

**From:** "[REDACTED] (USAFLS)"

**To:** "[REDACTED]"

**Cc:** "[REDACTED]"

**Subject:** FW: Epstein

**Date:** Wed, 28 Nov 2007 21:48:48 +0000

**Importance:** Normal

---

Hi [REDACTED] -- This is the first that I have heard about another attempt to meet with someone in Washington. I thought I would give you a heads up.

Hope all is well, [REDACTED]

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

P [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

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

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

**Sent:** Wednesday, November 28, 2007 4:35 PM

**To:** [REDACTED] (USAFLS)

**Subject:** Fw: Epstein

[REDACTED],  
Can u send Jay the proposed letter and redact the names? Thx,  
[REDACTED]

-----  
Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

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

**From:** Jay Lefkowitz <[REDACTED]>

**To:** [REDACTED] (USAFLS)

**Cc:** Acosta, Alex (USAFLS)

**Sent:** Wed Nov 28 16:29:09 2007

**Subject:** Re: Epstein

Dear [REDACTED]:

I received your email yesterday and was a little surprised at the tone of your letter, given the fact that we spoke last week and had what I thought was a productive meeting. I was especially surprised given that your letter arrived on only the second day back to work after the Thanksgiving Holiday, and yet your demands regarding timing suggest that I have been sitting on my hands for days.

You should know that the first time I learned about Judge Davis's selection of Podhurst and Josephsberg, and indeed the first time I ever heard their names, was in our meeting with you on Wednesday of last week.

EFTA00214836

Nevertheless, I have now been able to confer with my client, and we have determined that the selection of Podhurst and Josephsberg are acceptable to us, reserving, of course, our previously stated objections to the manner in which you have interpreted the section 2255 portions of the Agreement.

We do, however, strongly and emphatically object to your sending a letter to the alleged victims. Without a fair opportunity to review and the ability to make objections to this letter, it is completely unacceptable that you would send it without our consideration. Additionally, given that the US Attorney's office has made clear it cannot vouch for the claims of the victims, it would be incendiary and inappropriate for your Office to send such a letter. Indeed, because it is a certainty that any such letter would immediately be leaked to the press, your actions will only have the effect of injuring Mr. Epstein and promoting spurious civil litigation directed at him. We believe it is entirely unprecedented, and in any event, inappropriate for the Government to be the instigator of such lawsuits.

Finally, we disagree with your view that you are required to notify the alleged victims pursuant to the Justice for All Act of 2004. First, 18 USC section 2255, the relevant statute under the Non-Prosecution Agreement for the settlement of civil remedies, does not have any connection to the Justice for All Act. Section 2255 was enacted as part of a different statute. Second, the Justice for All Act refers to restitution, and section 2255 is not a restitution statute. It is a civil remedy. As you know, we had offered to provide a restitution fund for the alleged victims in this matter; however that option was rejected by your Office. Had that option been chosen, we would not object to your notifying the alleged victims at this point. At this juncture, however, we do not accept your contention that there is a requirement that the government notify the alleged victims of a potential civil remedy in this case.

Accordingly, for all the reasons we have stated above, we respectfully -- and firmly -- object to your sending any letter whatsoever to the alleged victims in this matter. Furthermore, if a letter is to be sent to these individuals, we believe we should have a right to review and make objections to that submission prior to it being sent to any alleged victims. We also request that if your Office believes that it must send a letter to go to the alleged victims, who still have not been identified to us, it should happen only after Mr. Epstein has entered his plea. This letter should then come from the attorney representative, and not from the Government, to avoid any bias.

As you know, Judge Starr has requested a meeting with Assistant Attorney General Fisher to address what we believe is the unprecedented nature of the section 2255 component of the Agreement. We are hopeful that this meeting will take place as early as next week. Accordingly, we respectfully request that we postpone our discussion of sending a letter to the alleged victims until after that meeting. We strongly believe that rushing to send any letter out this week is not the wisest manner in which to proceed. Given that Mr. Epstein will not even enter his plea for another few weeks, time is clearly not of the essence regarding any notification to the identified individuals.

Thanks very much,

Jay

"[REDACTED] (USAFSL)" <[REDACTED]>

11/27/2007 01:55 PM

To

"Jay Lefkowitz" <[REDACTED]>

cc

"Acosta, Alex (USAFSL)" <[REDACTED]>

Subject

Epstein

Jay,

Please accept my apologies for not getting back to you sooner but I was a little under the weather yesterday. I hope that you enjoyed your Thanksgiving.

Regarding the issue of due diligence concerning Judge Davis' selection, I'd like to make a few observations. First, Guy Lewis has known for some time that Judge Davis was making reasonable efforts to secure Aaron Podhurst and Bob Josephsberg for this assignment. In fact, when I told you of Judge Davis's selection during our meeting last Wednesday, November 21st, you and Professor Dershowitz seemed very comfortable, and certainly not surprised, with the selection. Podhurst and Josephsberg are no strangers to nearly the entire Epstein defense team including Guy Lewis, Lili Ann Sanchez, Roy Black, and, apparently, Professor Dershowitz who said he knew Mr. Josephsberg from law school. Second, Podhurst and Josephsberg have long-standing stellar reputations for their legal acumen and ethics. It's hard for me to imagine how much more vetting needs to be done.

The United States has a statutory obligation (Justice for All Act of 2004) to notify the victims of the anticipated upcoming events and their rights associated with the agreement entered into by the United States and Mr. Epstein in a timely fashion. Tomorrow will make one full week since you were formally notified of the selection. I must insist that the vetting process come to an end. Therefore, unless you provide me with a good faith objection to Judge Davis's selection by COB tomorrow, November 28, 2007, I will authorize the notification of the victims. Should you give me the go-ahead on Podhurst and Josephsberg selection by COB tomorrow, I will simultaneously send you a draft of the letter. I intend to notify the victims by letter after COB Thursday, November 29th. Thanks,

■

\*\*\*\*\*

The information contained in this communication is confidential, may be attorney-client privileged, may constitute inside information, and is intended only for the use of the addressee. It is the property of Kirkland & Ellis LLP or Kirkland & Ellis International LLP. Unauthorized use, disclosure or copying of this communication or any part thereof is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by return e-mail or by e-mail to [postmaster@kirkland.com](mailto:postmaster@kirkland.com), and destroy this communication and all copies thereof, including all attachments.

\*\*\*\*\*