

From: " [REDACTED] >

To: " [REDACTED] >

Subject: Notes/thoughts from jury exercise

Date: Sun, 26 Sep 2021 22:37:20 +0000

Hi [REDACTED]

Please see below for my thoughts on the jury exercise and my typed notes from the Q&A session at the end.

General Thoughts/Themes from Deliberation Observation

- In the group we observed deliberate, they all (even the initial skeptics) seemed to think that having witnesses testify under pseudonyms was good for the Govt.
- They reiterated often that it wouldn't be possible for someone as closely associated with the girls and Epstein to not know that the girls were underage (seemed to come more from how they felt about the arguments and less based on specific evidence, suggested to me that they were already sympathetic to Govt case).
- The points the jurors brought up about JE and GM not actually looking to mentor and take care of talented young people may be particularly helpful to highlight—seemed like they were highly skeptical of any claim that GM was actually interested in helping young people/girls given the circumstances under which she approached and interacted with them
 - Just girls, not boys/young men being selected
 - No formal or organizational structure behind it (e.g., finding a victim when driving by on the street, "where's the 501(c)(3)?")
 - The group had a brief discussion about the difference between helping kids who were talented but under-resourced versus helping (or exploiting) troubled kids, this made me wonder if there is any distinction worth drawing here or if there's a way for the Govt to say that JE and GM preyed on kids who were lacking, who needed money and/or to feel special, etc. (I know [REDACTED] brought up and emphasized the pattern of recruiting and harming victims but in my view there could be more emphasis on recruiting/harming already vulnerable victims, at least in argument if not through a witness or witnesses)
- I was surprised and glad to hear that the group seemed quite averse to victim shaming and didn't think that "[REDACTED]" credibility was undermined too much by the lying under oath re: prostitution or that waiting to report should be held against any of the victims (even among older members of our group).
- The "thank you for being here so I don't have to" comment from GM to one of the victims also seemed to really resonate with the jury, indicated GM knows the harms being done to the victims (or at least knew what was happening behind the closed doors) (I had not heard this part before and found it compelling and jarring to hear that GM would acknowledge what happened or what she thought would happen in a room w JE so openly)

Q&A Notes

- What if you knew JE died by suicide and GM wasn't charged until after?
 - Questions about why weren't they charged at the same time, not charged as equals in the scheme, was she under investigation before he died
- What if you knew JE was investigated and charged in FL in 2006 but not GM?
 - Some concern/consideration due to the idea that she might have been a secondary target (~6 raised hands when asked if they'd be concerned to hear she was a secondary target)
- What if you knew two victims came forward after his death?
 - Suggests JE still had power over them, they maybe were more comfortable to come forward after, did he have something on them, might have prevented them from coming forward before
- What if you knew "[REDACTED]" was still in recovery/treatment for drug addiction?
 - Suggests she's trying to get her life together and do the right thing, she has "every right to seek justice" for wrongs done to her

- No strong reaction/consensus w/r/t/ whether her appearance (e.g., if altered due to methodone) would affect jurors impression of her credibility
 - But many would want more context on what methodone was, what kind of substance, side effects, etc.
- What if you didn't hear GM received \$25 mil?
 - Would weaken govt argument, cast some doubt on her motive, emphasizes her incentive to bring in girls (~2/3/ agreed with these sentiments)
- What did you think about the quote from GM saying to a victim that the girl was doing it so GM wouldn't have to?
 - Almost all agreed that that strengthened govt case and explains her motive
- What did they think about victims' incentives to lie? Did they think the idea that they'd get paid somehow for their testimony was compelling?
 - Not really, one man was super vocal about thinking there was no market for that kind of book (would want to hear from GM), other jurors had skeptical looks when he was talking though, did not seem to all agree
- What did they think about learning about the money obtained through civil settlement?
 - Important context to know, could have changed their lives especially if they came from little means, about 2/3 of them agreed that they didn't think that getting money through the settlement was equivalent to getting justice
- Would it make a difference to know that some names on the masseuse list were adults? Employees? Certified masseuses?
 - Probably not re: adults (~1/2 agreed)
 - But possibly weakens the argument that GM knew girls were underage, esp. if JE had made the list/not her
 - Didn't get a strong read re: employees or certified masseuses
- What would you want to ask GM if she testified?
 - How much did she know?
 - Why would she take children?
 - What was her real relationship w/ JE post-romantic break up?
 - Why mixing mentorship with hiring masseuses?
 - Why would she/how could she be comfortable to teach kids to touch a grown man?
 - ■■■: "she should shut up and let her lawyers save her ass"
- What if victim witnesses crashed on cross?
 - Would expect it, would be angry re: victim shaming, victims have already been through a lot, would be "heartbreaking"
 - Around 2/3 agree and would feel empathy for victims if they fell apart on cross

■■■■■
 Paralegal Specialist
 U.S. Attorney's Office | SDNY
 1 Saint Andrew's Plaza
 New York, NY 10007
 ■■■■■
 ■■■■■