From: "████████████████████)" <████████████>
To: "██████████████ (USANYS)" <████████████████>, "████████████
(USANYS)" <████████████>
Cc: "███████████████)" <████████████>, "██████████ (USANYS)"
<███████████>
Subject: RE: GM -- search warrant returns
Date: Wed, 21 Oct 2020 15:04:27 +0000
Inline-Images: image001.jpg

My inclination is to mark all empty attachments as non-responsive. Unless anyone disagrees, I'll go ahead and tag all empty attachments as non-responsive in Relativity.

From: ████████████ (USANYS) <████████████████>
Sent: Wednesday, October 21, 2020 10:27 AM
To: ██████████ (USANYS) <██████████████>; ████████████) <████████████████>
Cc: ████████████) <████████████>; ██████████ (USANYS) <████████████>
Subject: RE: GM -- search warrant returns

We didn't, but that could also be a function of the stellar defense lawyers in the GEP case. My understanding is that the email will show the attachments ("i.e., "Attachment 1" "Attachment 2") but then when they click through the responsive documents, there just won't be a "Attachment 2" if that's the one that was missing. The reason we didn't "seize" them was that without any content, they weren't responsive to the warrant, which would be my concern with seizing them here. You could also ask Chris whether there's a way to substitute "blank attachment" or some sort of filler page for the missing attachments so that it's clear to the defense what happened.

From: ████████████ (USANYS) <████████████████>
Sent: Wednesday, October 21, 2020 10:22 AM
To: ██████████ (USANYS) <██████████████>; ████████████) <████████████████>
Cc: ████████████) <████████████>; ██████████ (USANYS) <████████████>
Subject: RE: GM -- search warrant returns

Just out of curiosity, did that result in a million questions from defense counsel about where the attachments were? I don't feel strongly about this at all, the only issue to flag is that if we tag them as responsive, we can then tell defense counsel that for any attachment that is blank, what that means is the FBI was unable to extract the attachment, so what they have is what we have. Alternatively we could mark all the blank pages as non-responsive and, if true, tell defense counsel that for any email lacking an attachment, the reason is the FBI was unable to extract one. Whichever you think will be more likely to stave off lots of follow up questions from defense counsel.

From: ████████████ (USANYS) <████████████████>
Sent: Wednesday, October 21, 2020 10:19 AM
To: ████████████) <████████████>; ██████████ (USANYS) <████████████████>
Cc: ████████████) <████████████>; ██████████ (USANYS) <████████████>
Subject: RE: GM -- search warrant returns

We ran into this issue in GEP and marked them non-responsive.

From: ████████████████) <████████████████>
Sent: Wednesday, October 21, 2020 10:15 AM
To: ██████████ (USANYS) <████████████>; ██████████ (USANYS) <████████████████>

I just spoke with Flatley about the partial emails and empty attachments. He explained that for those files, because of the platform Epstein was using to check some of his emails, the FBI's technology was not able to extract the full emails and attachments. So what we see on Relativity is what the FBI has as well.

Given that answer, do we want to mass mark the empty attachments as non-responsive? Or should we include the empty attachment files as related to the responsive partial emails?

From: [redacted] (USANYS) <[redacted]>
Sent: Tuesday, October 20, 2020 6:04 PM
To: [redacted]) <[redacted]>; [redacted] (USANYS) <[redacted]>
Cc: [redacted]) <[redacted]>; [redacted] (USANYS) <[redacted]>
Subject: RE: GM -- search warrant returns

Great, this all makes sense to me.

From: [redacted]) <[redacted]>
Sent: Tuesday, October 20, 2020 5:34 PM
To: [redacted] (USANYS) <[redacted]>; [redacted] (USANYS) <[redacted]>
Cc: [redacted]) <[redacted]>; [redacted] (USANYS) <[redacted]>
Subject: RE: GM -- search warrant returns

Yes, my view is that these would be responsive to 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6. And [redacted] confirmed that these have been de-duped.

I'm going to go through and do a few more spot checks to try to weed out any more false hits. My hope is that we can clarify the empty attachments with Flatley tomorrow and then ask PAE to start bates stamping the remaining responsive documents for production tomorrow.

Please let me know if you'd like to discuss anything else in the meantime.

From: [redacted] (USANYS) <[redacted]>
Sent: Tuesday, October 20, 2020 4:51 PM
To: [redacted]) <[redacted]>; [redacted] (USANYS) <[redacted]>
Cc: [redacted]) <[redacted]>; [redacted] (USANYS) <[redacted]>
Subject: RE: GM -- search warrant returns

Thanks, this is helpful. It seems like the [redacted] and jeevacation hits (which had two of the highest hit rates in the STR) would be responsive to #6 (and possibly #2, 3, 4, or 5) – is that right? And have these documents been de-duped?

1. Evidence concerning the identity or location of the owner(s) or user(s) of the Subject Devices.

2. Evidence concerning the identity or location of co-conspirators of JEFFREY EPSTEIN, including █████████ and GHISLAINE MAXWELL.

3. Evidence concerning communications to, from, by, and/or among co-conspirators of JEFFREY EPSTEIN, including █████████ and GHISLAINE MAXWELL.

4. Any documents or communications with or regarding victims or potential victims of the Subject Offenses.

5. Documents or records reflecting payments to victims and/or co-conspirators including but not limited to bank and financial records, spreadsheets, ledgers, account listings, check and wire records, and documents reflecting cash withdrawals.

6. Documents or records reflecting travel plans or arrangements for victims or potential victims of the Subject Offenses, or co-conspirators in those Subject Offenses, including

Given that the warrant authorizes seizing data from a more than 20-year period, and given the extent to which Epstein traveled, having this many responsive documents does not seem crazy to me. Particularly if you've already tried to weed out the spam, and spot-checked the responsive documents for each search term to make sure it wasn't pulling in false hits.

From: █████████████████) <██████████████████>
Sent: Tuesday, October 20, 2020 3:58 PM
To: ████████ (USANYS) <███████████████>; ████████ (USANYS) <██████████████████>
Cc: ███████████) <████████████>; ████████ (USANYS) <██████████████>
Subject: RE: GM -- search warrant returns

Sure, the warrant is attached.

From: ████████████ (USANYS) <████████████████>
Sent: Tuesday, October 20, 2020 3:52 PM
To: ███████████████) <████████████>; ████████ (USANYS) <███████████████>
Cc: ███████████) <████████████>; ████████ (USANYS) <█████████████>
Subject: RE: GM -- search warrant returns

Thanks ████████. Let's see what Flatley says about the attachments. Do you mind sending the rider for the warrant that we would be seizing these materials pursuant to?

From: █████████████████) <██████████████████>
Sent: Tuesday, October 20, 2020 2:12 PM
To: ████████ (USANYS) <███████████████>; ████████ (USANYS) <██████████████████>
Cc: ███████████) <████████████>; ████████ (USANYS) <█████████████>
Subject: RE: GM -- search warrant returns

Update from ████████:

There are 128,175 email attachments attached to emails with search term hits that are empty files. ████████ review of the emails to which these empty files attached suggests that the FBI only provided us with partial files for these emails. Unclear whether those partial files are all that the FBI was able to extract from the devices, or whether the FBI left out parts of these files when producing them to us. I have asked Flatley for a call tomorrow morning to discuss.

In the meantime, that still leaves us with a very large number of documents hitting on the search terms. Here is a breakdown of the file types:

- 1,087,903 are emails (majority featuring Epstein as sender or recipient)
- 323,179 are email attachments (128,175 of which are empty files as discussed above)
- The remaining 36,619 are a mix of non-email files with no association with emails, such as Word, PDF, PowerPoint, and Excel files.

From: ████████ (USANYS) <████████████>
Sent: Tuesday, October 20, 2020 8:26 AM
To: ████████████) <████████████>; ████████ (USANYS) <████████████>
Cc: ████████████) <████████████>; ████████ (USANYS) <████████████>
Subject: RE: GM -- search warrant returns

I tend to agree that if we really do have hundreds of thousands of emails between Epstein and ████ talking about the logistics of travel or meetings with women, we have a good faith basis to tag those as responsive. To the extent defense counsel (or we) want(s) to run search terms within those hundreds of thousands of emails focused on particular names or time periods, they are free to do so, and we may well want to do so.

Also agree on drilling down on the attachment issue. Sorry for the issue with Flatley, which is really annoying. Please let us know what you learn from him when he's back tomorrow.

From: ████████████) <████████████>
Sent: Tuesday, October 20, 2020 8:14 AM
To: ████████ (USANYS) <████████████>
Cc: ████████ (USANYS) <████████████>; ████████████) <████████████>; ████████
(USANYS) <████████████>
Subject: Re: GM -- search warrant returns

I can ask ████ about the attachments. ████████ is out today, so I cannot ask CART until tomorrow.

On Oct 20, 2020, at 7:28 AM, ████████████ (USANYS) <████████████> wrote:

Thanks ████████. Those certainly do sound like they would be responsive. But I can imagine improperly extracted attachments being something the defense will certainly complain about- can we go back to CART or ████ to ask them to figure out what happened and whether there is a way to fix it, or we just have to live with that (for instance, maybe the attachments were deleted or partially overwritten).

On Oct 19, 2020, at 11:47 PM, ████████████) <████████████> wrote:

Following up on this, I've done a spot check of a couple hundred of these hits, and the vast majority are emails with Epstein as a sender or recipient. A small number were spam emails, though I did not see any repeat emails from spam senders. The majority were emails discussing logistics, such as travel, phone calls, and meetings, including the travel plans of individuals with female names. Most of these logistics emails are with ████ ████. There are also emails about paying for school for people with female names, renovations to Epstein's properties, Epstein's finances, and miscellaneous emails about people with female names (e.g., discussing the physical appearance of various females, Epstein asking to have a threesome, modelling photos).

One thing I noticed is that most of the attachments to emails did not appear to have been successfully extracted. Most were just blank pages when I clicked through them. So one way to narrow the responsive category would be just to take the documents with hits and not the entire family of documents along with them.

From: ███████████████████)
Sent: Monday, October 19, 2020 10:37 PM
To: ███████████ (USANYS) <█████████████>; ████████████) <██████████████>; ████████
████ (USANYS) <█████████████>
Cc: ████████ (USANYS) <██████████████>
Subject: RE: GM -- search warrant returns

I'm struggling to think of a way to limit "███" or "jeevaction" more because:

- ███ is ████████ last name. Because she was Epstein's primary secretary who handled the travel logistics for Epstein, his employees, and the victims who traveled. So it makes sense that her last name has so many hits. Those will include essentially all of the day-to-day communications regarding Epstein's schedule and travel.

- The term "jeevacation" is the phrase Epstein used for the majority of his email addresses (e.g., jeevacation@gmail.com, jeevacation@yahoo.com, etc.). So it's unsurprising that this phrase is the highest hit. I suspect that number reflects the majority of Epstein's emails. We ran that search term because we do not know all of the email addresses Epstein used, and we suspected that there were more domains with "jeevacation" email accounts than we knew about.

We've already run search terms to cut out spam, though we can certainly try to find more.

From: ████████ (USANYS) <████████████████>
Sent: Monday, October 19, 2020 9:21 PM
To: ████████████) <█████████████>; ██████████████ (USANYS) <████████████████>
Cc: █████████████████) <████████████████>; ███████████ (USANYS) <████████████████>
Subject: RE: GM -- search warrant returns

Thanks, this is a helpful start. I would recommend we think about how we can perhaps narrow or focus our search terms a bit, perhaps through combinations/connectors or other means, particularly for common names/words that are likely to generate a significant number of hits. For example, "David" turns up nearly 40,000 hits, and "flight" or "flights" turns up over 100,000 just to pick a few.

Also, curious as to why "████" turns up 450,000 hits and "jeevacation" (which I'm not familiar with but assume you all are?) turns up 750,000. Those two alone seem to account for the overwhelming majority of documents we've identified, so if there's a way to focus those two in particular, that might be a big help.

One thing you might want to do is just review a couple hundred random hits, if you haven't already, to get a bit of a flavor for what we're turning up, as that may help inform our efforts to focus the search. I think we may also have the technology to weed out spam and potentially duplicates, if we haven't already, but defer to others with more experience in those areas....

From: █████████████████) <████████████████>
Sent: Monday, October 19, 2020 8:51 PM
To: ████████████ (USANYS) <████████████████>; ██████████████ (USANYS) <████████████████>
Cc: █████████████████) <████████████████>; ███████████ (USANYS) <████████████████>
Subject: RE: GM -- search warrant returns

The STR report is attached, in case that's useful.

From: ████████████████)
Sent: Monday, October 19, 2020 8:44 PM

1.4 million documents is obviously a substantial portion of the 1.6 million document database. Given our prior discussions, our understanding is that the office is okay with us designating all of these documents responsive, but please let us know if you'd like us to take a different approach.

Thanks,

██████

███████████
Assistant United States Attorney
Southern District of New York
One Saint Andrew's Plaza
New York, NY 10007
███████████████