

DRAFT 1

Tina [REDACTED]
Editor
Daily Beast
New York, NY

Re Jeffrey Epstein

Dear Ms. [REDACTED]

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] [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.

Without in anyway providing each inaccuracy, just several examples should illustrate the seriousness with which we view the issue, and our request for your intervention:

1. One of the two principal sources for Ms. [REDACTED] articles is a former Miami bookkeeper for the modeling agency MC2, see eg 7-22-10 article, bulletpoint 5. Her name is [REDACTED]. She plead guilty to grand theft in the first degree in the 11th Judicial Circuit Court for Dade County, Florida, on December 3, 2007 and was sentenced to 1 year of community control and 19 years of probation as a result of her embezzling \$148,000 from the modeling agencies for which she was employed (Case No F07-10933). She was also charged with Organized Fraud – Scheme to Defraud. She is an untrustworthy biased source of information. The information regarding her criminal charge and conviction and its direct relationship to her motive to give false testimony was available to your reporter but omitted from her articles;
2. Mr. Epstein did not, as your articles claim, see eg 7-22-10 bullet point 4, give Mr Brunel \$1,000,000 to start his modeling agency;
3. Despite both a state and federal investigation, Mr. Epstein has never been charged – and never participated – in wrongful conduct, particularly molesting three 12 year olds as alleged by Ms. [REDACTED] in her articles, see eg 7-21-10 nor has this allegation been made in prior civil cases as alleged by Ms. [REDACTED];
4. No civil plaintiff has ever been on Mr. Epstein’s planes or named in his flight logs, compare to Ms [REDACTED] allegations on 7-22-10;
5. [REDACTED] was not 14 when she came to the United States and is not 24 at the time of Ms. [REDACTED] 7-21-10 article;
6. Ms. [REDACTED], who is quoted by Ms. [REDACTED] in her 7-21-10 article as saying that Mr. Epstein told her the “younger the better” also told the Palm Beach police in the very same tape recorded interview that Mr. Epstein said “*he likes the girls that are between the ages of like 18 and 20*” ([REDACTED], Taped Interview, pg. 12);
7. Mr. Epstein never “committed” nor even considered (much less agreed) to a 10 year federal sentence (compare to Ms [REDACTED] 7-21-10 contention);
8. Ms. [REDACTED] second unreliable source of information, plaintiffs attorney [REDACTED] Edwards, see 7-21-10 article, is being sued by Mr. Epstein for wrongdoing related to his partnership with Scott Rothstein, another important fact about motivation that was omitted from the series of [REDACTED] articles;

9. 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;
10. Mr. Epstein has not been accused of “sex trafficking”, nor has he committed “sex trafficking” nor is he being investigated for “sex trafficking” despite Ms. [REDACTED] allegations, see articles of 7-21-10 bullet point 4 and 7-29-10 and despite Ms [REDACTED] stating in her 7-29-10 article that federal sources declined to comment on such an incendiary allegation;
11. 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