

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

JANE DOE NO. 2,

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

Plaintiff,

vs.

JEFFREY EPSTEIN

Defendant.
_____ /

JANE DOE NO. 3,

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

Plaintiff,

vs.

JEFFREY EPSTEIN

Defendant.
_____ /

JANE DOE NO. 4,

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

Plaintiff,

vs.

JEFFREY EPSTEIN

Defendant.
_____ /

JANE DOE NO. 5,

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

Plaintiff,

JEFFREY EPSTEIN,

Defendant.
_____ /

Jane Doe v. Epstein

Case No. 08-CV-80119-MARRA/JOHNSON

Epstein's Response to Jane Doe's Motion to Provide Recently Obtained Affidavit of Epstein

Page 2 of 9

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.

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

C.M.A.,

Plaintiff,

JEFFREY EPSTEIN

Defendant.

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

JANE DOE,

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.

**EPSTEIN'S RESPONSE TO JANE DOE'S MOTION TO PROVIDE
RECENTLY-OBTAINED AFFIDAVIT OF JEFFREY E. EPSTEIN IN
SUPPORT OF MATERIAL FACTS SUPPORTING MOTION FOR
APPOINTMENT OF A RECEIVER TO TAKE CHARGE OF PROPERTY OF EPSTEIN**

Defendant, JEFFREY E. EPSTEIN ("Epstein"), submits this response to Plaintiff's, Jane Doe ("Jane Doe"), Motion to Provide Recently-Obtained Affidavit of Jeffrey E. Epstein in

Support of Material Facts Supporting Motion for Appointment of a receiver to Take Charge of Property of Epstein ("Motion"), and states:

1. Jane Doe seeks to supplement her Motion for Injunction Restraining Fraudulent Transfer of Assets (DE #165) ("Injunction Motion") with a "recently-obtained" affidavit of Epstein. The instant Motion was filed *after* Epstein served his Memorandum of Law in Opposition to the Injunction Motion (DE #198). Thus, if the Court were to consider this late-filed affidavit, Epstein would have no opportunity to respond to the affidavit or any arguments based thereon. Accordingly, the Court should deny Jane Doe's Motion and disregard the affidavit.

2. Rule 6(c), Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, requires "[a]ny affidavit supporting a motion *must be served* with the motion." (Emphasis added). Moreover, Local Rule 7.1C.3, U.S. District Court, Southern District Local Rules, provides "[t]o the extent a party wants the Court to consider affidavits, declarations, or other materials in support of or in opposition to the motion, then (a) the movant *must serve with the motion* all such materials. (Emphasis added).

3. Despite Jane Doe's assertion that she did not *receive* the affidavit until July 13, 2009, there is no question Epstein's affidavit was available at the time Jane Doe served her Injunction Motion as the affidavit is almost *seven years old* (dated October 2002).

4. While Jane Doe calls it a "newly-obtained affidavit," it is not newly-obtained in the sense that it could not have been discovered at the time she served her Injunction Motion.

5. Simply put, the affidavit is untimely and the Court should therefore disregard it in determining Jane Doe's Injunction Motion.

6. Moreover, consideration of the affidavit would severely prejudice Epstein because cannot respond to Jane Doe's arguments, assertions and implications regarding the affidavit since he already filed his Memorandum of Law in Opposition to the Injunction Motion (DE #198).

7. This point is illustrated by Jane Doe's Reply to her Injunction Motion (DE #217), in which she attaches as Exhibit A Epstein's 2002 affidavit (before the Court ruled on the instant Motion) and uses it to make ridiculous and untenable conclusions about fraudulent asset transfers. For example, Jane Doe cites the portion of Epstein's affidavit in which he states he provides financial advice from the U.S. Virgin Islands in securities and other matters to his clients and that he is viewed as one of Citibank's most important individual clients. See DE #217 at 12. In the very next sentence, Jane Doe asserts "[g]iven the fact that asset transfers can take place to such countries as Israel, Switzerland, and the Cayman Islands, placing the burden on Jane Doe to document fraudulent asset transfers to such destinations effectively give a green light to massive fraud – a fraud that could ultimately total in the neighborhood of one billion dollars (\$1,000,000,000.00)."

8. Jane Doe somehow takes Epstein's assertion that he provides financial advice from the Virgin Islands and is an important Citibank client to essentially suggest he is involved in a billion-dollar international fraudulent transfer scheme. Such a conclusion is absurd and is pure fiction.

9. Epstein will obviously be unfairly prejudiced by his inability to respond to these ludicrous theories.

Jane Doe v. Epstein


Case No. 08-CV-80119-MARRA/JOHNSON

Epstein's Response to Jane Doe's Motion to Provide Recently Obtained Affidavit of Epstein

Page 6 of 9

10. Accordingly, the Court should disregard the affidavit in consideration of the Injunction Motion and strike the affidavit from Jane Doe's Reply Brief (Exhibit A to DE #217).

WHEREFORE, Defendant, JEFFREY E. EPSTEIN, respectfully requests the Court deny Jane Doe's Motion, strike the affidavit from Jane Doe's Reply Brief (Exhibit A to DE #217) and grant any additional relief the Court deems just and proper.

By: 
ROBERT D. CRITTON, JR., ESQ.
Florida Bar No. 224162
MICHAEL J. PIKE, ESQ.
Florida Bar #617296
DAVID A. YAREMA, ESQ.
Florida Bar No. 12492



Jane Doe v. Epstein

Case No. 08-CV-80119-MARRA/JOHNSON


Epstein's Response to Jane Doe's Motion to Provide Recently Obtained Affidavit of Epstein

Page 7 of 9

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 5th day of August 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
ROBERT D. CRITTON, JR., ESQ.

Florida Bar No. 224162

rcrit@bclclaw.com

DAVID A. YAREMA, ESQ.

Florida Bar No. 12492

dyarema@bclclaw.com

BURMAN, CRITTON, LUTTIER & COLEMAN

515 N. Flagler Drive, Suite 400

West Palm Beach, FL 33401

561/842-2820 Phone

561/515-3148 Fax

Counsel for Defendant, Jeffrey Epstein

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

Fax: 305-931-0877

ssm@sexabuseattorney.com

ahorowitz@sexabuseattorney.com

Counsel for Plaintiffs

Brad Edwards, Esq.

Rothstein Rosenfeldt Adler

401 East Las Olas Boulevard

Suite 1650

Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301

Phone: 954-522-3456

Fax: 954-527-8663

bedwards@rra-law.com

Counsel for Plaintiff in Related Case No.

08-80893

Jane Doe v. Epstein

Case No. 08-CV-80119-MARRA/JOHNSON

Epstein's Response to Jane Doe's Motion to Provide Recently Obtained Affidavit of Epstein

Page 8 of 9

*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

561-582-7600

Fax: 561-588-8819

Counsel for Plaintiff in Related Case No.

08-80811

reelrhw@hotmail.com

Jack Scarola, Esq.

Jack P. Hill, Esq.

Searcy Denney Scarola Barnhart & Shipley,
P.A.

2139 Palm Beach Lakes Boulevard

West Palm Beach, FL 33409

561-686-6300

Fax: 561-383-9424

jsx@searcylaw.com

jph@searcylaw.com

Counsel for Plaintiff, C.M.A.

Bruce Reinhart, Esq.

Bruce E. Reinhart, P.A.

250 S. Australian Avenue

Suite 1400

West Palm Beach, FL 33401

561-202-6360

Fax: 561-828-0983

ecf@brucereinhardt.com

Counsel for Defendant [REDACTED]

Theodore J. Leopold, Esq.

Spencer T. Kuvin, Esq.

Ricci-Leopold, P.A.

Paul G. Cassell, Esq.

Pro Hac Vice

332 South 1400 E, Room 101

Salt Lake City, UT 84112

801-585-5202

801-585-6833 Fax

cassellp@law.utah.edu

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

305 358-2800

Fax: 305 358-2382

rjosefsberg@podhurst.com

kezell@podhurst.com

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

561-659-8300

Fax: 561-835-8691

jagesq@bellsouth.net

Counsel for Defendant Jeffrey Epstein

Jane Doe v. Epstein

Case No. 08-CV-80119-MARRA/JOHNSON

Epstein's Response to Jane Doe's Motion to Provide Recently Obtained Affidavit of Epstein

Page 9 of 9

2925 PGA Blvd., Suite 200

Palm Beach Gardens, FL 33410

561-684-6500

Fax: 561-515-2610

Counsel for Plaintiff in Related Case No.

08-08804

skuvin@riccilaw.com

tleopold@riccilaw.com