

**From:** "[REDACTED] (USAFLS)" </O=USA/OU=FLS/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=[REDACTED]>  
**To:** "[REDACTED] (USAFLS)" <[REDACTED]>, "[REDACTED] (USAFLS)" <[REDACTED]>, "[REDACTED] (USAFLS)" <[REDACTED]>

**Subject:** RE: Request for Investigation of Jeffrey Epstein Prosecution

**Date:** Tue, 14 Dec 2010 22:23:31 +0000

**Importance:** Normal

---

I am on duty, sitting dutifully at my desk, and have lots to do, so whenever works for you all, works for me.

[REDACTED]  
Assistant U.S. Attorney  
500 S. Australian Ave, Suite 400  
West Palm Beach, FL 33401  
[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED] (USAFLS)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 14, 2010 3:48 PM  
**To:** [REDACTED] (USAFLS); [REDACTED] (USAFLS); [REDACTED] (USAFLS)  
**Subject:** RE: Request for Investigation of Jeffrey Epstein Prosecution

Colleagues,

I will be here until 7:30 p.m. I'm on travel to the NAC tomorrow, but can chat on Thursday.

---

**From:** [REDACTED] (USAFLS)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 14, 2010 3:34 PM  
**To:** [REDACTED] (USAFLS); [REDACTED] (USAFLS); [REDACTED] (USAFLS)  
**Subject:** RE: Request for Investigation of Jeffrey Epstein Prosecution

I agree, and I can provide some factual background on much of this. Are you all free to do a conference call? These are the items that I wanted to raise in my earlier email.

[REDACTED]  
Assistant U.S. Attorney  
[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 14, 2010 3:12 PM  
**To:** [REDACTED] (USAFLS); [REDACTED] (USAFLS)

EFTA00212214

Cc: [REDACTED] (USAFLS)

Subject: Request for Investigation of Jeffrey Epstein Prosecution

[REDACTED]

I have reviewed and letter provided to us by [REDACTED] at the December 10, 2010 meeting, which asks for an investigation of the Jeffrey Epstein prosecution. [REDACTED] asks us to conduct an investigation into whether “there were improper influences and actions during your office’s criminal investigation of Jeffrey Epstein, particularly regarding the decision to enter into a binding non-prosecution agreement blocking his prosecution for numerous federal sex offenses he committed over many years against more than thirty minor girls.”

USAM 1-4.100 requires DOJ employees to report any evidence or non-frivolous allegation of misconduct that may be in violation of any law, rule, regulation, order, or applicable professional standard. [REDACTED] letter presents a non-frivolous allegation of misconduct, that this office may have been improperly influenced in its decision not to federally prosecute Epstein. Additionally, he makes more specific claims in the letter, such as Epstein allegedly being tipped off before the execution of a search warrant, a former AUSA in this office representing individuals aligned with Epstein, and an unprecedented level of secrecy between our office and the FBI, where this office allegedly did not tell the FBI of the non-prosecution agreement until it had been executed.

We cannot investigate ourselves, and maintain an appearance of impartiality. The allegations in [REDACTED] letter go to the investigation and resolution of the case against Epstein, rather than the manner in which this office treated the victims under the CVRA, which is the subject of the litigation.

I believe [REDACTED] request for an investigation should be referred to the DOJ Office of Professional Responsibility.

[REDACTED]