

Subject: RE: PRIME CASES - RETURNS/COMMENTS [C]  
From: Tammy McFadden <[REDACTED]>  
Date: Fri, 08 Jan 2016 11:33:20 -0500  
To: Cherie Quigley <[REDACTED]>

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 [REDACTED] 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.

Gave no details on the following-

- A DEPOSIT was also received during the reviewing period. ???  
RESPONSES: I stated in my write up a CHECK was received, as well as provide the person who sent the check to the client

- LAUREL, INC, ??

- What does this mean? "BNP PARIBAS IBAN: BE58001408700179 SSB REF# SCMS151002551085" It tells me nothing. Should indicate \$5,535.84 wire to

Cabinet Experton SPRL referencing invoices for July – Sept \* RESPONSES:  
My write up indicated Disbursement of Funds – I have only provided the financial institution information in the past with no issues and you have approved

. SOCIETE GENERALE SSB REF#SCMS151020660775 IBAN:  
FR7630003032900005054038502, ?? Should indicate FFC to Mlle [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] in France RESPONSES: My write up indicated Disbursement of Funds I have only provided the financial institution information in the past with no issues and you have approved

. SWEDBANK SSB REF#SCMS151019655736 IBAN:  
LT387300010129516294, ??? RESPONSES: My write up indicated Disbursement of funds I have only provided the financial institution information in the past with no issues and you have approved

. CREDIT LYONNAIS SSB REF# SCMS151021657561 IBAN:  
FR2330002004690000060269070 SORT CODE: 30002 RIB CODE 00091 17 ??  
RESPONSES: My write up indicated Distribution of funds I have only provided the financial institution information in the past with no issues and you have approved

Once again, the timing of your communication is extremely alarming – you have always approved my Jeffery Epstein cases in this same write up manner in the past with no issues See CASE#118577, 117962, 123131 but today, you are highlighting imperfections and changes to the process. Which brings me back to the retaliation theory.

Agreed-

Case 129730 – complete error on my part – uploaded the incomplete case summary that did not included a list of sample checks.

Case 129340 – No Summary was attached - As advised, not sure what transpired large case items were uploaded and my case write up did not upload properly. Once advised, case write up was immediately attached. Pending your approval

Case 129875 – No Summary was attached - As advised, not sure what transpired large case items were uploaded and my case write up did not upload properly. Once advised, case write up was immediately attached. Pending your approval

From: Cherie Quigley  
Sent: Thursday, January 07, 2016 3:35 PM  
To: Tammy McFadden  
Subject: RE: PRIME CASES - RETURNS/COMMENTS [C]

Classification: Confidential

I don't review cases every day and 2 of the 5 that were returned had no summary attached.

It just happened to be a day that I was reviewing cases.

Case 129342 - the Profile was incorrect, for which you stated but didn't update

Cases 129730 - You indicated that you uploaded the incomplete case summary

Case 129340 – No Summary was attached

Case 129994 - not enough detail

Case 129875 – No Summary was attached

No retaliation at all. If you feel any did not warrant being returned, please let me know.

Cherie

From: Tammy McFadden  
Sent: Thursday, January 07, 2016 2:54 PM  
To: Cherie Quigley  
Subject: PRIME CASES - RETURNS/COMMENTS [C]

Classification: Confidential

Cherie –

I am noticing an unprecedented number of my PRIME October Cases being returned or commented on right on the tail end of email correspondences I sent to your attention in regards to outstanding PRIME PEP deferred cases that have not been properly waived and officially reviewed/ resolved by you. You actually started returning my October Cases less than 2 hours after I sent the email questioning PEP deferred cases. I am hoping it is just coincidental, and not a display of retaliation for being vocal.

Kind regards,

Tammy