
From: Tammy McFadden [REDACTED]
Sent: 1/8/2016 11:33:20 AM
To: Cherie Quigley [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: PRIME CASES - RETURNS/COMMENTS [C]

Classification: **Confidential**

See below responses highlighted in yellow

From: Cherie Quigley
Sent: Thursday, January 07, 2016 5:59 PM
To: Tammy McFadden
Subject: FW: PRIME CASES - RETURNS/COMMENTS [C]

Classification: **Confidential**

See below

Cherie

From: Tammy McFadden
Sent: Thursday, January 07, 2016 4:45 PM
To: Cherie Quigley
Subject: RE: PRIME CASES - RETURNS/COMMENTS [C]

Classification: **Confidential**

Thank you for your email. Again, I am hoping it is coincidental, but I find the timing to be extremely ironic.

Disagree -

Case 129342 - MORGAN RIO INVESTMENTS L.P. - the profile was incorrect because you did not modify the base profiles correctly back in March 2015. Yesterday, I responded by forwarding email correspondences I sent to your attention back in March 2015 noting the discrepancy, and you advising base profiles had been properly modified. That is why I asked if there was some sort of system error. You confirmed no system error, and responded by sending an excel spreadsheet with the base profile amounts/counts and averages. Account 44122237 Base profile has been modified, Case summary revised - approved.

Your comments at the end of the review stated "No changes in profile needed at this time – it appears the Profile was modified 6/18/2015. As of today, the base profile still reflects the incorrect in/out amounts, counts.". How do you state "No change in profile needed" yet indicate profile is incorrect but not change it??. Responses – I thought I was very clear with my responses to this question –?

Case 129994 - JEFFREY EPSTEIN – based on your comments, it appears you want dollar amounts affixed to every transactions. I am confused, because you have reviewed and approved previous Epstein cases that did not list transaction amounts on each transaction, but you highlighted Epstein October's cases as if I omitted in error.

The case was rejected due to **lack of details** not for the \$\$ amounts omitted. Since I was already rejecting it I added the \$\$ that you don't add, but should. I have not rejected in the past for not having the \$\$ amounts, but I will in the future. If that was the only issue it would not have been rejected. **RESPONSES** – I've always provided the grand total of the alerted amount(s) only in my write ups, and you have approved with no issues, but *today*, there is an issue This information should have been properly communicated.