

**From:** "[REDACTED] (USAFLS)" </O=USA/OU=FLS/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=DLEE>

**To:** "[REDACTED]. (USAFLS)" <[REDACTED]>, "[REDACTED] (USAFLS)" <[REDACTED]>

**Cc:** "[REDACTED]. (USAFLS)" <[REDACTED]>, "[REDACTED] (USAFLS)" <[REDACTED]>

**Subject:** Conversation with Cassell and Edwards - Bruce Reinhart's Motion to Intervene/Sanctions

**Date:** Tue, 10 May 2011 20:38:57 +0000

**Importance:** Normal

---

[REDACTED] and [REDACTED],

I just spoke with Cassell and Edwards about their upcoming response to Bruce Reinhart's motion to intervene and motion for sanctions. Cassell had previously written to OPR seeking access to information to respond to the motion for sanctions. I told [REDACTED] at OPR to refer Cassell back to me, and she did.

I suggested to Cassell that, since the victims were opposing the motion to intervene, they should await a ruling by the court on that issue. By doing so, we could avoid, for now, a dispute over the victims' right to government information regarding Reinhart's claim that the allegations against Reinhart for improperly representing Epstein's associates was not well-founded and/or based on a good faith belief. If the court denies the motion to intervene, we would not have to resolve that issue. Cassell and Edwards thought that was a good resolution of the issue.

Cassell and Edwards also brought up the government's non-opposition to Reinhart's motion to intervene. They viewed it as an implicit endorsement of the intervention motion. I told them the government viewed this matter as a dispute between Reinhart and the victims' attorneys, not involving the government.

Cassell and Edwards want to incorporate some language in their opposition to Reinhart's motion, to clarify that the government's non-opposition does not necessarily mean agreement with the motion. They will be sending me a draft so I can circulate it among us.

[REDACTED]