

From: "[REDACTED]"

To: [REDACTED] (USANYS)" [REDACTED]

Subject: FW: Daubert motion

Date: Tue, 09 Nov 2021 03:33:21 +0000

Attachments: Exhibit_B_[proposed_redactions].pdf

From: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>

Sent: Monday, November 8, 2021 9:43 PM

To: [REDACTED]

Cc: [REDACTED] (USANYS) [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: Daubert motion

Thanks very much, [REDACTED] I've reviewed and have no substantive edits. There were a few typos, but I gather from the email chain that multiple proofreads are ongoing, so don't want to clutter your inbox with track changes on those. Agree, there is no need to redact this filing and agree with your proposed approach to the exhibits.

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Monday, November 8, 2021 7:02 PM

To: [REDACTED]

Cc: [REDACTED] (USANYS) [REDACTED]

Subject: FW: Daubert motion

Hi [REDACTED],

This is the version ready for you, and specifically, Part I.C.4-6.

Also, team, I don't think we need to redact this filing, but we definitely want to redact the defense expert notice and the attached defense list of material, so I'm inclined to just file these temporarily under seal again. Let me know your thoughts, and I'll add our customary sealing footnote.

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Monday, November 8, 2021 6:57 PM

To: [REDACTED]

Cc: [REDACTED]

Subject: Daubert motion

Hey [REDACTED]

Passing the pen back to you while I'm joining the Rocchio witness prep.

I've inputted the chiefs' comments, [REDACTED]'s comments, and the citecheck from [REDACTED]. I'll be done with the webex at 10 and will finalize the exhibit attachments then. So that leaves inputting the intern citecheck from [REDACTED] which I've also attached, making sure those two articles don't contain any bombs before we file them, and anything else you have the time or inclination to do.

Thank you again for all your help with this!

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Assistant United States Attorney
Southern District of New York
1 Saint Andrews Plaza
New York, New York 10007

[REDACTED]