

From: "[REDACTED], [REDACTED] (USANYS)" <[REDACTED]>
To: "[REDACTED] (USANYS)" <[REDACTED]>
Cc: "[REDACTED], [REDACTED] (USANYS)" <[REDACTED]>, "[REDACTED] (USANYS)" <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Re: Epstein FOIA Update
Date: Sun, 11 Apr 2021 20:46:07 +0000

I can do anytime 3 or later, thanks.

Sent from my iPhone

On Apr 11, 2021, at 3:58 PM, [REDACTED] (USANYS) <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Sorry, but any chance we could do 4:00 or later? I have a call scheduled at 3:00. If not, I can have someone else cover the 3:00 call.

Thanks.

On Apr 11, 2021, at 3:20 PM, [REDACTED], [REDACTED] (USANYS) <[REDACTED]> wrote:

3 works for me. Please let me know if I can help with logistics here—happy to circulate invite/dial in if helpful. Thanks.

Sent from my iPhone

On Apr 11, 2021, at 2:44 PM, [REDACTED] (USANYS) <[REDACTED]> wrote:

No problem. Can we say 3? I'll see if Audrey thinks it makes sense for her to join in the first instance.

Sent from my iPhone

On Apr 10, 2021, at 4:12 PM, [REDACTED], [REDACTED] (USANYS) <[REDACTED]> wrote:

[REDACTED],

I understand from Audrey's email that you are scheduling a call for Monday. I unfortunately have conflicts between 11 and 3. I apologize in advance if this complicates scheduling.

[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPhone

On Apr 10, 2021, at 8:29 AM, [REDACTED] (USANYS) <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Thanks, [REDACTED]. Will review the transcript and then we can find a time to meet early in the week. It may make sense to meet first as a smaller group with you/[REDACTED] to best understand the lay of the land and then loop in the substantive case teams.

Sent from my iPhone

On Apr 9, 2021, at 7:21 PM, [REDACTED], [REDACTED] (USANYS) <[REDACTED]> wrote:

All,

I'm writing to bring everyone up to speed in the Epstein FOIA. We had a pretty rough, approximately 2 hour oral argument today before Judge Engelmayer. It may be easier to share the transcript (which I have same-day ordered and will circulate once received) and/or to talk things through on a call. In sum, the Court is very skeptical of the breadth of the 7(A) withholdings here and will enter an Order on Monday directing that the withheld documents be produced to the Court for *in camera* review. In connection with that, the Court will direct that any material withheld under 7(A) in connection with the *Tartaglione* case be specifically marked out as such (as compared to the broader set of material withheld on account of its likelihood of interference with *Noel*). Basically, the Court has concerns that too much has been withheld on the theory of interference with the criminal cases and will undertake its own assessment of the withholding of the documents.

The Court was also interested in exactly how much of the withheld materials have been produced to the *Noel* defendants under Rule 16, and it sounds like it will ask us to make specific representations about precisely which documents have been produced in *Noel*.

Also, as you will see from the transcript, the Court directed that I communicate to Audrey that he wants her to consider this case and to evaluate whether it is necessary to confer with Main Justice on the FOIA response here (specifically whether more documents might be produced on reconsideration). In particular, the Court perceived a possibility that the recent change in administration could have some bearing on this. I plan to communicate this to Audrey as soon as we have the transcript (I've asked for that piece of it tonight).

As noted I will follow up once I have the transcript and will also circulate the Court's Order when it comes out on Monday. I think it would probably make sense to have a call thereafter and will circulate an invite for early next week. I am also available to speak over the weekend if anyone would like to talk sooner.

Thanks,

[REDACTED]
Assistant United States Attorney
[REDACTED]