

From: Paul Cassell <casselln@law.utah.edu>

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

Brad Edwards

<brad@pathtojustice.com>

Subject: RE: Government's position on limited prospective intervention by Epstein

Date: Wed, 10 Jul 2013 17:55:50 +0000

Importance: Normal

[Redacted]

You will have seen Epstein's latest (and belated) motion for limited prospective intervention. We are writing on behalf of Jane Doe #1 and Jane Doe #2 to invoke their right to confer on this motion with the Government. We would like to know your position on the motion. Please let us know when it would be convenient to confer.

Sincerely, Brad Edwards and Paul Cassell for Jane Doe #1 and Jane Doe #2

Paul G. Cassell

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

Subject: RE: Are you going to confer with us?

[Redacted]

It has been nearly two weeks since we sent this request to you, and we haven't heard anything back from you. Are you going to confer with us about this? And what is the government's position going to be? You will note that Judge Marra said yesterday that there is a "substantial question" about whether the denial of a motion for a protective order is immediately appealable under *Mohawk* – which is exactly the argument we believe it would be in the Government's interest to endorse.

Sincerely,

Brad Edwards and Paul Cassell for Jane Doe #1 and Jane Doe #2

Paul G. Cassell

[Redacted]

error, please immediately notify the sender by reply electronic mail and delete the original message. Professor Cassell is admitted to the Utah State Bar, but not the bars of other states. Thank you.

From: Paul Cassell

Sent: Monday, June 24, 2013 6:46 PM

[REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Judge Marra's Order Granting the Victims' Motion to Compel Discovery Within 30 Days

[tried to send this earlier, but it may not have gone out]

[REDACTED]
We haven't seen the sealed order granting the Government's motion for stay either. (Have you?).

But, in any event, Judge Marra's order on June 19, 2013 (DE 190) specifically stated that "The petitioners' motion to compel discovery from the Government [DE 130] is GRANTED. Within THIRTY (30) DAYS from the date of entry of this order, the Government shall . . . [produce various discovery]." For your convenience, I attach a copy of DE 190 ordering the Government to produce discovery within 30 days.

So we are expecting to see you produce the bulk of our discovery on July 19, 2013, as specifically directed in DE 190 which granted our motion to compel.

Looking forward to moving the case towards a resolution.

Brad Edwards and Paul Cassell for Jane Doe #1 and Jane Doe #2

Paul G. Cassell

[REDACTED]
This message is intended only for the use of the addressee. If you are not the intended recipient, you may not use, disseminate, distribute or copy this communication. If you have received this message in error, please immediately notify the sender by reply electronic mail and delete the original message. Professor Cassell is admitted to the Utah State Bar, but not the bars of other states. Thank you.

[REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, June 24, 2013 5:24 PM

To: Paul Cassell; [REDACTED]; Brad Edwards

Subject: RE: One additional discovery request in Jane Doe #1 and Jane Doe #2 vs. U.S., No. 08-80736

Paul,

You have addressed your additional discovery request to the correct person. In the Court's order denying the government's motion to dismiss, the Court referenced "[t]he stay of discovery pending ruling on the government's motion to dismiss entered November 8, 2011 [DE #123] is LIFTED." I checked back into my CM/ECF notifications on Outlook, and did not find any for D.E. 123. I checked the docket sheet, which indicates a sealed order being entered on November 9, 2011, which is D.E. # 123.

I was under the impression the Court had not ruled on the government's motion to stay. On December 6, 2012, the petitioners filed their Motion for Prompt Ruling Denying Government's Motion to Stay (D.E. 179), in which the petitioners noted that, "[t]he government's motion was filed more than one year ago, yet (presumably because of a flurry of other

motions) the Court has yet to rule on this particular motion.” From this, it appears petitioners also believed the Court had not ruled on the government’s motion for stay.

In any event, your e-mail states that “you look forward to receiving the discovery materials that the Court has ordered you to produce on the schedule that the Court has ordered them produced.” What is your view as to the schedule that the Court has ordered the documents produced? Is that contained in D.E. 123? Thanks.

[REDACTED]

From: Paul Cassell [<mailto:cassellp@law.utah.edu>]

Sent: Monday, June 24, 2013 4:07 PM

[REDACTED] (USAFLS); Brad Edwards

Subject: RE: One additional discovery request in Jane Doe #1 and Jane Doe #2 vs. U.S., No. 08-80736

[REDACTED]

I am writing to confirm that you remain the person that we should be contacted with regard to the above-captioned case. If not, please advise as to who the appropriate contact person is (and please forward this message to that person).

In light of the Court lifting the stay on discovery, we are writing send one additional discovery request. Of course, this request is in ADDITION to the requests previously sent. It should not be viewed as replacing the other discovery requests or extending the deadline for producing the materials covered by the other discovery requests.

We look forward to receiving the discovery materials that the Court has ordered you to produce on the schedule that the Court has ordered them produced.

Please let us know if you have any questions.

Paul Cassell and Brad Edwards for Jane Doe #1 and Jane Doe #2

Paul G. Cassell

[REDACTED]