

4 January 1961

DPD-0131-60

MEMORANDUM FOR : Personnel Section, DPD

ATTENTION :

25X1A

FROM :

Executive Officer, DPD

SUBJECT :

25X1A

1. I have always been under the impression, perhaps erroneously, that military orders could dispel a tenant for the "notice" terms specified in his lease. Be that as it may, I do not see where we have violated or caused [REDACTED] extra financial hardship by rendering him short notice for movement. 25X1A

2. If [REDACTED] had given the landlord notice when we informed him of his movement orders he could have easily satisfied the terms of his lease. I know of no stipulation which requires that the leave be taken at any point other than where the individual is residing at the time movement orders are issued. Hence, if [REDACTED] went on leave 5 November he could have satisfied his leave requirement as well as the terms of lease without financial hardship. The fact that [REDACTED] decided to take leave when and where he would should be of no financial concern to us any more than the amount of money he spent during such leave. 25X1A

3. I agree that it is time to face this problem and to establish a policy and procedure for handling such cases. However, the phrase that we move individuals to present "no monetary loss" is too broad in scope and extremely difficult to specifically administer.

*Signed*

25X1A

EO/DPD

Distribution:

1-PERS/DPD

1-RI/DPD

DOCUMENT NO. \_\_\_\_\_  
NO CHANGE IN CLASS. ☒  
☐ DECLASSIFIED  
CLASS. CHANGED TO: TS S G  
NEXT REVIEW DATE: 2011  
AUTH: HR 70-2  
DATE: 12/11/81 REVIEWER: 064540