

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

Case No. 9:08-80736-Civ-Marra/Johnson

JANE DOE #1 and JANE DOE #2

v.

UNITED STATES
_____ /

**JANE DOE NO. 1 AND JANE DOE NO. 2'S NOTICE OF WITHDRAWAL OF
REQUEST FOR FURTHER NAMES FROM THE GOVERNMENT**

COME NOW Jane Doe No. 1 and Jane Doe No. 2 (the "petitioners"), by and through undersigned counsel, to file this notice that that they have conferred with the Government and obtained the information that they need, at this time, about the names of individuals that the Government confirmed to be Jeffrey Epstein's sex abuse victims at the time it negotiated the non-prosecution agreement (NPA).

The Court had ordered the Government to confer with petitioners' counsel regarding disclosure of Jeffrey Epstein's victims' names. DE 330 at 24. The Government conferred with counsel, and that conferral confirmed, in general terms, that petitioners' counsel already had knowledge of the names of the persons the Government identified to be victims. And, indeed, the conferral indicated that petitioners' counsel had knowledge of the names of many other victims as well. The Government, however, believes it needs additional direction from the Court before producing a formal list of victims' names. The Government has advised the Court, without supporting legal argument or citation of authority, that disclosing the names to petitioners' counsel would violate state and federal law. DE 332 at 4. The Government also informed the Court that

“to avoid unnecessary litigation,” it was “attempting to determine whether any of the named individuals will consent to the disclosure of their names and whether the petitioners are already aware of some (or all) of the names.” DE 332 at 4.

The reason for alerting the Court to this development is that on July 24, 2015, counsel for several sex abuse victims of Jeffrey Epstein, filed a statement that they did not want their identities disclosed to petitioners’ counsel at this time. DE 335 at 1. In light of that statement, on July 27, 2015, the Court entered a supplemental order indicating that the Government need not disclose the names of victims to petitioners’ counsel until the Court has evaluated the Government’s position that doing so would violate federal and state law. DE 336 at 2.

In the interest of avoiding the need for the Government to draft a brief on this issue, for the petitioners to respond, and for the Court to rule, petitioners’ counsel now notifies the Court that they are withdrawing their request for further production of names from the Government at this time. Petitioners now believe that their list of victims includes all of those identified by the Government, and then some, making this debate unnecessary.

The petitioners do not concede that disclosure of the names would violate any (unspecified) federal or state law.¹ In fact, it is essential that petitioners have the names of each identified victim for the purposes of completely and adequately prosecuting this action. And, should a future dispute or other circumstance making a missing name relevant to these proceeding arise, the petitioners

¹ With regard to federal law, court-ordered disclosure of sex abuse victims names to legal counsel occurs regularly, for example when the name is provided to defense counsel in a sex abuse case. And with regard to state law, the Supremacy Clause, U.S. Const. art. VI, would necessarily dictate that a federal court order requiring production would supersede any conflicting state law. Petitioners’ counsel would request that opportunity to provide additional briefing on these points should the Court wish to rule on these issues.

reserve the right to reassert their request for the names to be formally provided by the Government.

But at this juncture, it appears that no further litigation on this point is required.²

CONCLUSION

In light of Jane Doe No. 1 and Jane Doe No. 2's withdrawal of their request for the Government to produce names to their counsel, the petitioners respectfully submit that the Court need not take any further action on this issue.

DATED: July 31, 2015

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Bradley J. Edwards

Bradley J. Edwards
FARMER, JAFFE, WEISSING,
EDWARDS, FISTOS & LEHRMAN, ■■■

425 North Andrews Avenue, Suite 2

Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33301

Telephone ■■■■■■

Facsimile ■■■■■■

E-mail: ■■■■■■

And

Paul G. Cassell

Pro Hac Vice

S.J. Quinney College of Law at the
University of Utah*

332 S. 1400 E.

Salt Lake City, UT 84112

Telephone: ■■■■■■

Facsimile: ■■■■■■

E-Mail: ■■■■■■

Attorneys for Jane Does No. 1, 2, 3 and 4

² The Court has also ordered that “under no circumstances shall [a] victim’s name appear in nay court document unless filed under seal.” DE 336 at 2. Petitioners’ counsel are aware of this order and will, of course, scrupulously abide by it.

* This daytime business address is provided for identification and correspondence purposes only and is not intended to imply institutional endorsement by the University of Utah

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that the foregoing document was served on July 31, 2015, on the following using the

Court's CM/ECF system and/or U.S. mail:

Dexter Lee
A. Marie Villafaña
500 S. Australian Ave., Suite 400
West Palm Beach, FL 33401

Fax: [REDACTED]

E-mail: [REDACTED]

E-mail: [REDACTED]

Attorneys for the Government

And on

Robert C. Josefsberg
Podhurst Orseck, [REDACTED]
City National Bank Bldg.
25 W. Flagler Street, Suite 800
Miami, FL 33130

Attorneys for Settled Victims

/s/ Bradley J. Edwards