

DRAFT 1

Tina Brown
Editor
Daily Beast
New York, NY

Re Jeffrey Epstein

Dear Ms. Brown

This letter is written for the purpose of requesting that you review both the accuracy of a series of past articles originating with the Daily Beast, each authored by one of the Daily Beast's contributing writers, [REDACTED], and the appropriateness of the Daily Beast disseminating any further articles about Mr. Epstein – a very real likelihood, given an email sent to our client by the writer, absent your intervention. We ask you to conduct this review for the purpose of determining (a) whether the facts as stated in the prior (and the prospective future) articles are accurate and (b) whether the intensity of multiple repetitive articles is appropriate.

Mr. Epstein, as you may know, has completed his state sentence for events that occurred over five years ago. There have been no allegations of any improper conduct since the fall of 2005. Mr Epstein, instead, has returned to his life as a philanthropist and financial advisor. The series of three articles published on July 21, July 22, and July 29, 2010 have already done significant damage to Mr. Epstein. Given that they contain provably untruthful inaccuracies and omissions of material fact, we are asking you to defer any future articles authored by Ms. [REDACTED] until such a time as you can review the articles, and, if possible, meet with us to discuss the subject matter.

floridas history just as she omitted any context for the allegations attributed to the prior bookkeeper [REDACTED], see par 1 supra;

~~106.~~ 7 plaintiffs did not each receive \$1,000,000 during the week of July 14, 2010 as claimed by Ms [REDACTED], see 7-22-10;

~~117.~~ Mr. Epstein has not been accused of “sex trafficking”, nor has he committed “sex trafficking” nor is he, to the knowledge of any of his attorneys, being investigated for “sex trafficking” despite Ms. [REDACTED] repeated allegations to the contrary, see articles of 7-21-10 bullet point 4 and 7-29-10. Given Ms [REDACTED] concession in her 7-29-10 article that federal sources declined to comment on such an incendiary allegation we would question whether there exists a trustworthy source for this claim;

~~12. Dr. Stephen Alexander’s telephone has not been disconnected with no forwarding number as claimed by Ms. [REDACTED] in her July 29, 2010 article~~

We request that you conduct an independent review of the integrity of the three prior articles and delay disseminating a fourth until after the review. We remain available to meet with you

YT