

b6
b7C
b2
b7E

From: [redacted] (FBI)
Sent: Thursday, March 29, 2007 2:05 PM
To: [redacted] (SE) (FBI)
Subject: FW: NSL Question

UNCLASSIFIED
NON-RECORD

[redacted]

b6
b7C

Below you will find our original correspondence regarding header NSL sent out last fall.

Thanks

[redacted]

-----Original Message-----

From: [redacted] (FBI)
Sent: Tuesday, October 31, 2006 8:23 AM
To: [redacted] (FBI)
Subject: FW: NSL Question

b6
b7C
b2
b7E

UNCLASSIFIED
NON-RECORD

Please draft a new NSL for the overage material and we'll consider this closed...

b6
b7C
b2
b7E

-----Original Message-----

From: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Sent: Tuesday, October 31, 2006 5:00 AM
To: [redacted] (SE) (FBI)
Subject: RE: NSL Question

UNCLASSIFIED
NON-RECORD

b6
b7C

That's correct. [redacted]

-----Original Message-----

From: [redacted] (FBI)
Sent: Monday, October 30, 2006 7:55 PM
To: [redacted] (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: NSL Question

b6
b7C
b2
b7E

UNCLASSIFIED
NON-RECORD

We sent an NSL to an ISP for header information. The NSL requested info from Feb 2005 till Feb 2006. The info we received was from Feb 05 through Oct 06. I recall that previously you sent out guidance that in this type of a situation we could simply send another NSL for the additional period (here March 06 through Oct 06) provided that it is relevant to the investigation (it is) and not have to report any type of potential IOB. Is this still good policy? Thanks!

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED