

From: "[REDACTED]"
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] >

Subject: RE: Material Witness PA

Date: Thu, 18 Jun 2020 13:11:30 +0000

Okay, I can reach out to [REDACTED].

From: [REDACTED] >
Sent: Thursday, June 18, 2020 9:10 AM
To: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] >
Subject: RE: Material Witness PA

Can you discuss with the attache whether that is a normal approach (refusing to proceed because lack of predication)? All we want to do is ask some questions – do they really refuse to permit that, in an interview that would be happening regardless? Also, before doing that, someone should go back to the [REDACTED] team and confirm that there is nothing more to say. (I don't have the specifics of what we've already said, so I can't do it – but if you want me to handle let me know.)

From: [REDACTED] >
Sent: Thursday, June 18, 2020 9:02 AM
To: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] >
Subject: FW: Material Witness PA

See below on the MLAT. The only issue for you is the [REDACTED] one I raised briefly earlier this week – the Home Office doesn't think we're predicated on [REDACTED], and unless we provide further specifics about Andrew's knowledge of or involvement in criminal conduct in that case, they are not going to process that aspect of the MLAT. I take it from our conversation that there is no more info to provide. If so, can we tell them we are withdrawing our request as it pertains to [REDACTED] and only asking them to proceed on Epstein?

From: [REDACTED] >
Sent: Thursday, June 18, 2020 8:58 AM
To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED] >
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: Material Witness PA

[REDACTED] –

Here is my email and the UKCA response. I also had a conversation with Dawn Browne about this to discuss the way forward.

Just as a reminder, they are waiting on any additional information you have on [REDACTED]. If we have given them all we have, then we can just say this. They think the facts on that matter are pretty thin.

With regard to the voluntary interview issue, Dawn explained in more detail why they have been looking for us to exhaust all avenues for voluntary cooperation. They expect that once they approve the MLA and refer it to the police that the Blackfords will file a judicial review action. In that action, they believe Blackfords will claim that the Home Office failed to follow its internal guidelines on

Philomena

Philomena Creffield | Deputy Director & Head of UK Central Authority | International Directorate | BICS Policy & International Group

Delivering Judicial Cooperation Globally

From: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 18 June 2020 10:59
To: Creffield Philomena <[REDACTED]>; Gibbs Julian <[REDACTED]>; Browne Margaret <[REDACTED]>
Cc: Chadwick, Amanda J (London) <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Material Witness PA

Dear Philomena, Julian, and Dawn:

Thank you for taking the time to speak with us about the status of our MLA request in the Material Witness PA matter. You asked that we confer and then get back to you on an appropriate timeline for the completion of any discussions with counsel for a voluntary interview. The case team and I have had an opportunity to discuss this, and I have now had an opportunity to review the correspondence between the team and Gary Bloxsome beginning in January 2020.

Having reviewed this, it is plain to me that there has developed a significant mutual lack of trust between the case team and Blackfords. As a result, the possibility of a voluntary interview, done outside the context of the MLA request, is effectively nil. The case team believes, and I agree, that delaying the execution of the MLA request in the hope that Blackfords changes its position on a voluntary interview, will simply be an exercise in futility.

That is not to say that the witness will continue to decline an interview once requested by UK law enforcement in connection with an MLA request. Mr. Bloxsome has repeatedly stated, although without committing to any particular step, that his client is willing to assist the investigation. While there is some reason to question whether these claims are simply posturing, it may be that offering an interview in the context of a more formal request provides a more agreeable forum and structure for the witness. Moreover, in that context, the UKCA and UK law enforcement will see whether the witness will in fact answer questions about the crimes under investigation. As you will recall, the MLA request suggests that the initial approach by UK law enforcement be one for a consensual interview rather than testimony before a UK court. Our hope is that your experience is better than the case team's.

In short, efforts to obtain a truly voluntary interview have been exhausted. The case team has yet to see any commitment from Blackfords to making their client available to be questioned by law enforcement. We again request that the UKCA move forward without further delay.

Finally, my intention was to share with you the written correspondence from Blackfords in February which states in no uncertain terms that, "there is no purpose to be served in continuing to try to assist further." However, Blackfords requested that communication to be "private and confidential," and if

we were to share its entirety with you, I am certain that we would be criticized for breaching a requested confidence.

Many thanks for your ongoing assistance in this matter.

Best,

[Redacted]

[Redacted]
U.S. Department of Justice Attaché
United States Embassy – London
[Redacted]
[Redacted]
[Redacted]
[Redacted]

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

This email and any files transmitted with it are private and intended
solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed.
If you have received this email in error please return it to the address
it came from telling them it is not for you and then delete it from your system.
This email message has been swept for computer viruses.
