UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIRST CIRCUIT

APPLICATION FOR LEAVE TO FILE A SECOND OR
SUCCESSIVE MOTION TO VACATE, SET ASIDE
OR CORRECT SENTENCE
28 U.S.C. § 2255
BY A PRISONER IN FEDERAL CUSTODY

ALFRED W. TRENKLER
Name

19377-038
Prisoner Number

USP ALLENWOOD
Place of Confinement

INSTRUCTIONS-READ CAREFULLY

(1) This application must be legibly handwritten or typewritten and signed by the applicant under penalty of perjury. Any false statement of a material fact may serve as the basis for prosecution and conviction for perjury.

(2) All questions must be answered concisely in the proper space on the form.

(3) The Judicial Conference of the United States has adopted the 8 1/2 x 11 inch paper size for use throughout the federal judiciary and directed the elimination of the use of legal size paper. All pleadings **must** be on 8 1/2 x 11 inch paper; otherwise we cannot accept them.

(4) All applicants seeking leave to file a second or successive petition are required to use this form, except in capital (death penalty) cases. In capital cases only, the use of this form is optional.

(5) Additional pages are not permitted except with respect to additional grounds for relief and facts which you rely upon to support those grounds. You submit separate petitions, motions, briefs, arguments, etc., that support your application.

(6) In accordance with the "Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996," as codified at 28 U.S.C. § 2255(b), effective April 24, 1996, before leave to file a second or successive motion can be granted by the United

States Court of Appeals, it is the applicant's burden to make a prima facie showing that he satisfies either of the two conditions stated below.

> A second or successive motion must be certified as provided in [28 U.S.C.] section 2255 by a panel of the appropriate court of appeals to contain--
>
> > (1) newly discovered evidence that, if proven and viewed in light of the evidence as a whole, would be sufficient to establish by clear and convincing evidence that no reasonable factfinder would have found the movant guilty of the offense; or
> >
> > (2) a new rule of constitutional law, made retroactive to cases on collateral review by the Supreme Court, that was previously unavailable.

(7) When this application is fully completed, the original and four copies must be mailed to:

Clerk of Court
United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit
John Joseph Moakley Courthouse
1 Courthouse Way, Suite #2500
Boston, Massachusetts 02210

(Rev. 11/02)

APPLICATION

1. (a) State and division of the United States District Court which entered the judgment of conviction under attack
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS
(b) Case Number CR-92-10369

2. Date of judgment of conviction MARCH 8, 1994

3. Length of sentence LIFE Sentencing Judge RYA ZOBEL

4. Nature of offense or offenses for which you were convicted: 18 U.S.C. 371
5. CONSPIRACY, 18 U.S.C. 844(d) RECEIPT OF EXPLOSIVES, 18 U.S.C. 844(i) ATTEMPT TO DAMAGE OR DESTROY A MOTOR VEHICLE

5. Related to this conviction and sentence, have you ever filed a motion to vacate in any federal court?
Yes (X) No ( ) If "yes", how many times? ONCE (if more than one, complete 6 and 7 below as necessary)

(a) Name of court UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, DISTRICT OF MASS.
(b) Case number 99-CV-10074-RWZ
(c) Nature of proceeding 28 U.S.C 2255

(d) Grounds raised (list all grounds; use extra pages if necessary) INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL BY NOT ATTEMPTING TO INTRODUCE DR. PHILIPS TESTIMONY CONCERNING CODEFENDANT SHAY'S PROPENSITY FOR LYING.

(e) Did you receive an evidentiary hearing on your motion? Yes ( ) No (X)
(f) Result MOTION DENIED

(g) Date of result

6. As to any second federal motion, give the same information:
(a) Name of court
(b) Case number
(c) Nature of proceeding

(d) Grounds raised (list all grounds; use extra pages if necessary): _____

(e) Did you receive an evidentiary hearing on your motion? Yes ( ) No ( )

(f) Result _____

(g) Date of result _____

7. As to any third federal motion, give the same information:

(a) Name of court _____

(b) Case number _____

(c) Nature of proceeding _____

(d) Grounds raised (list all grounds; use extra pages if necessary) _____

(e) Did you receive an evidentiary hearing on your motion? Yes ( ) No ( )

(f) Result _____

(g) Date of result _____

8. Did you appeal the result of any action taken on your federal motion? (Use extra pages to reflect additional petitions if necessary)

(1) First motion	No ( ) Yes (X)	Appeal No. 00-1657
(2) Second motion	No ( ) Yes ( )	Appeal No. _____
(3) Third motion	No ( ) Yes ( )	Appeal No. _____

9. If you did not appeal from the adverse action on any motion, explain briefly why you did not: _____

10. State concisely every ground on which you now claim that you are being held unlawfully. Summarize briefly the facts supporting each ground.

(a) Ground one: CODEFENDANT SHAY NOW STATES THAT TRENKLER IS INNOCENT, THAT SHAY'S FATHER WAS RESPONSIBLE FOR BOMB

Supporting FACTS (tell your story briefly without citing cases or law): SHAY GAVE TWO HOUR INTERVIEW EXPLAINING WHY HE PLEAD GUILTY AT NEW TRIAL, THAT HIS FATHER WAS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE BOMB IN ORDER TO PRESSURE DEFENDANTS HE WAS SUING FOR $400,000.00, AND THAT TRENKLER WAS TOTALLY INNOCENT OF ANY PARTICIPATION IN CHARGED CRIME

Was this claim raised in a prior motion? Yes ( ) No (X)

Does this claim rely on a "new rule of law?" Yes ( ) No (X)
If "yes," state the new rule of law (give case name and citation):

Does this claim rely on "newly discovered evidence?" Yes (X) No ( )
If "yes," briefly state the newly discovered evidence, and why it was not previously available to you CODEFENDANT DID NOT AVAIL HIMSELF TO BE INTERVIEWED CONCERNING THIS CASE UNTIL JULY 18, 2006. SHAY NOW WILLING TO GIVE SWORN TESTIMONY OF TRENKLER'S NON PARTICIPATION IN THE CHARGED OFFENSE

(b) Ground two: BOMB TOGGLE SWITCH REMAINS ARE NOT FROM RADIO SHACK BUT INSTEAD FROM COMPETITOR

Supporting FACTS (tell your story briefly without citing cases or law): COMPARISON OF BOMB SWITCH REMAINS TO RADIO SHACK PART NUMBER 275-602 SHOW NO MATCH BUT INSTEAD REMAINS ARE AN EXACT MATCH TO A PHILMORE MODEL # 30219. GOVERNMENT THEORY CODEFENDANT MADE OVERT ACT PURCHASE WOULD BE NEGATED BY THIS EVIDENCE

Was this claim raised in a prior motion? Yes ( ) No (X)

Does this claim rely on a "new rule of law?" Yes ( ) No (X)
If "yes," briefly state the new rule of law (give case name and citation):

_____

_____

Does this claim rely on "newly discovered evidence?" Yes (X) No ( )
If "yes," briefly state the newly discovered evidence and why it was not previously available to you DEFENSE COUNSEL NEVER DIVULGED THIS TOGGLE SWITCH EVIDENCE TO DEFENDANT TRENKLER, MEMO FROM DEFENSE COUNSEL SEGAL TO SHAY DEFENSE GERTNER STATING THAT TRENKLER BOMB EXPERT MADE THE NO MATCH OBSERVATION WAS RECENTLY DISCOVERED IN DEFENSE RECORDS CAUSING DEFENDANT TRENKLER TO MAKE THE PHYSICAL COMPARISON BETWEEN ATF PHOTOGRAPH AND THE PURPORTED RADIO SHACK PURCHASE

[Additional grounds may be asserted on additional pages if necessary]

11. Do you have any motion or appeal now pending in any court as to the judgment now under attack? Yes (X) No ( )
If yes, name of court FIRST CIR. COURT OF APPEALS Case Number 07-1678 AND 07-1679

Wherefore, applicant prays that the United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit grant an Order Authorizing the District Court to Consider Applicant's Second or Successive Motion to Vacate under 28 U.S.C. § 2255.

Applicant's Signature

I declare under Penalty of Perjury that my answers to all the questions in this Application are true and correct.

Executed on 17 JULY 2007
[date]

Applicant's Signature

Proof of Service

Applicant must send a copy of this application and all attachments to the United States Attorney's office in the district in which you were convicted.

I certify that on 17 JULY 2007, I mailed a copy of this Application and all
[date]

attachments to UNITED STATES ATTORNEY'S OFFICE

at the following address:
JOHN JOSEPH MOAKLEY COURTHOUSE, ONE COURTHOUSE WAY
BOSTON MASSACHUSETTS 02210

Applicant's Signature

Pursuant to Fed.R.App.P. 25(c), "If an inmate confined in an institution files a notice of appeal . . ., the notice of appeal is timely filed if it is deposited in the institution's internal mail system on or before the last day of filing. Timely filing may be shown by a notarized statement or declaration (in compliance with 28 U.S.C. § 1746) setting forth the date of deposit and stating that first-class postage has been prepaid."

ATTACHMENT ONE OF TWO

GROUND 3: DEFENSE BOMB EXPERT REVEALED PRESENCE OF FINGERPRINT ON BOMB REMAINS IN ATF POSESSION.

SUPPORTING FACTS: DEFENSE BOMB EXPERT DENNY KLINE REVEALED ON JULY 2007 THAT IN 1993 HE VIEWED BOMB REMAINS, INCLUDING TAPE THAT ORIGINATED IN THE 91 BOMB, THAT HAD A VISIBLE FINGERPRINT. THIS HAD BEEN BROUGHT TO THE ATTENTION OF THE ATF AND TRENKLER'S DEFENSE COUNSEL. THIS EVIDENCE WAS NEVER MENTIONED IN ANY COURT DOCUMENTS NOR WAS IT BROUGHT TO DEFENDANT TRENKLER'S ATTENTION UNTIL JULY OF 2007.

WHY WAS THIS EVIDENCE NOT AVAILABLE PREVIOUSLY: NEITHER DEFENSE COUNSEL OR EXPERT DIVULGED THIS FINGERPRINT EVIDENCE TO DEFENDANT TRENKLER OR BY ANY MOTION TO ANY COURT TO COMPEL THE PRODUCTION OF THIS ACTUAL INNOCENCE AND EXCULPATORY EVIDENCE. THE FINGERPRINT ON THIS EVIDENCE BELONGS TO THE BOMB BUILDER AND WOULD PROVE TRENKLER'S INNOCENCE.

GROUND 4: REMOTE CONTROL RECEIVER IN 91 BOMB ONLY OPERATES FOR TWO (2) HOURS AFTER BEING TURNED ON. GOVERNMENT THEORY THAT BOMB WAS PLACED AND ARMED 40 HOURS PRIOR TO EXPLOSION NOT PLAUSABLE

SUPPORTING FACTS: FUTABA REMOTE CONTROL RECEIVER SALES REPRESENTATIVE STATED THAT THE MODEL USED IN THE 91 BOMB WAS AN OLD OUTDATED MODEL THAT WOULD ONLY OPERATE FOR TWO (2) HOURS. GOVERNMENT THEORIZED BOMB WAS PLACED AND ARMED 40 HOURS PRIOR TO EXPLODING. GOVERNMENT ALSO PRESENTED EVIDENCE THAT "TARGET" HANDLED BOMB 24 HOURS PRIOR TO EXPLOSION. WITH 2 HOUR OPERATING WINDOW BOTH THEORIES DO NOT HOLD UP. THE ONLY PERSON WHO KNEW WHERE BOMB WAS HIDDEN AND THE ONLY PERSON NEAR THE BOMB WITHIN THE 2 HOUR WINDOW WAS THE ORIGINAL PRIME SUSPECT, THOMAS LEROY SHAY.

WHY WAS THIS EVIDENCE NOT PREVIOUSLY AVAILABLE: TRIAL COUNSEL MADE NO EFFORT TO INQUIRE WITH FUTABA ON OPERATING TIME. BY CHANCE TRENKLER DISCOVERED THE NAME OF LOCAL FUTABA DISTRIBUTOR IN LEGAL DOCUMENTS AND MADE THE INQUIRY REVEALING THE TWO (2) HOUR WINDOW.

ATTACHMENT TWO OF TWO

GROUND 5: THE GOVERNMENT POSESSES EXCULPATORY, ACTUAL INNOCENCE EVIDENCE

SUPPORTING FACTS: DENNY KLINE, DEFENSE BOMB EXPERT, VIEWED A FINGERPRINT ON TAPE IN POSESSION OF THE ATF WHICH HAD BEEN DISCOVERED AS ORIGINATING WITHIN THE 91 BOMB. RECOVERED FROM THE UNDERCARRIAGE OF THE "TARGET" VEHICLE WERE MULTIPLE SETS OF FINGERPRINTS FROM THE SAME LOCATION BOMB ALLEGED TO HAVE BEEN PLACED. THE DEFENSE, UNTIL RECENTLY, NEVER KNEW ABOUT THE TAPE FINGERPRINT EVIDENCE AND THE PRINTS FROM THE UNDERCARRIAGE HAVE NEVER BEEN REVEALED.

ALTHOUGH THIS EVIDENCE EXISTS THE DEFENDANT TRENKLER HAS NEVER BEEN GRANTED ACCESS TO EITHER THE TAPE EVIDENCE OR THE TEST RESULTS FROM THE TARGET VEHICLE, BOTH EXCULPATORY EVIDENCE AND OR ACTUAL INNOCENCE EVIDENCE.

30 JULY 2007

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
JOHN JOSEPH MOAKLEY U.S. COURTHOUSE
1 COURTHOUSE WAY - SUITE 2500
BOSTON MASSACHUSETTS 02210

CLERK OF COURT,

IN REFERENCE TO CASE NUMBER 07-2112, ALFRED W. TRENKLER V. UNITED STATES, PETITION FOR RELIEF PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. SECTION 2254 OR 2255, ALFRED W. TRENKLER IS SUBMITTING THE FOLLOWING EXHIBITS:

A-1, A-2 — LETTER FROM TRENKLER DEFENSE ATTORNEY SEGAL AND FEINBERG TO SHAY ATTORNEY NANCY GERTNER, ESQ, RE: "TOGGLE SWITCH WHICH SHAY IS ALLEGED TO HAVE PURCHASED ON OCTOBER 18TH AND THE SWITCH DOES NOT MATCH THE REMANTS [SIC] OF THE TOGGLE SWITCH ATF HAS..."

A-3 — DEFENSE EXPERT DENNY KLINE REPORT RE: "...IT CAN BE CONCLUDED RADIO SHACK 275-602 TOGGLE SWITCH THAT I PURCHASED WAS NOT IDENTICAL TO THE ITEM BATF IDENTIFIED AS ORIGINATING FROM THE SAME RADIO SHACK TOGGLE SWITCH..."

A-4 TO A-6 — MOTION FOR A COURT ORDER TO REVIEW THE EVIDENCE THE ATF HAS FROM TRENKLER'S TRIAL.

A-7 TO A-9 — ATF PHOTOGRAPHS AND COMPARISON OF ATF SWITCH CONTACTS RECOVERED FROM BOMB TO PHILMORE MODEL 30-219 TOGGLE SWITCH SHOWING A PERFECT MATCH AND TO RADIO SHACK MODEL 275-602 TOGGLE SWITCH SHOWING NO MATCH.

A-10 — RADIO SHACK 275-602 AND PHILMORE 30-219 SWITCH COMPARISON.

ALFRED W. TRENKLER
19377-038
U.S.P. ALLENWOOD
P.O. BOX 3000
WHITE DEER, PA. 17887

LAW OFFICES

SEGAL & FEINBERG

210 COMMERCIAL STREET
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02109

(617) 720-4444
TELECOPIER (617) 720-4979

TERRY PHILIP SEGAL, P. C.*
MATTHEW H. FEINBERG**

MATTHEW A. KAMHOLTZ
SCOTT P. LOPEZ

*ALSO ADMITTED IN D. C.
**ALSO ADMITTED IN NEW YORK

March 17, 1993

Nancy Gertner, Esq.
Dwyer, Collora & Gertner
400 Atlantic Avenue
Boston, MA 02110

Dear Nancy:

Enclosed please find the material we have on Ed Carrion. I also sending Emmett a copy of this material and a copy of the various interviews with Shay Sr. and some information on Shay Sr.'s various lawsuits.

Please send me an index of the McPhee file and an index of all documents you have received from the Government.

It would really help if Emmett did all the background investigation of Shay Sr., Berger, Gimmarco and the mother.

When Emmett calls me, we will set up a time for him to come over, and we will make our files available and also show him the mock device which we had built. It makes sense to have him and Jim Karolides do joint interviews on Shay Sr.,and the neighbors who saw him with the box.

It would also be very helpful if Emmett interviews Pransky. It sounds like Jeff Boone has some information which could be helpful re Pranksy.

Denny Kline, the retired F.B.I. bomb expert I hired, will send a letter which I will send to you. Interestingly, he told me today he purchased a toggle switch which Shay is alleged to have purchased on October 18th, and the switch does not match the remants of the toggle switch ATF has as part of the physical evidence in this case.

A-1

I will file a letter with Judge Zobel asking her to defer ruling on my appeal of the Magistrate's discovery decisions until your motions are heard and decided by the Magistrate, and you then file for reconsideration with the District Court. Based on her comments today, I am concerned Judge Zobel will not only not hold a hearing on my motions for specific Brady material, such as the government's unsuccessful efforts to corroborate Shay's proffer, grand jury testimony of non testifying witnesses(my information is that much of the grand jury time was spent exploring the gay issue) etc. but simply rubber stamp Bowler's rubber stamp of the government's opposition.

If your case is first, I will be happy to suggest to Denny Kline that he testify for you.

It is clearly in both our interests to try to show Shay Sr. lied about the bomb, owed gambling debts, has a history of collecting on phony claims, might have built the bomb box in his garage, built the bomb to help his lawsuit, etc. Any information that Emmett comes up with about Gimmarco also helps us.

Sincerely,

Tony Philip Lagal

cc:James Karolides
Emmett Sheehan
Matt Feinberg, Esq.

It should be noted that John D. Amore, Futaba Divisional Services Manager, advised BATF that "paging systems often have very powerful signals that receivers can respond to."

The two contacts recovered by BATF and identified as originating from a Radio Shack toggle switch were one piece with two leads. On March 15, 1993, I purchased from Radio Shack two single-pole-single-throw toggle switches, Catalogue No. 275-602. I disassembled one of the toggle switches and found that the two contact leads were two separate pieces. Therefore, it can be concluded Radio Shack 275-602 toggle switch that I purchased was not identical to the item BATF identified as originating from the same Radio Shack toggle switch model. This suggests that the construction of the Radio Shack toggle switch Catalogue No. has changed or BATF erred in their identification. A reexamination of Submission 4 - exhibit 6 is requested to resolve this preliminary conclusion.

DENNY KLINE

WIRE

BATF:

Identifies 4 types of wire that are associated with the IED electrical circuitry, excluding the red and yellow detonator leg wires.

One wire, red insulation, larger gage, multistrand, could not be associated with the Futaba components. The three remaining types of wire are like wire used with battery snap connectors, Futaba components and a white wire antenna, also consistent with the Futaba system.

The lengths of wire (Submission 1 and 4) were examined microscopically for the presence of comparable Toolmarks and com[pared to tools (Submission 6) with negative results.

DLK:

No Toolmarks of value for comparison were identified on the wires recovered from the IED.

Tools were examined for wire and wire insulation residue with negative results.

BATF recovered numerous wires from Trenkler's habitats, but none of those wires were identical to the wires recovered from the IED.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

CRIMINAL ACTION NO. 92-10369-RWZ

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

VS.

ALFRED W. TRENKLER

Motion for a court order to review the evidence the ATF has from Mr. Trenkler's trial.

The motion is to make arrangements for a fingerprint expert – Richard Whalen, 1-508-520-2254 – and myself to examine all of the evidence the ATF has in its possession. The purpose is take photographs and fingerprints of the remnants of the 1991 Shay bomb and all other evidence in the ATF's possession. Please order the ATF to preserve all of this evidence from the Trenkler trial.

The reason for my request is as follows:

Cynthia Wallace, ATF forensic chemist, incorrectly identified the two contacts found in the bomb debris as coming from a switch exclusively made for Radio Shack, Model No. 275-602.

We purchased a competitive toggle switch – Philmore No. 30219 – to compare with the Radio Shack switch No. 275-602. The two switches are identical with one major exception – the contacts of the competitive switch matched the contacts of the ATF evidence; the contacts of the Radio Shack switch did not match (See enclosure).

The Radio Shack switch was the basis for a conspiracy between Alfred Trenkler and Thomas Shay. The court acknowledged the reliability problem associated with the testimony of Thomas Shay. The court's concern was that it is highly crucial evidence – "It is the evidence on the issue of conspiracy."

The incorrect identification of the toggle switch caused other members of the prosecution team to offer testimony or statements which were incorrect:

Thomas H. Waskom – ATF Explosive Enforcement Officer.
"He knows it is a Radio Shack toggle switch from reading Ms. Wallace's report and from going and seeing the item at Radio Shack himself. He also observed that the packaging said that it was exclusively made for Radio Shack."

Dennis Leahy – ATF Special Agent
Mr. Leahy had received information that a toggle switch from Radio Shack was found in the device. Untrue because only the two unmarked contacts were found.

They contacted Radio Shack and obtained a computer print out which showed a toggle switch No. 275-602 had been sold by the store at 197 Massachusetts Avenue in Boston. There was no address or telephone number on the print out to trace the purchase to Shay or anybody else. Mr. Leahy discovered a receipt at the store which Radio Shack headquarters had no record of. The receipt was improperly made out, plus none of the six (6) items listed in the receipt were found in the debris with the exception of the two contacts.

Paul V. Kelly – AUSA who prosecuted both cases – Trenkler and Shay.
"The chemist was able to identify the toggle switch from the bomb as model no. 275-602, a toggle switch, as you've heard, is custom manufactured for Radio Shack."

David Apfel, AUSA, at Shay change of plea and disposition proceedings.
"Thomas Shay purchased certain electrical components, including a toggle switch needed for the construction and testing of the explosive device."

Alfred Trenkler built a remote control explosive device consisting of dynamite, blasting caps and other materials including the toggle switch that Thomas Shay has purchased from Radio Shack on October 18, 1991.

The explosives device was affixed to the undercarriage of the 1986 Buick automobile owned and operated by Thomas Shay, Sr.

"The evidence in the case would conclusively show all of these facts."
A search for dynamite having been on the car proved negative.

In the Pre-sentence Report, the probation officer stated "It is unknown who actually affixed the bomb to the vehicle."

Kevin P. McGrath – AUSA
The ATF chemist identified the specific toggle switch used in the bomb as Model No. 275-602, a toggle switch which was custom manufactured for Radio Shack.

I am filing this motion pro se as Alfred's mother has spent $625,000 in legal fees defending an innocent son who is serving two illegal life sentences for a crime he did not commit.

The prosecutors did not prove that Mr. Trenkler 1) entered into a conspiracy with Tom Shay (2) built the 1991 Shay bomb, (3) obtained the dynamite, (4) placed the bomb on Tom Shay's father's car and (5) activated the bomb the morning of the explosion.

Incidentally, the bomb exploded 10 minutes after Evelyn Pirrello and her son, Robert, saw Tom Shay, Sr. walk up the driveway holding an object in his right hand. She described the object as about one foot long, either 4 or 5 inches wide and flat. She said the object had a drab color. Shay, Sr's. description of the bomb: 1" thick, by 5" or 6" wide by 10" or 12" long.

Shay, Sr. was the only one there to activate the bomb as the batteries would have been dead if the device had been put on the car on Saturday or Sunday as the prosecution testified.

As Judge Torrella stated in his dissenting opinion "constitutional cases are governed by a stringent harmless error analysis – a conviction cannot stand unless the effect of the evidence is harmless beyond a reasonable doubt." It was not harmless. Under the harmless beyond a reasonable doubt standard, we must vacate the conviction if there is "some reasonable possibility the error of constitutional dimension influenced the jury." It did influence the jury.

Respectfully submitted by
John D. Wallace Pro Se
On behalf of Alfred W. Trenkler,
My stepson.

Certificate of Service

I do hereby certify that on this 28th day of June, 2006, I placed in the U.S. mail, first-class postage prepaid, a true and correct copy of this motion for delivery to:

U.S. Attorney's Office for
The District of Massachusetts
One Courthouse Way, Suite 9200
Boston, MA 02210



ATF EVIDENCE

Photo #
1. 24 sub 1 fragments
2. " "
3. " " (uniform line: detonator(?))
4. Battery debris

Sub 4
5 #1 - Detonator
6 7 #16 Wood - Two sides
8 9 S-4 A | Clipping
10 Toggle Switch frags
11 12 Individuals w/ magnet
13 Detonator
14 Unexploded cap
15 From down, rigid.
16 17 18 Button magnet fragments
19. Wood frags.
20 Other frags

Box 103

Large Mag frag
22 - Futaba Switch component
23 Seat 8 plastic Item #15
24 Item 37 - Diagram | wood 1.
25 ~~Item~~ Item 20 - Paper battery & frags on tape
and Sub 4

Box
8 - 1 Ring magnet

Pic 1-7
9 & 12 - Plywood from T&S Sr. garage w/ plant

Box 103 8/9 - Pages from "J & L Industrial Supply 1990 Edition" 6 Thompson Rd East Windsor CT 06088
Hartford line 203 - 292 - 600
Purchasing FAX 203 - 29 6484



A-8

BAT HANDLE TOGGLE SWITCH
INDUSTRIES, Rockford, IL

$1.29
TOGGLE
SPST



TOGGLE SWITCH COMPARISON

BRAND	RADIO SHACK	PHILMORE
CATALOG NO.	275-602	30219
TYPE	SPST SINGLE POLE/ SINGLE THROW	SAME
CURRENT RATING	3 A 125 AC	SAME
CASE	SAME	SAME
ON/OFF MARKING	SAME	SAME
TOGGLE	SAME	SAME
HEXAGONAL NUT	SAME	SAME
THREADS PER INCH	SAME	SAME
* CONTACTS	TWO (2) DIFFERENT FROM CONTACTS RECOVERED	TWO (2) SAME AS CONTACTS RECOVERE
COMPANY	RADIO SHACK A DIVISION OF TANDY CORP. FT. WORTH, TEXAS	LKG INDUSTRIE ROCKFORD, IL.
MANUFACTURER	CUSTOM MANUFACTURED IN TAIWAN ROC FOR RADIO SHACK	MADE IN TAIWAI

* CONTACT COMPARISON BASED ON ATF PHYSICAL EVIDENCE OF CONTACTS RECOVERED ...