

[REDACTED]

Subject: Jane Doe Case

Date: Mon, 23 Jan 2012 14:17:50 +0000

Importance: Normal

Attachments: DE48-3_20110321_ [REDACTED] Victim_notification_ltr.pdf; DE48-4_20110321_ [REDACTED] victim_notification_ltr.pdf; DE48-6_20110321_ [REDACTED] ltr to [REDACTED].pdf; DE48-7_20110321_ [REDACTED] ltr to [REDACTED] for [REDACTED].pdf; DE48-8_20110321_302_of [REDACTED] from_Jan_2008.pdf; DE48_20110321_Motn_for_finding_a_violation_of_CVRA.pdf; DE48-2_20110321_ [REDACTED] 302.pdf

Hi Ed – FINALLY, I found it. Now I know why the court wants us to make our documents searchable.

See DE 48 at pages 3-4, paragraph #1. They specifically cite the Complaints and refer to Jane Does #1 and #2.

On page 5, paragraph 4, they make clear that Jane Doe #1 is [REDACTED], by referring to her 302, which they attach as Exhibit B.

They also explain that Jane Doe #1 is [REDACTED] and Jane Doe #2 is [REDACTED] by referring to their victim notification letters, on pages 5&6, paragraphs 6&7, which they attach as Exhibits C&D. (See also paragraph 37 and Exhibit H re [REDACTED])

Judge White granted my motion for extension of time this morning. I am running off to court now, but should be back by 11:15. Let me know how I can help, okay?

<<DE48-3_20110321_ [REDACTED] victim_notification_ltr.pdf>> <<DE48-4_20110321_ [REDACTED] victim_notification_ltr.pdf>> <<DE48-6_20110321_ [REDACTED] ltr to [REDACTED].pdf>> <<DE48-7_20110321_ [REDACTED] ltr to [REDACTED] for [REDACTED].pdf>> <<DE48-8_20110321_302_of [REDACTED] from_Jan_2008.pdf>> <<DE48_20110321_Motn_for_finding_a_violation_of_CVRA.pdf>> <<DE48-2_20110321_ [REDACTED] 302.pdf>>

