

Commission Exhibit No. 1699

Date 7/17/64

EDWARD J. NERAD, Chief Administrative Officer, Family Court of Cook County, Illinois (FCCC), was interviewed in the office of MICHAEL F. HENEGHAN, Chief Probation Officer, FCCC, 2246 West Roosevelt Road. Mr. HENEGHAN was present during the interview.

NERAD advised that the notation "September 30, 1922; Blumenthal" which appears on the FCCC Master File Card for EVA RUBENSTEIN, Case No. 83383 and which does not appear anywhere in her legal file is explained as follows:

The Master File Card reflects any dates which the FCCC's procedure organization considered important. These did not necessarily reflect court appearances only; however, EVA RUBENSTEIN's FCCC Legal Files reflect only court appearances, dates on which either she or someone acting in her behalf would have appeared before the court.

With regard to the specific notation "September 30, 1922; Blumenthal," NERAD advised that this, in his considered opinion, involved the date on which a probation officer was asked to more or less supervise EVA RUBENSTEIN's dependency case. He stated the specifics concerning this as well as any of the minor details concerning EVA's connection with the court would have been contained in the Social Service File concerning her. This file he said would have been destroyed sometime ago because of age and is no longer available.

Mr. NERAD, after reviewing the EVA RUBENSTEIN FCCC Legal Files, advised that at no time had she ever had an incorrigibility hearing. With regard to EVA's reportedly being "released from probation April 23, 1926," NERAD advised that the court documents actually contain the wording concerning this hearing "permanent release from guardianship" and that the statement that she was released from "probation" on that date as previously set out was an error either on his part or Mr. HENEGHAN's.

Mr. NERAD at this point stated that when originally contacted by the FBI, he stated that Cook County Juvenile Court records from the period in which the RUBENSTEIN family was in contact with the court

2
CG 44-645

would be on microfilm record. He stated after searching for and locating the record, it was ascertained that they had not been microfilmed and the information obtained was from the original documents.

Mr. NERAD advised that the type of activity which might have resulted in incorrigibility proceedings concerning HYMAN and/or EVA RUBENSTEIN or any child could have been the result of a widely varied type of activity on a child's part from disobedience, truancy and simple misdeemeanor to the most serious type of felony.

NERAD could make no definite statement as to whether incorrigibility proceedings were the normal concomitant of dependency hearings involving a broken or unstable home. He stated of the most often happening in his past experience which began in the 1930's was that it was more likely that a dependency hearing would be the outgrowth of an incorrigibility hearing. Once a child was declared incorrigible, an investigation into his background would indicate a broken or unstable home making dependency hearings necessary.

NERAD stated that the effect of a declaration of incorrigibility and placement on probation would vary with the probation officer assigned to the case and would depend upon the seriousness of the reason of the incorrigibility finding. Some probation officers, he stated, handled the child assigned to them on an individual basis and would only make them report if they felt it was necessary. NERAD stated that no record schedule on visits to the subject's home were set up and the probation officer used his own discretion in handling each case. He stated that if a child persisted in his incorrigibility, the ultimate punishment the court had would be to have sent him to St. Charles Training School, St. Charles, Illinois. He stated that apparently this did not happen to HYMAN RUBENSTEIN inasmuch as his Master Card File did not indicate that he had ever been sent there.

On 7/15/64 at Chicago, Illinois File # 44-645
by SA HERBERT F. BRICK/sbx Date dictated 7/17/64

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.