

From: "[REDACTED]" <[REDACTED]>

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

Subject: RE: Epstein update

Date: Thu, 06 Mar 2008 13:46:00 +0000

Importance: Normal

That's not a bad idea. I don't need the names or any identifying information. Thanks, [REDACTED].

From: [REDACTED]. (USAFLS) [mailto:[REDACTED]]

Sent: Thursday, March 06, 2008 8:19 AM

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: Epstein update

Hi [REDACTED] – I am running off to court but should be back by 10:30. Do you want me to redact the names or anything to prevent any unintentional leaks to the defense? They are very good at extracting information, they even got me by around the 6th meeting.

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, March 05, 2008 6:35 PM

To: [REDACTED] (USAFLS); [REDACTED]. (USAFLS); Acosta, Alex (USAFLS); [REDACTED] (USAFLS)

Cc: [REDACTED] (USAFLS); [REDACTED] (USAFLS)

Subject: RE: Epstein update

Thanks for the information, [REDACTED]. We have a March 12th meeting scheduled with Epstein's lawyers. I plan to conduct the review as expeditiously as I possibly can. It is difficult to be more definitive than that, however, because the defense has yet to provide me with an outline of the matters they wish me to review and they have also suggested that more than one meeting may be necessary. I can't imagine there will be any need for more than one meeting.

I think your updated prosecution memorandum should be part of my review, so, unless someone down there disagrees, please send it.

Thanks again.

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED] (USAFLS) [mailto:[REDACTED]]

Sent: Wednesday, March 05, 2008 6:10 PM

To: [REDACTED]. (USAFLS); Acosta, Alex (USAFLS); [REDACTED] (USAFLS); [REDACTED]

Cc: [REDACTED] (USAFLS); [REDACTED] (USAFLS)

Subject: RE: Epstein update

Let's finish the review of the package. Where is it at in the process ?

From: [REDACTED]. (USAFLS)
Sent: Wednesday, March 05, 2008 4:55 PM
To: Acosta, Alex (USAFLS); [REDACTED] (USAFLS); [REDACTED]; [REDACTED] (USAFLS)
Cc: [REDACTED] (USAFLS); [REDACTED] (USAFLS)
Subject: Epstein update

Hi all – I wanted to update you on a couple of new developments in the Epstein case. First, [REDACTED] is supposed to give a press conference today announcing the filing of a third lawsuit against Epstein. That case also involves a victim whom we are no longer referring to in the indictment [REDACTED – please do not tell that to the defense.] [REDACTED] seems to have latched onto the [REDACTED] group which, as discussed in my third addendum to the pros memo, we have already decided to forego for the most part.

[REDACTED] – Since I am not certain of the scope of your meeting, I do not know how critical it is for you to see the new facts developed in the supplemental pros memos (you reviewed the initial pros memo from May of last year). If you would like the supplements, please let me know. The legal theories have remained the same.

I also wanted to call to everyone's attention the three-year statute of limitations in Florida for the state solicitation offenses. The statute will run for all the victims this summer. Once it runs we cannot insist on a state court plea to a new charge. It also means that the state cannot charge the crimes related to the victims discovered after the initial investigation. We have asked the Palm Beach Police Department to forego presenting those charges for state prosecution in deference to our prosecution. If we do not intend to go forward, it is imperative that we communicate that to the Police Department as soon as possible so they can present those victims for state prosecution.

I have reserved time with the grand jury on the 18th. I had hoped to present the indictment at that time, but in light of [REDACTED] communication with Jay, I will push it off until the 25th. I would still like to start the presentation on the 18th so we aren't accused of rushing the grand jury. So, I hope that the final indictment packet will be approved by that date.

Thank you.

