

From: "[REDACTED] (USAFLS)" <[REDACTED]>
To: "[REDACTED] (USAFLS)" <[REDACTED]>, "[REDACTED] (USAFLS)" <[REDACTED]>, "[REDACTED] (USAFLS)" <[REDACTED]>
Cc: "[REDACTED] (USAFLS)" <[REDACTED]>, "[REDACTED] (USAFLS)" <[REDACTED]>

Subject: RE: Epstein -- Rule 6(e) issue
Date: Wed, 30 Jun 2010 18:50:43 +0000
Importance: Normal

Okay. I will just sit tight. I am supposed to receive another 200 pages. Assuming it is more of the same, I will not bother you all again.

Thank you.

[REDACTED]

Assistant U.S. Attorney

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Fax [REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED] (USAFLS)
Sent: Wednesday, June 30, 2010 2:38 PM
To: [REDACTED] (USAFLS); [REDACTED] (USAFLS); [REDACTED] (USAFLS)
Cc: [REDACTED] (USAFLS); [REDACTED] (USAFLS); [REDACTED] (USAFLS); [REDACTED] (USAFLS)
Subject: RE: Epstein -- Rule 6(e) issue

I agree with Stamm, especially in light of the fact that Judge Marra has ordered that the docs be produced.

From: [REDACTED] (USAFLS)
Sent: Wednesday, June 30, 2010 2:04 PM
To: [REDACTED] (USAFLS); [REDACTED] (USAFLS); [REDACTED] (USAFLS)
Cc: [REDACTED] (USAFLS); [REDACTED] (USAFLS); [REDACTED] (USAFLS); [REDACTED] (USAFLS)
Subject: RE: Epstein -- Rule 6(e) issue

[REDACTED]

I also do not see how we could prevail on a 6(e) basis to block a private party from turning over materials which they have in their possession. Nor do I see any reason for us to do this, particularly in a civil litigation setting where we are not a party. It might be different if they were trying to subpoena the materials directly from us, but that is not the case here.

[REDACTED], [REDACTED], anyone else have a different view?

[REDACTED]

