

From: "[REDACTED] (USANYS)" <[REDACTED]>
To: "[REDACTED] (USANYS)" <[REDACTED]>
Cc: "[REDACTED] (USANYS)" <[REDACTED]>, "[REDACTED] (USANYS)" <[REDACTED]>, "[REDACTED] (USANYS)" <[REDACTED]>
Subject: RE: [REDACTED] MTD Opposition
Date: Sat, 30 Nov 2019 15:03:19 +0000

Buried in a much longer (and interesting) piece about Epstein, is the following which may be of interest for [REDACTED] (particularly since David Boies is involved):

<https://www.nytimes.com/2019/11/30/business/david-boies-pottinger-jeffrey-epstein-videos.html?action=click&module=Top%20Stories&pgtype=Homepage>

Mr. Pottinger obliged — and walked into what looked like a trap. He described two hypotheticals, both of which were consistent with what had been discussed with The Times at the Harvard Club.

In one, which he called a “standard model” for legal settlements, Mr. Pottinger said the money would be split among his clients, the Astria Foundation, Kessler and the lawyers, who would get up to 40 percent.

In the second hypothetical, Mr. Pottinger wrote, the lawyers would approach the videotaped men. The men would then hire the lawyers, ensuring that they would not get sued, and “make a contribution to a nonprofit as part of the retainer.”

“No client is actually involved in this structure,” Mr. Pottinger said, noting that the arrangement would have to be “consistent with and subject to rules of ethics.”

“Thank you very much,” Kessler responded.

Mr. Pottinger later said that the scenario would have involved him representing a victim, settling a case and then representing the victim’s alleged abuser. He said it was within legal boundaries. (He also said he had meant to type “No client *lawsuit* is actually involved.”)

Such legal arrangements are not unheard-of. Lawyers representing a former Fox News producer who had accused Bill O'Reilly of sexual harassment reached a settlement in which her lawyers agreed to work for Mr. O'Reilly after the dispute. But legal experts generally consider such setups [to be unethical](#) because they can create conflicts between the interests of the lawyers and their original clients.

From: [REDACTED] (USANYS) <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, November 29, 2019 9:21 PM
To: [REDACTED] (USANYS) <[REDACTED]>
Cc: [REDACTED] (USANYS) <[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED] (USANYS) <[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED] (USANYS) <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Re: [REDACTED] MTD Opposition

Unfortunately, I have a proffer then. Can you do 3:30pm? [REDACTED], and I are all available then.

On Nov 29, 2019, at 8:43 PM, [REDACTED] (USANYS) <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Let's do 11 if that works for everyone.

Sent from my iPhone

On Nov 29, 2019, at 8:37 PM, [REDACTED] (USANYS) <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Same.

On Nov 29, 2019, at 5:44 PM, [REDACTED] (USANYS) <[REDACTED]> wrote:

I could do those windows.

On Nov 29, 2019, at 5:22 PM, [REDACTED] (USANYS) <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Monday between 11 and 2 or 3-5 is good.

Sent from my iPhone

On Nov 29, 2019, at 4:21 PM, [REDACTED] (USANYS) <[REDACTED]> wrote:

[REDACTED],

Please let us know if you some availability on Monday for a brief meeting about [REDACTED] in advance of some additional discussions we need to have with [REDACTED] this coming week.

Thanks,

█

From: █ (USANYS) <█>
Sent: Thursday, November 21, 2019 12:08 PM
To: █ (USANYS) <█>; █ (USANYS) <█>
Cc: █ (USANYS) <█>; █ (USANYS) <█>
Subject: RE: █ MTD Opposition

From: █ (USANYS) <█>
Sent: Thursday, November 21, 2019 12:02 PM
To: █ (USANYS) <█>; █ (USANYS) <█>
Cc: █ (USANYS) <█>; █ (USANYS) <█>
Subject: RE: █ MTD Opposition

Well done, team. Light edits attached. How are the preps/interviews going out there?

From: █ (USANYS) <█>
Sent: Wednesday, November 20, 2019 2:41 PM
To: █ (USANYS) <█>; █ (USANYS) <█>
Cc: █ (USANYS) <█>; █ (USANYS) <█>
Subject: █ MTD Opposition

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