

From: Paul Cassell <[REDACTED]>

To: [REDACTED] Brad Edwards <[REDACTED]>

Cc: [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: Proposed Meeting Dates and Proposed Statement of Facts

Date: Thu, 28 Oct 2010 20:51:54 +0000

Importance: Normal

Hey [REDACTED]

1. Thanks for getting back to us – based on the judge’s order today, it looks like he wants us to try and resolve it and otherwise move quickly.
2. Looking at my schedule, I can fly to Florida for a meeting on the morning of the 16th. Would we meet in Miami?
3. We would very much like to talk substance with the U.S. Attorney – not haggle over factual details. Therefore, we would like to sort through all of the facts in this case as quickly as possible. I understand that both you and [REDACTED] are leaving shortly. Do you have time today or tomorrow to finish up our discussion on the facts. I think we should get through each of the facts we propose and determine if you can stipulate and, if not, how (if at all) the stipulation can be reworded so avoid any concerns you might have.
4. To move the process along, I think you should send us a note about which facts you can stipulate to. It seems to me that you should be able to immediately stipulate to facts 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 surrounding the facts of the case. 7, 8, and 9 are all sourced by e-mails. 10 involves a question of [REDACTED] intent – perhaps we could list what our position is on what the intent was and then have you explain what your position is on what the intent was. 11 and 12 are sourced by e-mails. 13 is partially sourced by e-mails. We then have our position on what the “marching orders” were. You could list your position on what the “marching orders” were – attaching any relevant documents and/or correspondence that would prove your position or that you rely upon in formulating your position. 15 is sourced by an e-mail. 16 were are willing to remove, at this time, if it would further our efforts to reach a resolution. 17 and 18 are sourced by e-mails. On 19, we could list our reasonable inference and you could give, instead, your position as to why the U.S. Attorney’s Office entered into the confidentiality provision, again attaching any relevant documents or correspondence or e-mails that are relevant to this issue. 20 is sourced by an e-mail. 21 is sourced by an FBI 302, although you have refused to provide it to us. Could you confirm that this is accurate and then attach the 302 as the source? Obviously our client is at a significant disadvantage because she did not take notes during the meeting. We believe that your “best efforts” obligation requires you to make this information available to her. If you continue to persist in the view that CVRA rights do not attach to our clients in this case, we may be forced to file a motion on this issue – of prevail on the U.S. Attorney to extend us CVRA rights in this case. As you know, we still have outstanding to you a request for you to explain how we should tee up this case procedurally to reach a fair resolution for all concerned. 22 is based on our client’s view. If you disagree with our client’s view, perhaps we could list you view of what our client’s views are and the basis for your op-inion. 22-31 are all sourced by e-mails or CVRA notices or other indisputable sources. 32 could be handled similarly to 22. 33-35 seem indisputable. 36 and 37 are based on the Edwards affidavit. [REDACTED] could give a contrary affidavit if she disagrees. 38 is sourced by an e-mail. 39 is backed up by a letter. 40 is based on a victim notification. 41-43 are court proceedings. 44-49 rests on pleadings and court hearings. 50 - 54 are based on the Edwards affidavits and court docket records. 55 seems indisputable. Please let us know quickly how you propose to resolve all this. I am available all day today and all day tomorrow to work with you on this and I think Brad has some time as well.
5. As you know, we have been trying to get a government stipulation on facts since about August 2008 – and you have now had our proposed facts for nearly a week. So can we move forward on this soon?

Thanks for getting back to us – we continue to look forward to working with you. Please tell the U.S Attorney how much we appreciate him making time for us to meet with him. I know that Jane Doe #1 and Jane Doe #2 really appreciate it and are excited to hear that their CVRA case is now moving forward towards a resolution.

Paul Cassell

Co-Counsel for Jane Doe

Paul G. Cassell
Ronald N. Boyce Presidential Professor of Criminal Law

[REDACTED]
Salt Lake City, UT 84112-0730

[REDACTED]
<http://www.law.utah.edu/profiles/default.asp?PersonID=57&name=Cassell,Paul>

CONFIDENTIAL: This electronic message - along with any/all attachments - is confidential. This message is intended only for the use of the addressee. If you are not the intended recipient, the person responsible to deliver it to 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. Thank you.

From: [REDACTED] (SAFLS) [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: Thursday, October 28, 2010 1:51 PM
To: Paul Cassell; Brad Edwards
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Proposed Meeting Dates

Paul and Brad,

Are both of you available to meet on November 16, 18, or 19? We cannot meet sooner because I will be on government travel to the National Advocacy Center in Columbia, SC, from November 2-10, 2010, and [REDACTED] will be on annual leave from November 1 through November 12, 2010.

Thanks.

[REDACTED]