

From: "[REDACTED] (USAFLS)" <[REDACTED]>

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: Re:

Date: Mon, 26 Sep 2011 19:54:03 +0000

Importance: Normal

Setting aside the non-pros and prosecuting him as though the Non-pros had never been signed.

[REDACTED]

-----Original Message-----
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, September 26, 2011 3:52 PM
To: [REDACTED] (USAFLS)
Subject: Re:

Suggest what thing?

----- Original Message -----
From: [REDACTED] (USAFLS) <[REDACTED]>
To: [REDACTED]
Sent: Mon Sep 26 15:48:05 2011
Subject: RE:

No. He already served his sentence in state court and performed all his other obligations under the Non-Pros (including paying damages to 30-some girls). I argued it would be a Due Process violation to even suggest such a thing.

[REDACTED]

-----Original Message-----
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Re:

Have we conceded that a showing that we violated the CVRA would justify reopening/setting aside the nonpros?

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Sent: [REDACTED]

Subject: RE:

Ideally to set aside the Non-Prosecution Agreement with Epstein and then to somehow convince us (probably through public pressure via the press) to prosecute him.

[REDACTED]

----- Original Message -----
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: [REDACTED]

What is the relief jane does want in the cvra case?