

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

**CASE NO. 17 Civ 616 (JGK)**

JANE DOE 43,

Plaintiff,

vs.

JEFFREY EPSTEIN, GHISLAINE  
MAXWELL, [REDACTED], LESLEY  
GROFF, AND [REDACTED]

Defendants.

**NOTICE OF MOTION FOR SANCTIONS**

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE, that Defendants Jeffrey Epstein (“Epstein”) and Lesley Groff (“Groff”) (together, “Defendants”), upon the pleadings and prior proceedings had herein, and on the grounds stated below, intend to move this Court before the Honorable John G. Koeltl at the United States Courthouse, 500 Pearl Street, New York, New York, for an Order pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 11(c), sanctioning Plaintiff and Plaintiff’s counsel, together with such other relief as this Court deems just and proper.

The grounds for sanction are as follows.

*First*, on January 26, 2017, the Plaintiff filed a Complaint in the above-captioned matter.

*Second*, on May 15, 2017, the Defendants served a letter on Plaintiff detailing the many deficiencies in the Complaint, including, but not limited to, the failure of the Complaint to a) allege a legally sufficient claim as to either Defendant, b) identify the statutes allegedly violated by the Defendants, c) establish that the claims in the Complaint are not barred by applicable statute of limitations, d) establish personal jurisdiction over the Defendants, and e) establish that venue is properly laid in this District (“Deficiency Letter”).

*Third*, on June 5, 2017, the Plaintiff filed and served the First Amended Complaint (“FAC”). The FAC failed to correct any of the deficiencies in the Complaint that were described in detail in the Deficiency Letter, including, but not limited to, the following:

- a) the allegations in the FAC do not support a plausible claim that Plaintiff is a victim of sex trafficking, as opposed to a willing participant in an adult relationship in which she received an Upper East Side lifestyle and other benefits;
- b) the FAC fails to allege facts sufficient to support any violation of the statutes alleged;
- c) the claim in the FAC is barred by the longest possible statute of limitations;
- d) the FAC fails to establish that the Court possesses personal jurisdiction over the Defendants; and
- e) the FAC fails to establish that venue is properly laid in the Southern District of New York.

*Finally*, Plaintiff’s deposition testimony, and the documents that she produced, in the action captioned [REDACTED] *v. Maxwell*, No. 15 Civ. 7433 (RWS) (the “[REDACTED] action”) further demonstrate that the FAC should be dismissed for the reasons set forth above and in the Deficiency Letter, and that Plaintiff and Plaintiff’s counsel filed the FAC for improper purposes.

PLEASE TAKE FURTHER NOTICE that, pursuant to Rule 11(c)(2), Plaintiff has a period of 21 days within which to take corrective action and voluntarily dismiss the FAC with prejudice before Defendants file their Rule 11 motion seeking all appropriate relief, including, but not limited to, an order dismissing the FAC and holding each of the Plaintiff and her counsel

liable for all of Defendants' reasonable attorneys' fees and costs incurred in connection with the Complaint and the FAC and directing Plaintiff and her counsel to pay the same.

Dated: July 21, 2017

STEPTOE & JOHNSON, LLP  
By /s/ Michael C. Miller  
Michael C. Miller  
Justin Y.K. Chu  
Michael Keough  
Attorneys for Defendants  
JEFFREY EPSTEIN & LESLEY GROFF

To:

FARMER, JAFFE, WEISSING,  
EDWARDS, FISTOS & LEHRMAN, P.L.  
Brad Edwards  
Attorney for Plaintiff  
Jane Doe 43

ALSTON & BIRD, LLP  
Alexander S Lorenzo  
John E. Stephenson, Jr.  
(Application for admission  
*pro hac vice* pending)  
Attorneys for Defendant [REDACTED] [REDACTED]