

From: [REDACTED]

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: 2422(b) based upon telephone contact

Date: Fri, 21 Dec 2007 15:49:03 +0000

Importance: Normal

Hi [REDACTED] -- I read that case. Fascinating stuff. Can I ask why you chose 2425 instead of 2422(b) [using a facility of interstate commerce to induce a minor to engage in prostitution]?

And any chance you could send me a copy of the indictment?

Thank you so much.

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Friday, December 21, 2007 10:44 AM

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: 2422(b) based upon telephone contact

[REDACTED] -- I did a 2425 prosecution (USA v. Giordano, 442 F.3d 30 (2d Cir. 2006)), in which the 2d Cir. held that a cellular telephone was a facility of interstate commerce, even when the offending calls were intrastate. Good luck. [REDACTED]

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Tuesday, December 18, 2007 9:07 AM

To: USAEO-PSC-Coordinators

Subject: 2422(b) based upon telephone contact

Hi everyone -- Sorry to trouble you, but I have a defense attorney who is claiming that NO ONE has ever been prosecuted anywhere in the United States for a violation of 2422(b) based exclusively on the use of a telephone as the facility of interstate commerce. I know that is false because I have prosecuted two of these, but it would be really helpful if you could provide me with examples of other cases throughout the country.

Thank you so much.