

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

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

JANE DOE,

Plaintiff,

v.

JEFFREY EPSTEIN,

Defendants.

---

**Joint Stipulation Of Mootness Regarding Plaintiff's Emergency Motion For Hearing Finding That Epstein Is In Civil Contempt Of The Court's Two Orders Forbidding Harassment And Indirect Contact, For Appropriate Sanctions, And Additional Remedies Including Referral For Criminal Contempt**

Plaintiff, JANE DOE and Defendant, JEFFREY EPSTEIN ("Epstein"), hereby file their Joint Stipulation of Mootness Regarding Plaintiff's Emergency Motion for Hearing Finding That Epstein Is In Civil Contempt of the Court's Two Orders Forbidding Harassment And Indirect Contact, For Appropriate Sanctions, And Additional Remedies Including Referral for Criminal Contempt (the "Motion for Contempt"), and each state:

1. On July 2, 2010, Plaintiff filed the Motion for Contempt and an associated Motion to file same under seal. (DE )
2. The parties have resolved the above lawsuit.
3. Plaintiff's counsel has been advised that the investigator was hired by Defense Counsel and was supervised by Defense Counsel.
4. Defense counsel hired the investigators following the exchange that occurred at the June 12, 2009 hearing on Defendant's Motion to Stay the cases. See Composite Exhibit

“A” at pages 26-30 & 33-34. For instance, the court asked Plaintiffs’ attorneys the following questions:

**The Court:** [] So again, I just want to make sure that if the cases go forward and if Mr. Epstein defends the case as someone ordinarily would defend a case being prosecuted against him or her, that that in and of itself is not going to cause him to be subject to criminal prosecution?

\*\*\*

**The Court:** You agree he should be able to take the ordinary steps that a defendant in a civil action can take and not be concerned about having to be prosecuted?

\*\*\*

**The Court:** Okay. But again, you’re in agreement with everyone else so far that’s spoken on behalf of a plaintiff that defending the case in the normal course of conducting discovery and filing motions would not be a breach?

**Mr. Horowitz – counsel for Jane Does 2-7:** Subject to your rulings, of course, yes.

\*\*\*

**The Court:** But you’re not taking the position that other than possibly doing something in litigation which is any other discovery, motion practice, investigations that someone would ordinarily do in the course of defending a civil case would constitute a violation of the agreement? (Ex. “A,” p.34).

**Ms. Villafana:** No, your honor. I mean, civil litigation is civil litigation, and being able to take discovery is part of what civil litigation is all about... But. . . , Mr. Epstein is entitled to take the deposition of a Plaintiff and to subpoena records, etc.

5. Putting aside certain fact disputes between the Plaintiff, defendant and their respective investigators to what occurred, both parties agree the issues are moot and warrant no further action. Accordingly, the Motion for Contempt should be deemed moot and an order should be entered withdrawing same on that basis.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff and Defendant requests that the Court enter and order finding the above Motion for Contempt as moot, and grant any additional relief the Court deems just and proper.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Robert D. Critton, Jr.  
ROBERT D. CRITTON, JR., ESQ.  
Florida Bar No. 224162

**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 via transmission of Notices of Electronic Filing generated by CM/ECF on this \_\_\_ day of July, 2010:

Brad Edwards, Esq.  
Farmer, Jaffe, Weissing, Edwards, Fistos  
& Lehrman, PL  
425 N. Andrews Ave.  
Suite #2  
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301  
P [REDACTED]  
F [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Jack Alan Goldberger, Esq.  
Atterbury Goldberger & Weiss, P.A.  
250 Australian Avenue South  
Suite 1400  
West Palm Beach, FL 33401-5012  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
*Co-Counsel for Defendant Jeffrey Epstein*

Paul G. Cassell, Esq.  
*Pro Hac Vice*  
332 South 1400 E, Room 101  
Salt Lake City, UT 84112  
[REDACTED]  
*Co-counsel for Plaintiff*

By: /s/ Robert D. Critton, Jr.  
ROBERT D. CRITTON, JR., ESQ.  
Florida Bar No. 224162  
[REDACTED]

MICHAEL J. PIKE, ESQ.  
Florida Bar #617296  
[REDACTED]  
BURMAN, CRITTON, LUTTIER & COLEMAN, LLP  
303 Banyan Boulevard, Suite 400  
West Palm Beach, FL 33401  
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

*(Co-Counsel for Defendant Jeffrey Epstein)*