

which she gave him. He drank the water, and he then grabbed her around the neck, choked her, and beat her in the face and removed a \$10 bill from her pocket and about \$20 from her purse.

The then 20-year-old criminal admitted his guilt in this case, and was indicted by the grand jury on this case and three other cases involving housebreakings, robberies, and assaults. In February 1959, he was sentenced to serve 18 to 54 months.

Three and one-half years later, in late August 1962, this individual was released from prison. On September 9, 1962, he committed another housebreaking and robbery, following his adopted modus operandi. In this case the complainant, an 82-year-old woman, reported that about 4 o'clock in the afternoon she answered a knock on her door. A Negro man asked her if she knew a man, whose name he mentioned, but the complainant could not remember it. The man then pushed the complainant against the wall and stated "all I want is your money, don't get excited, I'm not going to hurt you." The criminal took a box holding five church envelopes, each containing about \$3; and then went into the living room where he took a black leather identification folder containing papers, and a change purse containing about \$1.

In this particular case, we were fortunate enough to find and identify a palm print obtained at the scene of the crime. The subject was arrested and charged, even though he denied the offense. In October 1962 he was indicted by the grand jury on the charge, but, because of the subsequent death of the complainant from natural causes, the indictment was dismissed, on motion of the government, in January 1963.

By May 1963, he had resumed his criminal activities. On May 13, 1963, we received a report of a housebreaking and robbery offense against a 71-year-old woman; on May 20, 1963, we received a similar report involving a 63-year-old woman; on May 29, 1963 we received a report of assault (with apparent intent to rob) from a 67-year-old female complainant.

The modus operandi and general physical description in these cases clearly indicated to us that the previously described criminal could be responsible for these housebreakings, assaults, and robberies. But we were unable to find fingerprints or other scientific evidence at the scenes of these crimes. I might interject that our "uneducated" subject had learned well the crime lesson of his arrest on fingerprint evidence; one of his new victims reported his wearing gloves (in May) and another his wiping his fingerprints from all articles he handled. The photograph of this suspect was shown to each victim and to whatever witnesses were available in the several cases, and the witnesses and one victim seemed to think that he was the assailant involved, but none could make a positive identification. These several tentative identifications, in addition to the modus operandi, seemed to us to provide probable cause for arrest of this criminal, and we discussed with an assistant U.S. attorney the issuance of a warrant for his arrest; however, because not one of the witnesses was able to make a positive identification which would be adequate for a conviction, our request for a warrant was refused.

As we were, therefore, unable to issue a lookout to the force authorizing the arrest of this individual, we followed what we considered to be the next best course open to us and issued to the force a confidential