

From: "[REDACTED] (USAFLS)"

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

Subject: RE: Response to Paul's email?

Date: Fri, 10 Mar 2017 16:57:37 +0000

Importance: Normal

It is beautiful, as usual. My only correction is the spelling of [REDACTED] name. It is [REDACTED].

[REDACTED] drafted all of the responses that you ask about below and in your other email.

[REDACTED]
Assistant U.S. Attorney
Southern District of Florida
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED] (USAFLS)

Sent: Friday, March 10, 2017 11:38 AM

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

Subject: Response to Paul's email?

[REDACTED] and [REDACTED],

Here's my overlong draft response. I don't love it, and it presently includes everything I think we could, but might not necessarily want to, say. What do you think about trying to reach out to [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] today to confirm that they also had no communications or info concerning the matters addressed in the supplemental discovery requests?

By the way, I know we were operating under extensions, but did we ever send written responses to either the supplemental request for admissions or the supplement request for production? If not, should we get that done soon? Should we also close the loop with former WPB Chief Reiter, even though we have confirmed from our side that the petitioners' contentions involving him are bogus?

■