

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, May 27, 2008 6:46 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Epstein

Hey [REDACTED].

Sorry to bother you on your vacation. Apparently the DAG is inclined to allow Epstein's counsel to present further arguments. [REDACTED] has requested [REDACTED] and I to prepare, in email format, arguments to present to the DAG supporting why the case should not be stalled any further. [REDACTED] mentioned statute of limitation issues. I don't know what the specific statute of limitations are (if there are any) for the various counts. Seems like the statute of limitations was for the life of the victim but I'm not certain. Other points that can be made include the private investigators continuing to contact the victims and the relocation of our victims to various parts of the country. Do you have any suggestions as to what would be our best course of persuasion? Thanks and happy travels.

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED], [REDACTED] (USAFLS) [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, May 27, 2008 2:54 PM
To: [REDACTED] (USAFLS); [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED], [REDACTED] (USAFLS)
Subject: Epstein

Hi [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] sent me an email about epstein wanting to do less time. I hope that his request will be denied. The original deal was supposed to be 2 years so he has already gotten a big break. Plus we have identified more victims since we agreed to the 18 months. Please keep me posted. Thanks.

[REDACTED] (USAFLS)

From: [REDACTED], [REDACTED] (USAFLS) <AVillafana@usa.doj.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, May 27, 2008 11:45 PM
To: [REDACTED], [REDACTED] R. (MM) (FBI); [REDACTED], [REDACTED] (USAFLS); [REDACTED] (FBI)
Subject: Re: Epstein

Aaaargh.

The statute of limitations issue is the state statute of limitations. I think joe says it is two years. The issue is implicated in two ways. First, because of the state's leniency for the first set of girls, the second set have been presented only to us for prosecution. If we cannot go forward, then there will be no prosecution of those crimes. (In response to the argument that joe should just present them now, we believe that some of the victims are unknown to the defense and disclosing them further weakens our case by allowing them to depose and harass those victims.)

Second, our "state resolution" of the case requires epstein to plead to something that hasn't been charged yet so further delay will allow him to escape one of the terms of the deal he signed several months ago. (There also is a sol on the private cause of action under 2255 pursuant to which he must pay damages to the girls. The delay will allow him to escape responsibility for that term, too.)

Other reasons:

The victims are getting older. Clearly one of epstein's arguments will be that he did not know they were minors. The older they are when they testify the more plausible epstein's argument becomes.

The grand jury we are using will expire soon. We have already presented more than a dozen hours of testimony and the grand jury is invested and wants to indict.

We promised the girls swift justice so they could move on with their lives. [REDACTED] is a perfect example of why this is needed. The delay so far has led many to reach out to private lawyers which, in turn, let's e argue that they are only in it for money.

Why give him more time? He has had more than a year's delay already for no reason other than the names of the attorneys he can afford to hire. This is not a white collar or other non-violent crime. This is a child exploitation crime with more than 20 known child victims. We are mandated by statute and doj policy to prosecute those cases vigorously and in a timely fashion - whether the children were prostitutes or unwilling victims. Why is this case being treated so differently?

----- Original Message -----

From: [REDACTED] R. (FBI)
To: [REDACTED] (USAFLS)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tue May 27 18:45:37 2008
Subject: RE: Epstein

Hey [REDACTED],

Sorry to bother you on your vacation. Apparently the DAG is inclined to allow Epstein's counsel to present further arguments. [REDACTED] has requested [REDACTED] and I to prepare, in email format, arguments to present to the DAG supporting why the case should not be stalled any further. [REDACTED] mentioned statute of limitation issues. I don't know what the specific statute of limitations are (if there are any) for the various counts. Seems like the statute of limitations was for the life of the victim but I'm not certain. Other points that can be made include the private investigators continuing to contact the victims and the relocation of our victims to various parts of the country. Do you have any suggestions as to what would be our best course of persuasion? Thanks and happy travels.

08-80736-CV-MARRA

P-014930

From: [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED] (USAFLS) [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, May 27, 2008 2:54 PM
To: [REDACTED] (USAFLS); [REDACTED] (USAFLS)
Cc: [REDACTED], [REDACTED] (USAFLS)
Subject: Epstein

Hi [REDACTED], [REDACTED] sent me an email about epstein wanting to do less time. I hope that his request will be denied. The original deal was supposed to be 2 years so he has already gotten a big break. Plus we have identified more victims since we agreed to the 18 months. Please keep me posted. Thanks.

[REDACTED] (USAFLS)

From: [REDACTED] (FBI) <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, May 28, 2008 6:33 PM
To: [REDACTED], [REDACTED] (USAFLS)
Subject: Re: Epstein

Hey we emailed [REDACTED] (MOST:) of your comments re any further delays and added a few of our own. The US Atty Gen was here today in MM. I would love to know if Epstein came up. [REDACTED] and Acosta were going to present to the DAG reasons not to delay any further. Hopefully they were successful and we r still on for Tues. We interviewed SR today. She told Epstein her true age, she belvd was 14 or 15. Phone records show contact @ age 16. She said Epstein told her he did not care about age. She also said that E told her he had f***d TM. TM brought SR. Anyways, I'll fill u in later. NY getting close to locating ML. We have cell and good address. Keep your fingers crossed. Talk to u soon.

----- Original Message -----

From: [REDACTED] (USAFLS) <[REDACTED]>
To: [REDACTED], [REDACTED] R.; [REDACTED] (USAFLS); [REDACTED]
Sent: Tue May 27 23:45:06 2008
Subject: Re: Epstein

Aaaargh.

The statute of limitations issue is the state statute of limitations. I think joe says it is two years. The issue is implicated in two ways. First, because of the state's leniency for the first set of girls, the second set have been presented only to us for prosecution. If we cannot go forward, then there will be no prosecution of those crimes. (In response to the argument that joe should just present them now, we believe that some of the victims are unknown to the defense and disclosing them further weakens our case by allowing them to depose and harass those victims.)

Second, our "state resolution" of the case requires epstein to plead to something that hasn't been charged yet so further delay will allow him to escape one of the terms of the deal he signed several months ago. (There also is a sol on the private cause of action under 2255 pursuant to which he must pay damages to the girls. The delay will allow him to escape responsibility for that term, too.)

Other reasons:

The victims are getting older. Clearly one of epstein's arguments will be that he did not know they were minors. The older they are when they testify the more plausible epstein's argument becomes.

The grand jury we are using will expire soon. We have already presented more than a dozen hours of testimony and the grand jury is invested and wants to indict.

We promised the girls swift justice so they could move on with their lives. [REDACTED] is a perfect example of why this is needed. The delay so far has led many to reach out to private lawyers which, in turn, let's e argue that they are only in it for money.

Why give him more time? He has had more than a year's delay already for no reason other than the names of the attorneys he can afford to hire. This is not a white collar or other non-violent crime. This is a child exploitation crime with more than 20 known child victims. We are mandated by statute and doj policy to prosecute those cases vigorously and in a timely fashion - whether the children were prostitutes or unwilling victims. Why is this case being treated so differently?

----- Original Message -----

From: [REDACTED] (FBI)
To: [REDACTED] (USAFLS)
Cc: [REDACTED] (FBI)
Sent: Tue May 27 18:45:37 2008
Subject: RE: Epstein

Hey [REDACTED],

Sorry to bother you on your vacation. Apparently the DAG is inclined to allow Epstein's counsel to present further arguments. [REDACTED] has requested [REDACTED] and I to prepare, in email format, arguments to present to the DAG supporting why the case should not be stalled any further. [REDACTED] mentioned statute of 08-80736-GV-MARRA. I don't know what the specific statute of limitations are. P-014932

are any) for the various counts. Seems like the statute of limitations was for the life of the victim but I'm not certain. Other points that can be made include the private investigators continuing to contact the victims and the relocation of our victims to various parts of the country. Do you have any suggestions as to what would be our best course of persuasion? Thanks and happy travels.

■

From: ■, ■, ■ (USAFLS) [■]
Sent: Tuesday, May 27, 2008 2:54 PM
To: ■ (USAFLS); ■ (USAFLS)
Cc: ■, ■ (USAFLS)
Subject: Epstein

Hi ■: ■ sent me an email about epstein wanting to do less time. I hope that his request will be denied. The original deal was supposed to be 2 years so he has already gotten a big break. Plus we have identified more victims since we agreed to the 18 months. Please keep me posted. Thanks.