

**From:** "

**To:** "

**Subject:** FW: RE: RE: RE: RE: Out of Office AutoReply: PRIVATE & CONFIDENTIAL

**Date:** Thu, 24 Jun 2010 16:11:24 +0000

**Importance:** Normal

---

FYI

**From:** [REDACTED]

**Sent:** Thursday, June 24, 2010 12:05 PM

**To:** [REDACTED]

**Subject:** Re: RE: RE: RE: RE: Out of Office AutoReply: PRIVATE & CONFIDENTIAL

Hola [REDACTED]

Posted today in the Huffington Post. Please distribute. I hope this will help USAG be on the same page with county and city officials.

Thank you. You may click on link below. Also please can you forward to Ms. [REDACTED] thank you. I met her at AR sentencing last Friday and we briefly spoke after the sentencing.

[http://blogger.huffingtonpost.com/mt.cgi?\\_\\_mode=view&\\_type=entry&id=623850&blog\\_id=3](http://blogger.huffingtonpost.com/mt.cgi?__mode=view&_type=entry&id=623850&blog_id=3)

Best regards,

Conchita Sarnoff

The message and any attachment may be confidential or privileged and is intended only for the individual or entity identified above as the addressee. If you are not the addressee, or if this message has been addressed to you in error, you are not authorized to read, copy or distribute this message or any attachments and we ask that you please delete this message and any attachments and notify the sender by return email.

Delivery of this message and any attachments to any person (s) is not intended in any way to waive confidentiality or a privilege.

Jun 22, 2010 11:55:38 AM [REDACTED] wrote:

☺ thanks

---

**From:** [REDACTED]

**Sent:** Tuesday, June 22, 2010 11:55 AM

**To:** [REDACTED]

**Cc:** [REDACTED]

**Subject:** Re: RE: RE: RE: Out of Office AutoReply: PRIVATE & CONFIDENTIAL

Maybe it wasn't a major typo rather what you subconsciously wanted to say... If you would like at any point to reach out and help me understand more clearly your decision before the publication of the book you can reach me either on [REDACTED] or via email, thank you.

Conchita Sarnoff

EFTA00207551

The message and any attachment may be confidential or privileged and is intended only for the individual or entity identified above as the addressee. If you are not the addressee, or if this message has been addressed to you in error, you are not authorized to read, copy or distribute this message or any attachments and we ask that you please delete this message and any attachments and notify the sender by return email.

Delivery of this message and any attachments to any person (s) is not intended in any way to waive confidentiality or a privilege.

Jun 22, 2010 11:26:41 AM [REDACTED] wrote:  
Sorry the **major** typo -- I accidentally left out the word "not."  
The sentence should have read: As I stated previously, we will **not** discuss our prosecutorial decisions or comment on pending matters.  
Sorry for any confusion.  
Sincerely, [REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 22, 2010 11:21 AM  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Re: RE: RE: Out of Office AutoReply: PRIVATE & CONFIDENTIAL  
Ms. [REDACTED]

Thank you for agreeing to discuss the case, please let me know best time to speak with you or other USAG attorney.

Yours respectfully,  
Conchita Sarnoff

The message and any attachment may be confidential or privileged and is intended only for the individual or entity identified above as the addressee. If you are not the addressee, or if this message has been addressed to you in error, you are not authorized to read, copy or distribute this message or any attachments and we ask that you please delete this message and any attachments and notify the sender by return email.

Delivery of this message and any attachments to any person (s) is not intended in any way to waive confidentiality or a privilege.

Jun 22, 2010 09:59:59 AM [REDACTED] wrote:  
Thank you for your email. As I stated previously, we will discuss our prosecutorial decisions or comment on pending matters.  
Sincerely, [REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 22, 2010 7:47 AM  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Re: RE: Out of Office AutoReply: PRIVATE & CONFIDENTIAL  
Ms. [REDACTED]

As the chief law enforcement office in the State of Florida with a mission to uphold the law and provide justice I am quite disappointed at your lack of response and in general, lack of cooperation articulated by some of your colleagues.

It is my understanding that one of your core missions is to provide, investigate and prosecute, crimes relating to the safety and integrity of the public; I assume this would include the most vulnerable citizens of the state-underage minors.

It seems that in the case of Jeffrey Epstein for some unusual reason your office was unable to prosecute the appropriate crime for which he should have been charged. Unlike the single offense of prostitution with a minor (the charge the USAG agreed with and Epstein was ultimately found guilty of), the Palm Beach Police Department and other significant law enforcement agencies including the FBI were ready, after an extensive investigation and acquired evidence, to prosecute him on far more egregious charges relating to child trafficking (please see the 5 offenses in the NPA).

As you know, according to the 2000 TVPA federal laws, child trafficking carries a far more serious penalty than the mere 18 months in a county prison and has a long term deleterious implication upon our society at large. Child trafficking as defined by the State Department is "the use of force, fraud or coercion for purposes of sex or labor exploitation with a minor child". An offense that in Epstein's case could have been easily prosecuted given the mounting evidence and numerous victims who came forward during the probe.

If we as a society allow individuals, who have the power and influence to destroy a child's life, to walk free amongst us, then we as individuals are just as guilty as that person who committed the crime and irrevocably damaged the future of an innocent life.

Yours Respectfully,

Conchita Sarnoff

The message and any attachment may be confidential or privileged and is intended only for the individual or entity identified above as the addressee. If you are not the addressee, or if this message has been addressed to you in error, you are not authorized to read, copy or distribute this message or any attachments and we ask that you please delete this message and any attachments and notify the sender by return email.

Delivery of this message and any attachments to any person (s) is not intended in any way to waive confidentiality or a privilege.

Jun 21, 2010 11:10:30 AM, Alicia.Valle@usdoj.gov wrote:

Hello Conchita –

Thank you for your emails. I am Special Counsel to the US Attorney and I handle all media inquiries for the office. AUSA [REDACTED] was covering for me last week. Unfortunately, we will not be commenting on any aspect of this matter, as the non-prosecution agreement is still pending. In addition, we do not discuss the reasoning/rationale behind our prosecutorial decisions.

Thank you

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, June 21, 2010 10:15 AM  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]

**Subject:** RE: Out of Office AutoReply: PRIVATE & CONFIDENTIAL  
[REDACTED] from my office will be responding to your email.

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Sunday, June 20, 2010 1:58 PM  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Re: Out of Office AutoReply: PRIVATE & CONFIDENTIAL

Hello Jeffrey,

Thank you for reading my emails. Please respond to my questions when you return, thank you very much.

I am certain you are up to speed with all media reports on Alfredo Rodriguez since his sentencing on Friday, June 18th.

Moving forward, I fear it will be very difficult for DOJ not to respond to some very significant questions re. JE's plea deal and investigation. Most importantly, why are certain key facts still in the dark? Judge Marra eluded to those during AR sentencing.

1. There was no executable search warrant during JE's first investigation. Why?
2. Where are the alleged 5 copies of the (Alfredo Rodriguez-JE valet), journals? Who has those?
3. According to [REDACTED] testimony during sentencing DOJ does not have 1 copy of journals and never did.
4. If [REDACTED] never saw copies of AR journal and doesn't know what's inside, why would she believe the journal would have made a difference in JE's 2005-07 investigation and sentencing guidelines, since she doesn't know what's inside journal?
5. Maybe the info (pictures, emails, etc), contained in AR journal was the same or just copies of email that were previously given as testimony or in depo's by all victims, staff and others involved in case and investigation during original investigation to PB Police Dept and FBI.
6. There seems to be a lot of assuming and relying on AR journals for Epstein's earlier VERY SHORT conviction.
7. Two attorney's (Brad Edwards and Adam Horowitz) have copies of AR journal. Why haven't they been asked to hand them over and show AMV? Strange. That info is on an earlier media report.

Thank you and I hope to speak soon.  
Sincerely,

Conchita Sarnoff

The message and any attachment may be confidential or privileged and is intended only for the individual or entity identified above as the addressee. If you are not the addressee, or if this message has been addressed to you in error, you are not authorized to read, copy or distribute this message or any attachments and we ask that you please delete this message and any attachments and notify the sender by return email.

Delivery of this message and any attachments to any person (s) is not intended in any way to waive confidentiality or a privilege.

Jun 18, 2010 06:46:45 PM, [REDACTED] wrote:

EFTA00207554

I will be out of the office until Monday. I will not have limited access to email. If you need immediate assistance, please contact my assistant, Helena, at [REDACTED]