bureau Agent.

INFORMANT: Washington Field Office

Copy of letter from SAC, Washington Field Office to the DIRECTOR dated 12/30/59. SUBJECT: ANTI RACKETEERING. Reference is made to report of SAC at Los Angeles dated 11/30/59, requesting Washington Field Office obtain information regarding ROBERT MAYHUGH Associates.

Attention is directed to Section K of SAC letter 54-53 dated 10/5/54, concerning ROBERT MAHEU ASSOCIATES.

Washington Field Office is making no inquiries regarding MAHEU Associates in view of the above instructions.

No Documentation:
(Reviewers Note: SAC LETTER NO. 54-53 dated 10/5/54. ROBERT MAHEU is a former Special Agent who has initiated a private investigative agency in Washington D.C.)
MAHEU also has hired former SA to assist him. It is a private investigative body who are going to do investigative work for congressional committees on a contractual basis. If any information is received about this organization or any personnel of the Bureau is contacted by them, the Bureau is to be immediately advised.

Los Angeles report by SA[Name] dated 6/27/61. Title: [Name] aka. ANTI RACKETEERING

From Synopsis:

Continues to reside at[Address]. On 5/31/61 he deposited two checks in the amount of $7,271, in the Fidelity Bank, Beverly Hills, California. Checks were drawn on Cantillon and Cantillon, Trust Account, Anmanson Bank, Beverly Hills, California. An individual, answering [Description], paid a hospital bill of over $600 in cash for a singer and entertainer from Las Vegas, Nevada.

Telephone numbers charged to [Name] telephone account, telephone number [Number] from 3/15/61 to 5/20/61 reflects that on 4/29/61 a call was made to Falls Church, Virginia, [Name].

DATE FURNISHED: 5/20/61
AGENT: [Name]
INFORMANT: [Confidential]
ORIGINAL: FD 302- see serial 92-113-513

With reference to the above telephone call: [Name], Falls Church, Virginia - On April 11, 1961, [Name] furnished information that [Name] is [Name].

DATE FURNISHED: 4/11/61
AGENT: [Name]
INFORMANT: LA T-7
ORIGINAL: ORAL
Coded teletype from SAC, Las Vegas to the DIRECTOR and Los Angeles dated 7/13/61. SUBJECT: ANTI RECKETEERING.

LV 39-C* advised that was interphonic contact today with ROBERT MAHEW, former Bureau Agent, who is involved in case captioned ET AL, UPUC*. MAHEW is presently staying Bellaire (phoatic), Los Angeles. discussed with MAHEW a one six millimeter film, which identified as a bare breast show. This film had apparently been tied up in some litigation.

INFORMANT: Las Vegas Office

Los Angeles report by SA dated 8/4/61. TITLE: ANTI RACKETEERING.

From Synopsis:

ROBERT MAHEU, a private investigator in Washington D.C., telephoned him in October, 1960 requesting help from him in physical surveillance work in Las Vegas. and MAHEU each sent one man to Las Vegas.
This information was furnished by _______ during an interview by Miami agents SA _______ and SA _______ on 1/24/61.

INFORMANT: Miami Office

"During the period from October 11 to October 29, 1960, ROBERT A. MAHEU and a _______ were registered at the Kenilworth Hotel, Miami Beach, Florida, and accompanied MAHEU. MAHEU informed SAs of the FBI that _______ was _______ but refused to further identify him."

INFORMANT: Miami Office
He said that he did discuss his decision with some time prior to ordering the installation but does not recall the specific date or place where he discussed the matter with [REDACTED]. He pointed out that he does not recall whether or not this occurred during October, 1960, when they were both registered at the Kenilworth Hotel in Miami Beach, Florida. He pointed out that he had met with [REDACTED] on a number of occasions and, therefore, does not recall the specific occasion in which he discussed this decision with [REDACTED]. He does not recall what comment [REDACTED] made when informed of his decision.

"MAHEU said that he requested a Miami Beach private investigator, to institute a technical surveillance of DAN ROWAN's room at the Riviera Hotel in Las Vegas, Nevada. He said that he does not recall what his specific requests were regarding the type of installation to be used, but had left this up to [REDACTED]. He said that he was interested only in conversation within DAN ROWAN's room and had in mind the installation of a microphone and transmitter and not a telephone tap. He said, however, that he does not recall whether or not he specified not to make a telephone installation. He said that he does recall that he definitely did not request a physical surveillance of ROWAN.

"MAHEU stated that he does not know the identity of the unknown subject, also known as [REDACTED]. He said that he definitely did not contact [REDACTED] and tell [REDACTED] that he would send one of his men. He insisted that [REDACTED] furnished both men to handle this assignment in Las Vegas and that [REDACTED] had charged him for transportation and time for two men."
"MAHEU repeated that he would take full responsibility for ordering the installation, that the installation was made for the reasons he had given above and in a previous interview, and definitely was not made at the request or for the benefit of [blank] or SAMUEL GIANCANA."

DATE FURNISHED: 7/13/61
AGENT: SA
INFORMANT: Interview with ROBERT MAHEU
ORIGINAL: FD 302, see 92-113-539

TITLE: [Blank] aka. ANTI RACKETEER

From Synopsis:
[Blank] resided in Las Vegas, Nevada, during past month with the exception of two reported trips in short duration to Los Angeles, California. His contacts and associates reported.

A check of Pacific Telephone and Telegraph records reflect that the following calls were made to Falls Church, Virginia, and charged to [blank] telephone account from 5/20/61 to 8/1/61:

5/20/61 - [Blank]
6/16 & 17/61 - [Blank]
and 7/8/61 - [Blank]

DATE FURNISHED: 9/5/61
AGENT: SE
INFORMANT: [Blank]
(CONFIDENTIAL)
ORIGINAL: FD 302, see 92-113-564

Previous investigation reflects the subscriber to these numbers is ROBERT MAHEU, Falls Church, Va.
Los Angeles report by SA[ ] dated 11/22/61.
TITLE: [ ] aka. ANTI RACKETEERING

From Synopsis:

[ ] made several trips to Los Angeles in October and November. A source who has known[ ] for many years stated that, in his opinion, there is overall control and close coordination of three groups of "hoodlums," namely, the "Eastern mob," the "Chicago mob," and the "Cleveland mob," who dominate the major casinos in Las Vegas, Nevada, and that[ ] acts in the capacity of coordinator of the groups on the scene in Las Vegas, Nevada. Source stated that this was a fact but he did not know how it could be proven.

Information has previously been reported in this investigation that on September 12-15, 1961, and[ ] resided at the Beverly Crest Hotel, Beverly Hills, California, and while there were charged with telephone calls to numerous telephone numbers. These telephone numbers were listed and the identity of the subscribers set out. It is noted that is is not known whether[ ] or[ ] actually made the calls.

One of the numbers listed is[ ] subscriber is ROBERT A. MAHEU, 155 South Bristol, Brentwood, California.

DATE FURNISHED: 10/17/61
AGENT: [ ]
INFORMANT: (CONFIDENTIAL)
ORIGINAL: FD 302, see 92-113-606

Los Angeles report by SA[ ] dated 3/10/62.
TITLE: [ ] aka. ANTI RACKETEERING

From Synopsis:

Personal history and background furnished: Associates, contacts and criminal activities reported.
"Information will be set out later in this report that _______ is an acquaintance of _______. AND that in the latter part of 1960, an investigation was conducted concerning a wire tap on the phone of DAN ROWAN at the Riviera Hotel in Las Vegas in which an individual named _______ was arrested by local authorities and in which _______ was involved. _______ revealed that he was told by ROBERT MAHEU, a private detective and a friend of _______, that he, _______, was to contact a Mr. _______ at the New Frontier Hotel in Las Vegas and would pay him $1000. _______ contacted and received the $1000. _______ upon interview by Bureau Agents, denied this."

INFORMANT: Miami Office see 139-77-33

Information furnished on these pages is identical that that previously reported in 92-113-541.

Los Angeles report by SA _______ dated 3/25/63.

TITLE: _______ aka.

From Synopsis:

_______ made several trips between Las Vegas and Los Angeles in February and March, 1963. Information reported concerning his current activities, contacts, associates, legitimate enterprises and finances.

"On 3/21/63, LA T-129 furnished information that _______."

DATE FURNISHED: 3/21/63
AGENT: Not Stated
INFORMANT: LA T-129 is LA 4396-C
ORIGINAL: Tech
TITLE: [REDACTED] aka. ANTI RACKETEERING

From Synopsis:

Information reported concerning [REDACTED] current residence, birth data, activities, contacts, associates, and alleged connection with the Desert Inn Hotel.

On 5/1/63, LA T-152 advised that [REDACTED]

INFORMANT: LA T-152 is [REDACTED]

The current Los Angeles Telephone Directory reflects that telephone number [REDACTED] is listed to ROBERT A. MAHEU and Associates, 10889 Wilshire Boulevard, West Los Angeles, California.

No Documentation

TITLE: [REDACTED] aka. ANTI RACKETEERING

From Synopsis:

Information concerning [REDACTED] travels reported. [REDACTED] frequents the Friars Club in Beverly Hills. His contacts and associates set out. Results of an examination of Rosselli's bank account reported.

ROBERT A. MAHEU, 642 Toyopa Drive, Pacific Palisades, California. ROBERT A. MAHEU and Associates.

Information previously set out that on 3/21/63 [REDACTED] desired to get in touch with ROBERT MAHEU, and on 5/1/63 MAHEU called [REDACTED] at the Desert Inn Hotel in Las Vegas. [REDACTED] was not in and MAHEU left telephone number of Granite [REDACTED], in Los Angeles.

Current Los Angeles telephone directory reflect number [REDACTED] is listed to ROBERT A. MAHEU and Associates,
10889 Wilshire Boulevard, West Los Angeles, California.

Information set out previously that ROBER MAHEU who operates a private investigatative firm, is quite well acquainted with [redacted].
DATE FURNISHED: 6/19/63
AGENT: SE
INFORMANT:
ORIGINAL: FD 302, see 92-113-2252
(not to be made public except through the issuance of a subpoena duces tecum)
92-113-2249
(continued)

Foote Cone & Belding
(advertising)
247 Park Ave.,
New York City

INFORMANT: New York Office,
see serial 92-113-2378A

Hughes Tool Company
5425 Polk
Houston, Texas

INFORMANT: Houston Office
see serial 92-113-2314

Shamrock Hilton Hotel
Houston, Texas

INFORMANT: Tampa Office
serial 92-113-2332

PBX at Fontainebleau Hotel
Miami Beach, Florida

INFORMANT: Miami Office
see serial 92-113-2318

INFORMANT: Boston Office
see serial 92-113-2294
Los Angeles report by SA [Redacted] dated 8/19/63.
TITLE: [Redacted], aka. ANTI RACKETEERING

From Synopsis:

In July of 1963 [Redacted] AND [Redacted] traveled to Lake Tahoe, Nevada and then went to Las Vegas where they attended the LISTON-PATTERSON fight. [Redacted] current residents and associates reported.
"The May, 1963 issue of a magazine entitled 'Grapevine', which sets forth that it is the official publication of the Society of Former Special Agents of the FBI, Inc. on page 37 contains an article headed 'MAHEU Office Moves'. The article then states 'The Washington D.C. Office of ROBERT A. MAHEU Associates is moving to 900 17th Street, N.W., Washington 6, D.C., Suite 316 effective July 1.

'Society members ROBERT A. MAHEU and are at the Washington office of the firm which also has branches in Los Angeles and Tucson.'

"The same issue of this publication on Page 24 contains an article which reads as follows:

"[In New Home]

'...who is with ROBERT A. MAHEU Associates at the firm's Los Angeles office, is now residing at 648 Ocampo Drive, Pacific Palisades, California.'"

DATE FURNISHED: Not Stated
ORIGINAL: Not Located

"Information concerning some of the toll calls and local calls charged to the various telephone numbers subscribed to by ROBERT A. MAHEU and ROBERT A. MAHEU Associates were set out previously in this investigation.

"One of the numbers called was Telephone No. on March 16, 1963."

DATE FURNISHED: 6/19/63
AGENT: SE
INFORMANT: 
ORIGINAL: FD 302, see 92-113-2252 (CONFIDENTIAL)
Richmond letter to the SAC dated 9/27/63. SUBJECT: ANTI RACKETEEERING

This communication identifies subscribers to telephone numbers called from a telephone of ROBERT A. MAHEU and Associates, 10889 Wilshire Blvd., Los Angeles, California.

Subscriber to __________ is ___________. His employment is listed as Pump Tank Inspector, Standard Oil Company, Washington, D.C.

Subscriber to __________ is ___________. He was formerly with the FBI.

Subscriber to __________ is ___________. His employment is listed as Pump Tank Inspector, Standard Oil Company, Washington, D.C.

Subscriber to __________ is ___________. He is employed by the Small Business Administration as an administrator comptroller.

Subscriber to __________ is Captain ___________. In 1961 he was assigned to the Industrial War College as a member of the United States Navy.

Subscriber to numbers __________ and __________ is ___________. He is employed as a communications worker for the United States Government. (agency not identified)

INFORMANT: Richmond Office
Letter to SAC, Los Angeles from SAC, Washington Field Office dated 9/30/63. SUBJECT: ANTI RACKETEERING

Washington Field Office indicies further reflect that MAHEU has been interviewed on several occasions in connection with matters of security and intelligence nature in connection with the following investigations;

IS - RA - DR

MISC - INFO CONCERNING (NATIONALITIES INTELLIGENCE)

aka; RA; IS-DR

aka; RA

aka; RA - IS - DR

It is noted that a substantial part of the above investigative matters were concerned with Dominican Republic intelligence activities in the U.S. There is no indication in Washington Field Office files that MAHEU Associates were involved in an illegal fashion in connection with these activities.

INFORMANT: Washington Field Office

Los Angeles report by SA dated 10/8/63. TITLE: ANTI-RACKETEERING

From Synopsis:

Information set out concerning current address and activities, contacts and associates, finances, and legitimate businesses reported.

ROBERT A. MAHEU, 642 Topopa Drive, Pacific Palisades, California. ROBERT A. MAHEU & Associates.

Information has previously been set forth that has been in contact with ROBERT A. MAHEU on several occasions in the past. Total calls charged to MAHEU's
firm were set out. The following information pertains to the identity of the subscribers of some of these numbers:

Subscriber to is

He is an attorney in Washington, D.C.

Subscriber to is

Last employment is part owner of the, Olympia, Washington.

Subscriber to is Sahara Motor Hotel, 401 N. First Street, Phoenix, Arizona.

Subscriber to is Del Webb Corporation, Del Webb Building, 3800 N. Central Avenue, Phoenix, Arizona.

Subscriber to telephone number Main is

and Subscriber to telephone number (non-published) is a Pay Telephone at Kaufman Mobil Service Station, 4301 E. Broadway, Tucson, Arizona.

Subscriber to is

Law Firm, Humble Building, Houston, Texas. and is for

of Hughes Dynamics, 10889 Wilshire Blvd., Los Angeles, California.

All other information regarding telephone numbers and individuals reported in this report was previously reported in 92-113-2249.

INFORMANT: Above information received from Washington Field Office, Phoenix Office and Houston Office.

TITL: [redacted], aka. ANTI RACKETEERING

From Synopsis:

Information regarding [redacted] residence, activities, legitimate enterprises, and contacts and associates reported.

"ROBERT A. MAHEU
642 Papaya Drive,
Pacific Palisades, California

"On May 1, 1964, LA T-152 advised that [redacted]

INFORMANT: LA T-152 is [redacted]


TITL: [redacted], aka. ANTI RACKETEERING

From Synopsis:

Information concerning [redacted] residence, current activities, legitimate enterprises and associates reported. Review of bank accounts and telephone account set out.

On 1/24/66, LA T-8 advised that on 1/18/66 [redacted] arrived at Perino's Restaurant around 1:00 p.m. for lunch. He was with two men, one of whom was ROBERT MAHEU, whom source believes is an attorney from
Washington, D.C. Source learned from the bookkeeper at Perino's Restaurant that MAHEU has an account at Perino's under the name ROBERT A. MAHEU, Kirkeby Center, 10889 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles. Source advised that MAHEU signed for the lunch on 1/18/66, for the three men the total bill was $45.60.

"LA T-8 further advised that

DATE FURNISHED: 1/24/66
AGENT: SA
INFORMANT: LA T-8
ORIGINAL: ORAL, see

Memo from SA to the SAC dated 12/21/66. Information from Source advised that

DATE FURNISHED: 12/2/66
AGENT: SA
INFORMANT: 
ORIGINAL: ORAL, see

Log - not reviewed.

Copy of Chicago airtel to Las Vegas dated 3/16/61. SUBJECT: SAMUEL M. GIANCANA, aka. ANTI RACKETEERING

On 3/13/61 the Bureau instructed Chicago to interview ROBERT MAHEU, and DAN ROWAN to determine specifically if GIANCANA had any connection with the wire tapping of DAN ROWAN's room at the Riviera Hotel, Las Vegas.

No Documentation
Memo to the SAC from SA dated 10/8/69.
SUBJECT: Information received from Source determined

DATE FURNISHED: 9/24/69
AGENT: SA
INFORMANT: Oral, see
ORIGINAL: Oral, see

Memo to the SAC from SA dated 2/2/70.
SUBJECT: Information received On 1/26/70 source advised that

DATE FURNISHED: 1/26/70
AGENT: Probably SA
INFORMANT:
ORIGINAL: Oral,

Memo to the SAC from SA dated 6/12/70.
SUBJECT: Information received from
The 12/12/68 issue of the Las Vegas Sun newspaper reflects that ROBERT A. MAHEU, chief executive officer of the Hughes-Nevada operation, announced that pioneer Las Vegas hotel man, __________________ is now a consultant to the Hughes resort hotels.

INFORMANT: Las Vegas Office
Information furnished in this serial is identical to that previously reported in 139-77-33 and 92-113-541, page 8.

Information furnished in this serial is identical to that previously reported in 92-742-324.

Chicago report by SA [ ] dated 1/10/64.

SUBJECT: [ ]

From Synopsis:

[ ] and other individuals who have had contact with [ ] in various business and financial transactions were interviewed and furnished pertinent background information regarding [ ] and his activities.

Attorney [ ] was interviewed on 10/7/63. He represents [ ] of Omaha, Nebraska, who is the [ ] of National Title Guaranty Company.

[ ] said he met [ ] through [ ] of National Title Guaranty Company. [ ] said at the time he was a practicing attorney in Provo, Utah, representing one [ ] of Salt Lake City, Utah, who was attempting to sell several of his Idaho and Utah savings and loan companies. Through [ ] and [ ], learned that [ ] and [ ] were interested in purchasing the savings and loan companies and that they had unlimited funds.

[ ] said he contacted ROBERT MAYHEW and [ ] of the Hughes Tool Company, Westwood, California, who were also interested in buying [ ] savings and loan companies, and requested them to get some background information in regard to [ ] and [ ] was formerly employed as Hughes Tool Company and was well acquainted with MAYHEW and [ ] and thought possibly because of their various connections back in Washington, D.C., they could get some information concerning [ ] and [ ]

INFORMANT: Chicago Office
Memo from SAC, Los Angeles to SAC, Las Vegas dated 7/25/67. SUBJECT: FRONTIER HOTEL. ANTI-RACKETEERING

Source advised that

DATE FURNISHED: 6/25/67
AGENT: SA
INFORMANT: Oral
ORIGINAL: see

Los Angeles airtel to the DIRECTOR dated 6/21/67. SUBJECT: CRIMINAL INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM, LOS ANGELES DIVISION.

Source advised that

DATE FURNISHED: 6/19/67
AGENT: SA
INFORMANT: Oral
ORIGINAL: Oral
Memo to the SAC from [_____] dated 10/24/68.
Information received from [_____].

Source advised [_____].

DATE FURNISHED: Probably 10/24/68
AGENT: SA
INFORMANT: [_____]
ORIGINAL: Oral

Memo to the SAC from [_____] dated 7/17/70.
Information received from [_____].

According to source, [_____].

DATE FURNISHED: 6/29/70
AGENT: SA
INFORMANT: [_____]
ORIGINAL: Oral

Memo to the SAC from [_____] dated 8/5/70.
Information furnished by [_____].

Source called [_____].
Xerox copy of New clip from the Los Angeles Times dated 8/21/70. Article entitled "HUGHES Aide Seeks Control of Bankrupt Electronics Firm" by JOE R. NEVAREZ.

"ROBERT A. MAHEU, chief executive of HOWARD HUGHES' Nevada operations, has proposed a reorganization plan that will give him majority control of an Irvine-based electronics firm operating under Chapter XI of the Bankruptcy Act since January.

"Elpac Inc., a manufacturer of electronics components and computer sub-assemblies, said it agreed in principle this week to the proposal from MAHEU, who is acting for himself and not for the HUGHES organization.

"The MAHEU plan is based on converting most of Elpac's existing debt of about $2.8 million into equity by issuing new common stock. A note for $720,000 held by Bank of California would not be included in the exchange. The present common stock would be reduced by a 1 for 4 reverse split, with the approval of the existing shareholders. On completion of the plan, MAHEU would own about 2,103,000 shares of the new stock and the existing holders would own approximately 96,600 shares.

"MAHEU also would contribute $300,000 cash for payment of tax liabilities and other priority claims.

"The plan requires approval of the Bank of California, Elpac's debenture holders, and a majority of unsecured creditors. A hearing date has been set for Sept. 15 for confirmation and final approval of the plan by federal referee AARON PHELPS in Santa Ana."
This serial is identical to that previously reported in 94-430H-342.


HOWARD HUGHES said he has not left Nevada for good, he also declared emphatically that he has fired ROBERT MAHEU as chief of his six casinos here as well as his other Nevada operations.

There is a rummor which Mr. HUGHES has not denied and by firing Mr. MAHEU may have been confirmed. The talk is that owning Las Vegas, or a large chunk of it, hasn't turned out to be nearly as profitable as Mr. HUGHES had planned it to be.

Some people say that inviting the Mafia back into Las Vegas might not be such a bad idea. The new owners, including the HUGHES executives, have been something less than management wizards, these observers feel. Mr. HUGHES seems to have reached the same conclusion himself. His unceremonious dumping of Mr. MAHEU caught the most headlines, but in recent months the HUGHES organization also named a new director of hotel operations and new managers at two hotel-casinos. One newcomer is MOE DALITZ, former manager of the Desert Inn who was identified in the Kefauver crime hearings as a leader of a Cleveland bootlegging gang.

Others say Mr. MAHEU WAS FIRED NOT BECAUSE HE got rid of so many crooks, but because he may not have gotten rid of enough'. The Hughes Tool men who blew into town a few days ago to five Mr. MAHEU say he wasn't producing enough revenue from the casinos.

ORIGINAL: News clip

News clip from the Los Angeles Times dated 12/9/70. Artitical entitled "MAHEU CHARGES SHOW SCOPE OF HUGHES FIGHT." "Gives Court Affidavits to Bar Ouster."
"LAS VEGAS-The power struggle for Howard Hughes' Nevada empire finally reached a Las Vegas court Tuesday. Court records showed what the two sides are fighting for—and how.

"Hughes Tool Co. was attempting to oust the man who was HUGHES' top lieutenant in a Nevada operation which it was reported, grossed $500 million per year.

"But the chief aide, ROBERT A. MAHEU, refused to be fired and fought the ouster with charges that:

"HUGHES has been disabled by illness since September, 1970, and has placed his trust since in the hands of MAHEU.

"HUGHES 'left the premises or was removed' from his Desert Inn penthouse in Las Vegas Thanksgiving Eve, via an unguarded fire exit.

"Plan to Fire 155 Alleged

"Hughes Tool Co. planned to fire 155 key people in the Nevada operation after it wrested control of the empire from MAHEU.

"Hughes once wrote MAHEU of 'his purpose to make me the trustee of his stock in the Hughes Tool Co. itself'—which would have made MAHEU master of virtually the entire HUGHES fortune."

Since HUGHES disappearance Hughes Tool Company executives have been striving to gain control of his holdings in Nevada.

MAHEU's attorney cast suspicion on the document that was the basis of MAHEU's discharge—a proxy giving Hughes Tool Company officials CHESTER C. DAVIS, , and FRANK WILLIAM (BILL) GAY the power to vote Hughes' tool company stock and assume authority over the Nevada properties.

Attorney MORTON GALANE said MAHEU had sent a copy of the proxy to Washington handwriting expert CHARLES APPEL and offered U.S. District Judge HOWARD W. BABCOCK
Affidavits filed in connection with the legal actions contained many insights into the struggle for control of the $300 million Nevada empire.

Perhaps the most interesting was MAHEU's contention that prior to March of 1967, HUGHS said he would make MAHEU "trustee of his stock in the Hughes Tool Company".

It appears that Mr. HUGHES disappeared on 11/25/70 from the Desert Inn Hotel penthouse.

MAHEU stated that "Commencing on or about Sept. 1, 1970, HOWARD R. HUGHES, by reason of illness and disability, has not exercised his control over the operation of the properties."

MAHEU said the HUGHES operation included 8,000 employees, with a 1969-70 payroll of $50 million and a gross "handle" of approximately $500 million.

Original: News clip

News clip from the Herald Examinerr dated 12/9/70. Article entitled "Battle Over Signature in Hughes Case."

Attorney, MORTON GALANE, representing ROBERT MAHEU, HUGHES' right-hand man in his Nevada enterprise who was fired by the Hughes Tool Company last Saturday was expected to try again to hand the judge an opinion by a Washington handwriting expert as to the authenticity of a signature on a document supposedly written to MAHEU by HOWARD HUGHES.

MAHEU obtained a temporary restraining order to prevent his firing and the Hughes Tool takeover on the strength of another document supposedly written by HUGHES.

Clark County District Attorney GEORGE FRANKLIN told The Herald-Examiner that he asked handwriting expert RALPH BRADFORD to examine the Hughes Tool Company proxy and the signature of the billionaire earlier this week.
'Because allegations were raised by MAHEU that HUGHES had been kidnaped, or a crime had been committed, it was my duty to establish the truth of this document,' FRANKLIN said.

"The hearing before Judge BABCOCK is on a motion by the Hughes Tool Co. to quash a temporary restraining order obtained by MAHEU which keeps anyone from taking over his operations.

"MAHEU, who holds a Nevada gambling license, based his request for the order on grounds that the tool company group from out-of-town does not hold individual licenses issued by the state to conduct gambling, and this might endanger the casino licenses."

ORIGINAL: News Clip

News clip and photograph from the Los Angeles Times dated 12/10/70. Article entitled "EX-SPY, FBI MAN ROBERT MAHEU Able Opponent in Hughes Row", by DICK MAIN. Photograph of ROBERT MAHEU, captioned KEY FIGURE-ROBERT MAHEU, center of battle for Nevada holdings of HOWARD HUGHES."

"ROBERT A. MAHEU, controversial front man in billionaire HOWARD HUGHES' Nevada operations, is among other things, a balding grandfather, active in Boy Scout work, a lawyer, businessman and a lgy church leader.

"But he also has played other roles which would rival that of the central character of the wildest spy or mystery thriller on the newstand or television series.

"A onetime FBI agent, he served in World War II as a counter-espionage agent who posed as a French-speaking black market operator, supplying German spies with ladies' hosiery and false secrets.

"K eeps in Top Shape

"At 52, he helps keep himself in tiptop physical shape in rigorous tennis matches and is responsible for building championship courts and promoting matches by top players in Las Vegas."
"He holds one of the best FBI pistol marksmanship records on the bureau's books, yet he has been quoted as saying he seldom needed to carry a gun.

"He's able to handle most physical situations with his own hands," a Las Vegas acquaintance said. 'Just ask the burglar he caught in his house a few years ago.'

"The burglar, he added, not only was taken into custody by MAHEU but he also was 'pulverized.'

"MAHEU also is active in the Roman Catholic Church and is a director of the American Foundation for Ecumenical Research Studies, a national all-faith church group.

"When he joined the HUGHES organization in 1955 as a consultant, MAHEU already had a background to fit him for almost any role HUGHES might assign him.

"'The Hughes group couldn't have done better if they had gone to Central Casting,' a Las Vegas friend said.

"MAHEU was superbly qualified to perform any role—from trickshot artist to corporation lawyer—called for in the often unique demands made upon its employes by the Hughes organization.

"Joined FBI in 1941

"A graduate of Holy Cross College in Worcester, Mass., and Georgetown law school, he joined the FBI as a special agent in 1941.

"After the Pearl Harbor attack, he was credited with establishing an intelligence network in the Pacific Northwest.

"In 1943, he went to Washington for special undercover work and later was in charge of a squad of agents involved in major espionage and intelligence cases.

"As a 'French Canadáén black market operator,' he supplied German agents with false reports that the allies planned to invade France in its southern provinces instead of Normandy."
"In 1947, he left the FBI, started a brokerage firm in Maine and in 1950 returned to Washington and joined the Small Business Administration. Later, he formed a management, engineering and public relations consulting firm.

"With the Hughes organization, he came to the West Coast and for a time lived in Pacific Palisades.

"About four years ago, he was tapped to launch Hughes' multi-million-dollar casino and land acquisition program in Nevada.

"Typically, he reverted to a 'cover' pose-as ROBERT MURPHY, a guest at the Desert Inn. There he laid the groundwork for buying the property and preparing the penthouse for occupancy by his employer.

"Later, he became an active civic leader in Las Vegas and the spokesmen and physical representative in public for HUGHES.

"He and his wife, YVETTE, have four children, [fill in names]."

ORIGINAL: News Clip

Article entitled "Hughes Sends Evidence; Bitter At Long Fight," by CLIFF BLACKBURN, L.A. TIMES dated 12/10/70.

Las Vegas-Mystery billionaire HOWARD HUGHES, declared to be in perfect health by a physician in the Bahamas, today sent a document to HUGHES TOOL Company officials here ordering an immediate audit of all financial activities of ousted Nevada aide ROBERT A. MAHEU.

The Herald-Examiner learned exclusively that a three-page document from Hughes, containing his signature, fingerprints and a complete medical report, arrived here today by courier plane.

HUGHES orders are to proceed immediately with a close scrutiny of MAHEU's stewardship of the last four years of the recluse's $300 million Nevada empire.
MAHEU and his chief of security JACK HOOPER were fired by Hughes Tool executive CHESTER DAVIS; after he presented them with a power of attorney he said was signed by HUGHES.

MAHEU has contended that he doubts the authenticity of the proxy and its signature, and has refused to turn over the HUGHES property.

ORIGINAL: News Clip

News clip from the Los Angeles Times entitled "Mystery Witness Reportedly Saw Hughes Leave Desert Inn," by DIAL TORGERSON.

"LAS VEGAS-A mystery witness is waiting to testify that he saw HOWARD HUGHES leave the Desert Inn last Thanksgiving Eve."

HUGHES has not been seen in public since he arrived in Las Vegas on Thanksgiving Day, 1966. MAHEU's attorney is waging a court battle to keep ROBERT A. MAHEU from being ousted as HUGHES' Las Vegas lieutenant. They say HUGHES was "spirited away" from under the protection of MAHEU's security guards by men from International Intelligence, Inc., employed by Hughes Tool Company.

MORTON GALANE, MAHEU's attorney, said they have an eye witness to the removal of HOWARD HUGHES from the Desert Inn Hotel.

"Time magazine said it had learned that HUGHES became suspicious of some of his Nevada employes after learning that federal agents were investigating reports of corruption in his operations, including 'kickbacks' reportedly paid HUGHES staffers by persons selling land to the HUGHES organization and by entertainers appearing at HUGHES' hotels."

ORIGINAL: News Clip

Article entitled "Hughes Land Deals Irk Local Real Estate Men". There is little doubt that HOWARD HUGHES is the undisputed land baron of Southern Nevada. The operational methods used by the Hughes real estate arm, headed by HERB NALL, has infuriated a number of local real estate agents.

"Only one broker, DOUG DeSURE, doesn't care if he is quoted on some of his dealings with the Hughes people, and some of these transactions predated the arrival of HUGHES where BOB MAHEU was living at the Desert Inn under the alias of BOB MURPHY."

ORIGINAL: Publication

Copy of Salt Lake City air tel to the DIRECTOR dated 2/7/61. SUBJECT: UNSUB, aka UPUC

Los Angeles requested to interview and ascertain his interest in subject, and why he called Attorney of Las Vegas, Nevada, to represent. Determine if was the attorney who called ROBERT MAHEU in Washington, D. C. to furnish the two men for the job in Las Vegas of technical surveillance on DAN ROWAN. Attempt to ascertain identity of Uns

"Washington Field note results of interview with , set forth in reports of SA , dated 12/23/60 and 1/28/61 at Miami reflect claims ROBERT MAHEU made second call to send only one man to Las Vegas. Results of interview with MAHEU set forth in report of , dated 1/12/61, reflects MAHEU denies making the second call to relative to the second man. Thus, it appears MAHEU or being untruthful. Washington Field, in your reinterview with MAHEU, again ask MAHEU about the second call, attempt to ascertain if he in fact did make the call as claimed by ."
Salt Lake City enclosed a copy of a Washington Field Office airtel to the Director dated 1/30/61. (see serial 11). SUBJECT:

"ROBERT MAHEU, MAHEU and KING ASSOCIATES, INC., 1125 19th St., N.W., advised 1/19/61 he would attempt to secure permission from the attorney in Los Angeles to furnish his name to the FBI for interview. On 1/27/61, efforts were made to contact MAHEU and as he was not in his office, word was left to have him contact WFO.

"On 1/30/61, ROBERT MAHEU telephonically contacted WFO and advised he had been in touch with the attorney in Los Angeles by phone but attorney did not desire to have his name furnished to the FBI. MAHEU advised he is leaving on 1/30/61 to go to Los Angeles and while there will talk further with the attorney in an attempt to secure permission to furnish his name to the Bureau. It was suggested to MAHEU that upon receipt of this permission, that MAHEU contact the Los Angeles Office but he stated he is returning to WDC within a few days and will furnish the information upon his return. He stated in the event he is delayed in returning to WDC, he will telephonically contact WFO from Los Angeles. MAHEU stated he 'is in the middle on this thing' as he is 'the only person who knows the attorney's name'. He stated he will make every effort to secure the permission of the attorney to divulge his name and furnish it to WFO."

INFORMANT: Salt Lake City Office

Los Angeles report by SA [redacted] dated 1/6/61. TITLE: [redacted]; UNSUB, aka. UPUC

From Synopsis:

Telephone listing for Los Angeles number called by [redacted] immediately after arrest of [redacted], Los Angeles, Nevada, set out. Telephone listings for Los Angeles numbers called by ROBERT A. MAHEU and [redacted] from Miami Beach, Florida 10/11/60 to 10/30/60 set out. [redacted] Los Angeles attorney
139-77-24 (continued)

p. 2

denies knowing DAN ROWAN OR [REDACTED], but knows ROBERT MAHEU.

Telephone number Crestview 1-8770 was listed to ROBERT A. MAHEU, 1510 Gilcrest Drive, Beverly Hills, California.

DATE FURNISHED: 2/10/61
AGENT: SA
INFORMANT: [CONFIDENTIAL]
ORIGINAL: FD 302, see serial 139-77-20

p. 3
Los Angeles airtel to the DIRECTOR dated 1/29/69.

SUBJECT: _____________, aka; ET AL ITAR-GAMBLING; ETC

For the information of the Bureau, on 12/2/68; La Cosa Nostra member and hoodlum______________, former hotel operator, Las Vegas, Nevada; ________________, former hotel operator Las Vegas, Nevada; Los Angeles bookmaker__________, and political fixer______________, after a six month trial, Los Angeles, were found guilty of ITAR-Gambling, Conspiracy and ITSP for their participation in the Friars Club ITAR-Gambling trial. All defendants tried and in addition, ________________, who pled guilty, were found guilty on every count of the indictment which went to the jury, which counts totaled 49.

Some of the letters that were written on behalf of the defendants attesting to their fine character, honesty, standing in the community; etc., were written by various prominent individuals who may be of par-
ticuliar interest to the Bureau. One of these is ROBERT A. MAHEU, Executive for HOWARD HUGHES.

A letter was written to Judge Gray, dated 1/13/69, from ROBERT A. MAHEU, Chief Executive, Hughes-Nevada Operations, in behalf of [underline].

DATE FURNISHED: 3/13/69 (block stamp date)
AGENT: Not Stated
INFORMANT: Not Stated
ORIGINAL: Xerox Copy of Letter filed in 166-1048H-60
TO: CHIEF CLERK

Subject: Robert A. Maken

Aliases

Address

Birth Date Birthplace Race Sex
[ ] Male [ ] Female

Exact Spelling [ ] Main Criminal Case Files Only [ ] Restrict to Locality of

[ ] All References [ ] Main Criminal References Only

[ ] Main Subversive Case Files Only [ ] Main Subversive (If no Main, list all Subversive References)

[ ] Subversive References Only [ ] Main Criminal (If no Main, list all Criminal References)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File &amp; Serial Number</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>File &amp; Serial Number</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>94-1304-39</td>
<td></td>
<td>94-1304-39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94-1304-359</td>
<td></td>
<td>92-903-293</td>
<td>C E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92-113-2521</td>
<td>099</td>
<td>92-113-235084</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92-113-2889</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>92-113-2305</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92-113-2347</td>
<td>C 2347</td>
<td>92-113-2287</td>
<td>C 2287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92-113-2249</td>
<td>C 2249</td>
<td>92-113-2201</td>
<td>P 113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92-113-108</td>
<td>P5</td>
<td>94-1300-13</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139-77-24</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>166-1040</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166-1040-113802</td>
<td>C 113802</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Requested by: [ ] Squad [ ] Extension [ ] File No.

Search by 

Consolidated by: (date) b6 b7C

Reviewed by: (date) 2/24/71

File Review Symbols

I - Identical P - Not identifiable
NI - Not identical U - Unavailable reference GPO 875-388
TO: CHIEF CLERK

Subject

Aliases

Address

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Birth Date</th>
<th>Birthplace</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exact Spelling</th>
<th>Main Criminal Case Files Only</th>
<th>Restrict to Locality of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All References</td>
<td>Criminal References Only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Subversive Case Files Only</td>
<td>Main Subversive (If no Main, list all Subversive References)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subversive References Only</td>
<td>Main Criminal (If no Main, list all Criminal References)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File &amp; Serial Number</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robert A. Mathew (cont)</td>
<td>62-4677F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert A. Mathew associated</td>
<td>67-4677F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66-1706-162C</td>
<td>92-113-2841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92-113-2287P2F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66-1706-162C</td>
<td>66-172-263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92-113-217F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Mathew</td>
<td>92-743-315F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92-1112-1637F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92-1112-263F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92-1138-51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Requested by        Squad Extension File No.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search by</th>
<th>(date)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consolidated by</td>
<td>(date)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed by</td>
<td>(date)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

File Review Symbols

I - Identical        ? - Not identifiable
NI - Not identical   U - Unavailable reference  GPO 875-368
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exact Spelling</th>
<th>Main Criminal Case Files Only</th>
<th>Restrict to Locality of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All References</td>
<td>Main Criminal References Only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Subversive Case Files Only</td>
<td>Main Subversive References Only</td>
<td>Main Subversive (If no Main, list all Subversive References)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subversive References Only</td>
<td>Main Criminal (If no Main, list all Criminal References)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File &amp; Serial Number</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>File &amp; Serial Number</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>92-1112-14</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>92-113-711</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92-113-565</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>92-113-541</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92-135-58</td>
<td></td>
<td>94-430-1861</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94-430-1841</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>94-430-1754</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134-27-11</td>
<td></td>
<td>134-24-35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Requested by

Squad

Extension

File No.

Search by

(date)

Consolidated by

(date)

Reviewed by

(date)

File Review Symbols

I - Identical
NI - Not Identical
? - Not identifiable
U - Unavailable reference

GP 875-388
TO: CHIEF CLERK

Subject

Aliases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Birth Date</th>
<th>Birthplace</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- Exact Spelling
- All References
- Main Criminal Case Files Only
- Criminal References Only
- Main Subversive Case Files Only
- Main Subversive (If no Main, list all Subversive References)
- Subversive References Only
- Main Criminal (If no Main, list all Criminal References)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File &amp; Serial Number</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>File &amp; Serial Number</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>92-1269-1150</td>
<td>F C</td>
<td>92-11321213</td>
<td>F C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92-113508</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>26-8712*</td>
<td>Destroyed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92-712295P3</td>
<td>F C</td>
<td>92-11521307</td>
<td>F C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92-712279P4</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>92-119315</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92-113213</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>92-11521307</td>
<td>F C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Requested by Squad Extension File No.

Search by (date)

Consolidated by (date)

Reviewed by (date)

File Review Symbols

I - Identical
NI - Not Identical
? - Not identifiable
U - Unavailable reference

GP-0 875-388
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
FOI/PA
DELETED PAGE INFORMATION SHEET
FOI/PA# 1401918-0

Total Deleted Page(s) = 5
Page 13 ~ Duplicate;
Page 15 ~ Duplicate;
Page 20 ~ Duplicate;
Page 21 ~ Duplicate;
Page 23 ~ Duplicate;

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
X Deleted Page(s) X
X No Duplication Fee X
X For this Page X
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
DIRECTOR, FBI
(ATTN: FBI LABORATORY)

SAC, LAS VEGAS (62-NEW)

ROBERT A. MAHEU
MISCELLANEOUS INFORMATION
CONCERNING

Enclosed herewith for the Laboratory are ten legal size sheets of paper bearing various handwriting.

Enclosed handwriting exemplars are from ____________ and ROBERT A. MAHEU, and were given in connection with the prosecution of MAHEU and [_____] regarding the stock manipulation in the purchase of Hughes Air West.

USA LAWRENCE J. SEMENZA advised that these handwriting exemplars were given in connection with this suit, and will probably become evidence in a perjury investigation in connection with that case. He said the exemplars have to be returned to the individuals who gave them. However, prior to the returning of these exemplars, he wishes that they be photographed by the FBI Laboratory so that they may be used in a handwriting comparison and this handwriting will be furnished by him at a later date.

The Laboratory is requested to photograph and examine the enclosed exemplars for future possible use in connection with a Bureau investigation and to immediately return the original to the Las Vegas Office so that they may be returned to the USA’s Office.

62-939-1

2 - Bureau (Enc. 10)
3 - Las Vegas
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Date Filed</th>
<th>Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10/17 72</td>
<td>With honor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FD-340a (Rev. 3-12-74)
File No. 62-939-118
Date 10-12-77
From USA
ADDRESS OF CONTRIBUTOR: 601 Nevada, Min.

To Be Returned Yes Receipt Given No

Description: 2 sheets of paper w/vision hand writing
206-502-5593
8:00 ETA
9:00 Apt
Seattle
Seatack
Has ground transportation

702-735-9182
Seattle - ALW
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
15^7 & 13,400 \\
16^3 & 500 \\
16^5 & 200 \\
17^2 & 700 \\
17^3 & 8220 \\
17^4 & 2100 \{800 \text{ earlier} \} \{1820 \text{ later} \} \\
\hline
19,100 & 57,276.02 \text{ total} \\
\end{array}
\]
FRONTIER HOTEL
LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89109 • PHONE 702-734-0110

17,600 - 17" @ 8:20 no up-side
(11:20)

22,000 800
17^3
17^4

34
B. B. W.
17^3 - 2,200
17^4 800

16 6 @ 9:05
(12:05)

40,500 800
15^6
15^7
Close 9:20
To: SAC, Las Vegas (62-New)  
May 16, 1977

FBI FILE NO.  
ROBERT A. MAHEU;
LAB. NO. D-770506032 NL

Re: MISCELLANEOUS INFORMATION
CONCERNING

Specimens received  
4/29/77

K1 Five handwriting samples of [REDACTED]
K2 Five handwriting samples of ROBERT A. MAHEU

Remarks:

The submitted evidence, which was photographed, is returned herewith.
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20535

To: SAC, Las Vegas (62-New)

From: Director, FBI

ROBERT A. MAHEU;

Re: MISCELLANEOUS INFORMATION
CONCERNING

May 16, 1977

Examination requested by: Las Vegas

Reference: Letter 4/25/77

Examination requested: Document

Remarks:

Enclosures (4) (K1, K2, 2 Lab report)

2 - Las Vegas - Enclosures (2) (2 Lab report)

Enclosures to

ADMINISTRATIVE PAGE
Memorandum

TO: SAC, LAS VEGAS (62-939)  
DATE: 6/10/77

FROM: SA

SUBJECT: ROBERT A. MAHEU;
MISCELLANEOUS INFORMATION CONCERNING

On 4/25/77, USA LAWRENCE J. SEMENZA advised that there was a possible perjury case being prepared against the above captioned subjects and provided some handwriting exemplars of the subjects that will be used in this case. He said in view of the fact that he had to return them to the subjects, he desired that they be photographed by the Laboratory for future use in this case. These exemplars have been photographed by the Laboratory and returned to the Las Vegas Office. The exemplars have been returned by the Las Vegas Office to USA SEMENZA.

In view of the fact that there is no further investigation at this time, it is recommended that this matter be closed.

Buy U.S. Savings Bonds Regularly on the Payroll Savings Plan
10/12/77

TO: DIRECTOR, FBI
     (ATTN: FBI LABORATORY)

FROM: SAC, LAS VEGAS (62-939) (P)

SUBJECT: ROBERT A. MAHEU
          MISCELLANEOUS INFORMATION
          CONCERNING (B)

Re Las Vegas letter to Bureau, 4/25/77, and FBI Laboratory report dated 5/16/77, Laboratory number D-770506032 NL.

Enclosed for the FBI Laboratory is one sheet of paper with the Frontier Hotel letterhead and a plain 5 x 8 sheet of paper both containing writing.

Referenced Las Vegas letter requested FBI Laboratory to photograph handwriting exemplars provided by and ROBERT A. MAHEU for possible future comparison with additional evidence.

On 10/12/77, U.S. Attorney LAWRENCE J. SEMENZA made available the enclosed documents for comparison with the handwriting samples of and MAHEU. Mr. SEMENZA advised that he feels that the writing on the enclosed documents is that of and requests that an examination of the documents be made to determine if such is the case. Mr. SEMENZA also requested a comparison be made with the samples submitted by MAHEU.

2 - Bureau (Enc. 2)
1 - Las Vegas
HJO: dsc dsc
(3)
Report of the

FBI Laboratory

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20535

To: SAC, Las Vegas (62-939)

November 9, 1977

FBI FILE NO. 62-117596

LAB. NO. 71018113 D IK

SAC, Las Vegas (62-939)

November 9, 1977

FBI FILE NO. 62-117596

LAB. NO. 71018113 D IK

Specimens received 10/17/77

Q1 Sheet of paper bearing handwriting and numbers beginning ...

Q2 Sheet of Frontier Hotel stationery bearing handwriting, handwriting and numbers beginning "1 MC 18 ..."

Result of examination:

It was determined that the handwriting on specimen Q2 was not prepared by ROBERT A. MAHEU, the writer of specimen K2.

Because of the presence of some discrepancies in the known and questioned writings and the possibility of those divergent characteristics being attributable to deliberate distortion, the writer of specimen K1, could not be definitely established as the writer of specimen Q2. However, significant characteristics, noted as a result of comparing those writings, indicate that should not be eliminated as a suspect in the preparation of specimen Q2.

Because of the lack of sufficient comparable writing for a satisfactory examination, no conclusion was reached as a result of such examination as could be made of the writings on specimen Q1 with the known writings of MAHEU and.

Page 1 (over)
However, differences, noted as a result of such examination as could be made, indicate that the writings on specimen Q1 probably were not prepared by MAHEU.

Specimens Q1 and Q2 are returned herewith. Photographs have been retained.
To: SAC, Las Vegas (62-939)

From: Director, FBI

November 9, 1977

FBI FILE NO. 62-117596

LAB. NO. 71018113 D IK

Re: ROBERT A. MAHEU;
MISCELLANEOUS INFORMATION
CONCERNING (B)

Examination requested by: Las Vegas

Reference: AirTel 10/12/77

Examination requested: Document

Remarks:

Enclosures (4) (2 Lab report, Q1, Q2)
Mr. Lawrence J. Semenza  
United States Attorney  
District of Nevada  
Federal Office Building, Room 4-634  
300 Las Vegas Boulevard South  
Las Vegas, NV 89101  

Re: ROBERT A. MAHEU

Dear Mr. Semenza:

Reference is made to your request of October 12, 1977 for handwriting comparison to be made with the handwriting of samples of Davis and Maheu with handwriting contained on a sheet of paper bearing the Frontier Hotel letterhead and a plain 5" x 8" sheet of paper. Enclosed for your information is a copy of the report of the FBI Laboratory concerning your request.

The original of the Laboratory Report will be maintained in the file in this office. The handwriting samples you provided on October 12, 1977 will also be maintained in the file.

If further information comes to your attention which would cause a need for additional examination to be made of this evidence, it is suggested that more extensive handwriting exemplars of be obtained so that a sufficient amount of comparable handwriting would be available to the FBI Laboratory.

This letter confirms a conversation between you and Special Agent on November 22, 1977. No further investigation is contemplated by this office at this time.

Very truly yours,

JAMES M. POWERS  
Special Agent in Charge
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