

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA**

JANE DOE NO. 2,

Plaintiff,

vs.

JEFFREY EPSTEIN

Defendant.

CASE NO.: 08-CV-80119-MARRA/JOHNSON

JANE DOE NO. 3,

Plaintiff,

vs.

JEFFREY EPSTEIN

Defendant.

CASE NO.: 08-CV-80232-MARRA/JOHNSON

CASE NO.: 08-CV-80380-MARRA/JOHNSON

JANE DOE NO. 4,

Plaintiff,

vs.

JEFFREY EPSTEIN

Defendant.

CASE NO.: 08-CV-80381-MARRA/JOHNSON

JANE DOE NO. 5,

Doe 101 v. Epstein
Page 2

Plaintiff,

JEFFREY EPSTEIN,

Defendant.

CASE NO.: 08-80994-CIV-MARRA/JOHNSON

JANE DOE NO. 6,

Plaintiff,

JEFFREY EPSTEIN,

Defendant.

CASE NO.: 08-80993-CIV-MARRA/JOHNSON

JANE DOE NO. 7,

Plaintiff,

JEFFREY EPSTEIN

Defendant.

C.M.A.,

CASE NO.: 08-80811-CIV-MARRA/JOHNSON

Plaintiff,

JEFFREY EPSTEIN

Defendant.

JANE DOE,

CASE NO.: 08-80893-CIV-MARRA/JOHNSON

Doe 101 v. Epstein
Page 3

Plaintiff,

JEFFREY EPSTEIN et al,

Defendants.

_____ /

DOE II,

CASE NO.: 09-80469-CIV-MARRA-JOHNSON

Plaintiff,

JEFFREY EPSTEIN et al,

Defendants.

_____ /

JANE DOE NO. 101,

CASE NO.: 09-80591-CIV-MARRA-JOHNSON

Plaintiff,

JEFFREY EPSTEIN

Defendant.

_____ /

JANE DOE NO. 102,

CASE NO.: 09-80656-CIV-MARRA/JOHNSON

Plaintiff,

JEFFREY EPSTEIN,

Defendant.

_____ /

**DEFENDANT, JEFFREY EPSTEIN'S, RESPONSE TO JANE DOE NO. 101 AND JANE
DOE NO. 102'S MOTION FOR A NO CONTACT ORDER**

Doe 101 v. Epstein
Page 4

Defendant, JEFFREY EPSTEIN, (“MR. EPSTEIN”), by and through his undersigned attorneys responds to the Plaintiffs’ Jane Doe No. 101 and Jane Doe No. 102 (“Plaintiffs”) Motion for a No Contact Order [DE 113] and states:

1. Plaintiffs’ Motion was completely unnecessary and a waste of attorney time and judicial resources. Plaintiffs’ motion was filed to cast a false light on Mr. Epstein and his attorneys, and to draw attention away from the fact that many of the alleged “victims” on the referenced “list” were or are admitted prostitutes, dancers at strip clubs (Platinum Gold, Cheetah, Diamond Dolls, T’s Lounge, Flashdance, etc.) or have criminal records or warrants for their arrests, to reference only a few issues about them.

2. Plaintiffs seek an advisory opinion on an issue which does not exist. Neither Mr. Epstein nor his attorneys have initiated any contact, direct or indirect, with any alleged “victims”, nor does Plaintiffs’ counsel or any alleged person by way of affidavit alleged any type of contact, direct or indirect. The undersigned’s May 21, 2009 (**Exhibit 1** hereto) letter could not have been clearer as to the position of Mr. Epstein and his attorneys, i.e. “To my knowledge, neither Mr. Epstein nor any attorney or agent of those attorneys who represent Mr. Epstein, have contacted or attempted to contact your clients. Given that it is not Mr. Epstein’s intention to have any direct contact with your clients, it is unnecessary to respond point by point to any statements attributed to my co-counsel.” To the extent it was not clear in the undersigned’s letter, neither Mr. Epstein nor his attorneys, nor their agents intend to have any direct or indirect contact with Plaintiffs counsels’ clients. What else is there to say?

3. Is Plaintiffs’ counsel suggesting that Mr. Epstein cannot even be at the depositions of his clients as parties or witnesses? That certainly will be direct ‘eye’ contact at a

Doe 101 v. Epstein
Page 5

minimum. If that is Plaintiffs' position then Jane Doe 101 and 102, and any other matters where Plaintiffs' firm's clients are involved, should be stayed until expiration of the Non-Prosecution Agreement, otherwise Mr. Epstein will be denied his due process right of any civil party to be present at opposing party's deposition.

4. Rather than to mislead the court by providing a substantially redacted copy of the undersigned's May 18, 2009 letter, a full copy of the letter redacting only the client's full name is attached as **Exhibit 2**. The letter is important in that the Defendant and his attorneys recognize that no contact included not serving his client with a deposition subpoena through a process server, i.e. potentially an "agent" by serving her attorney. As this court will note from paragraph 2 of **Exhibit 1**, a very cautious approach was taken by Defendant and his attorneys, in stating "However, based on the position that you, Bob, have taken, I am providing/serving you with the subpoena for L.S.P.'s deposition on June 11."

5. Plaintiffs' counsel further tries to obfuscate Defendant's position by redacting the last paragraph of the May 18, 2009 letter, which states "Finally as I also indicated in our telephone conversation, your client contacted Jack Goldberger's [one of Mr. Epstein's attorneys] office last week suggesting that Jack was holding up the settlement. He did not speak with her. I don't know where Ms. P got that idea." Plaintiffs' counsel should be more concerned about controlling their own clients.

6. Rather than the Plaintiffs filing this needless, unwarranted and excessive motion where they take another shot at Mr. Epstein so they can remind the court of their alleged damages, maybe, they should focus more on the background of their own clients, including the individual referenced in the May 18, 2009 letter.

Doe 101 v. Epstein
Page 6

7. Finally, Mr. Epstein pled guilty to one count of felony solicitation (which was not related to a minor), under §796.07(2)(f), F.S. and one count of procuring a minor for prostitution under §796.03 F. S. Plaintiffs' reference to both counts being related to "minors" is again misleading and incorrect.

8. At the time of the state court plea on June 30, 2008, neither Defendant nor his counsel nor the state attorney's office had seen the "secret" list of alleged victims, i.e. Mr. Epstein was forced to agree to a list of individuals that the USAO refused to provide pre-plea. The list was not provided to Mr. Epstein's attorney until after the plea and Mr. Epstein was in jail. With the parties to the plea completely unaware who would be on the list, how then could the state plea be construed as a limitless no contact order. Mr. Epstein is doing more than the law requires.


WHEREFORE, Defendant, Mr. Epstein, requests this court deny the motion as premature and unnecessary based on the current state of the facts.

Certificate of Service

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true copy of the foregoing was electronically filed with the Clerk of the Court using CM/ECF. I also certify that the foregoing document is being served this day on all counsel of record identified on the following Service List in the manner specified by CM/ECF on this 29th day of May, 2009


Doe 101 v. Epstein
Page 7

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
ROBERT D. CRITTON, JR., ESQ.
Florida Bar No. 224162

¹
MICHAEL J. PIKE, ESQ.
Florida Bar #617296


BURMAN, CRITTON, LUTTIER & COLEMAN
515 N. Flagler Drive, Suite 400
West Palm Beach, FL 33401


(Counsel for Defendant Jeffrey Epstein)

Doe 101 v. Epstein
Page 8

Certificate of Service
Jane Doe No. 2 v. Jeffrey Epstein
Case No. 08-CV-80119-MARRA/JOHNSON

Stuart S. Mermelstein, Esq.
Adam D. Horowitz, Esq.
Mermelstein & Horowitz, P.A.
18205 Biscayne Boulevard
Suite 2218
Miami, FL 33160
305-931-2200



Counsel for Plaintiffs in Related Cases Nos. 08-80069, 08-80119, 08-80232, 08-80380, 08-80381, 08-80993, 08-80994

Richard Horace Willits, Esq.
Richard H. Willits, P.A.
2290 10th Avenue North
Suite 404
Lake Worth, FL 33461



Counsel for Plaintiff in Related Case No. 08-80811



Jack Scarola, Esq.
Jack P. Hill, Esq.
Searcy Denney Scarola Barnhart & Shipley,
P.A.

2139 Palm Beach Lakes Boulevard
West Palm Beach, FL 33409



Counsel for Plaintiff, C.M.A.

Brad Edwards, Esq.
Rothstein Rosenfeldt Adler
401 East Las Olas Boulevard
Suite 1650
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301



Counsel for Plaintiff in Related Case No. 08-80893

Paul G. Cassell, Esq.
Pro Hac Vice
332 South 1400 E, Room 101
Salt Lake City, UT 84112



Co-counsel for Plaintiff Jane Doe

Isidro M. Garcia, Esq.
Garcia Law Firm, P.A.
224 Datura Street, Suite 900
West Palm Beach, FL 33401
561-832-7732
561-832-7137 F
isidrogarcia@bellsouth.net

Counsel for Plaintiff in Related Case No. 08-80469

Robert C. Josefsberg, Esq.
Katherine W. Ezell, Esq.
Podhurst Orseck, P.A.
25 West Flagler Street, Suite 800
Miami, FL 33130




Doe 101 v. Epstein
Page 9

Bruce Reinhart, Esq.
Bruce E. Reinhart, P.A.
250 S. Australian Avenue
Suite 1400
West Palm Beach, FL 33401


Counsel for Defendant Sarah Kellen

Theodore J. Leopold, Esq.
Spencer T. Kuvin, Esq.
Ricci-Leopold, P.A.
2925 PGA Blvd., Suite 200
Palm Beach Gardens, FL 33410


Counsel for Plaintiff in Related Case No. 08-08804


Counsel for Plaintiffs in Related Cases Nos. 09-80591 and 09-80656

Jack Alan Goldberger, Esq.
Atterbury Goldberger & Weiss, P.A.
250 Australian Avenue South
Suite 1400
West Palm Beach, FL 33401-5012


Counsel for Defendant Jeffrey Epstein