

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

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

Subject: RE: Epstein

Date: Mon, 13 Sep 2010 19:07:10 +0000

Importance: Normal

Publicity and scorn, I think. Possibly an internal investigation, although all of the parties, other than myself, are gone. I tracked down my emails to [REDACTED] reminding him of our obligations to the victims. There also was a mention in [REDACTED] papers about a plan to lobby Congress to revise the victims' rights legislation.

From: [REDACTED] (USAFLS)

Sent: Monday, September 13, 2010 3:05 PM

To: [REDACTED] (USAFLS)

Subject: RE: Epstein

[REDACTED],

This is really interesting. They can't get any money out of the U.S. Government since they have not filed a claim under the Federal Tort Claims Act, assuming they could even make a claim that the U.S. Government engaged in tortuous conduct. Their lawsuit for money damages against Epstein has been resolved, so their CVRA action cannot be used as a vehicle to get information to support their other lawsuit.

Other than trying to heap scorn and abuse on our office, does Brad think he can get the district court to set aside the non-prosecution agreement? Even if that were to occur, the district court could not order our office to prosecute Epstein, since separation of powers precludes that action. What do you think Brad wants?

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED] (USAFLS)

Sent: Monday, September 13, 2010 2:36 PM

To: [REDACTED] (USAFLS)

Subject: Epstein

[REDACTED] – Don't know if you have been watching CM/ECF, but this just came in today on Jane Does [REDACTED] United States.

<< File: DE39_20100913_Notice in response to admin order closing case.pdf >>

Nothing really for us to respond to, yet . . .