

## Exhibit 20:

The following 1 page is submitted as an Exhibit for 'Plaintiff's Memo, Presenting Details of his Complaint'.

**Description of Exhibit Contents:**

*This is Plaintiff's Appeal (dated November 2, 2012) to the Response by Defendant FAA for FOIA #2012-7031. It consists of a 1-page letter. The letter identifies the absurdity of Defendant FAA's marking many redactions as 'non-responsive', when they were precisely what Plaintiff had requested. The letter also challenged the excessive use of FOIA Exemption #6.*

28242 S. Salo Rd., Mulino, OR 97042

tel. (971) 295-7669

Friday, November 2, 2012

Federal Aviation Administration  
AFN-1, Asst. Administrator for Finance and Management  
800 Independence Avenue SW  
Washington, DC 20591

Dear Sir or Madam,

Please accept this letter as an **Appeal requesting reconsideration** of the Agency response to my FOIA request 2012-7031. I made the original FOIA request on 7/23/12. The first part of the FOIA response provided 9-pages of heavily redacted records and was received 9/4/12, signed by David Suomi. A second part of the FOIA response was received on 9/29/12 (2-pgs, with illegible signature for Suomi). A third part was received on 10/22/12, also signed by (illegible) for Mr. Suomi. This appeal is filed timely based on agency production of all partial responses.

FOIA Exemption #6 was liberally and excessively applied.<sup>1</sup> Furthermore, memos by President Obama, Attorney General Holder, and DoT FOIA Officer Rosalind Knapp all clearly define the need for release of these records.

***For this Appeal, I ask that you immediately produce unredacted copies of all records as specified in my original FOIA request. This would include the entire 86-page ROI,<sup>2</sup> as well as copies of the Management Investigation, the memo requesting the Security Investigation, the suspension proposal draft, and the final suspension letter.***

Please fully comply with all FOIA timelines. I await your response.

Sincerely,



Jeff Lewis

<sup>1</sup> In the first response portion, redactions were liberally applied with a label reading "not responsive to request". The original request asked for the entire disciplinary letters (draft and final versions), so it makes no sense that content in these letters is redacted as 'not responsive'.

<sup>2</sup> It is understood that this particular ROI was produced in response to alleged misconducts by an unnamed employee, during a time period when FAA/NATCA relations were extremely strained (as identified at the bottom of page three of the 6/5/07 final discipline letter). I wish to know the allegations, as they will shed light on the handling of my own personnel case, for which a 94-page ROI was produced during the same stressful period.