

The truthfulness of [REDACTED]'s allegations and testimony in [REDACTED]'s Civil Action have been severely compromised by the need to seek a [REDACTED] dollar payout to maintain [REDACTED] massive fraud. Because false settlements of tens of millions of dollars in cases relating to EPSTEIN were misrepresented to [REDACTED] in this ponzi scheme, [REDACTED] and the attorneys in the Civil Actions needed to create a fiction that included extraordinary damages. However, the truth behind the Civil Actions could never support such extraordinary damages. Unethical and illegal measures were, therefore, undertaken to create an entirely inflated value of their claims against EPSTEIN.

Though she held herself out as a "victim" of Epstein she admitted to having returned over and over again to his after her claim of abuse. For example, in the Civil Action of [REDACTED], She has now admitted, under oath, to being a [REDACTED] since the age of [REDACTED] (see Depo Transcript [REDACTED]). She testified [REDACTED], (see Depo Transcript [REDACTED]) and "[REDACTED]" (see Depo Transcript [REDACTED]). [REDACTED] admitted her activity with other than Epstein to making \$[REDACTED] on maybe more than [REDACTED] in [REDACTED]. (see Depo Transcript [REDACTED]). [REDACTED] admitted under oath to [REDACTED] (see Depo Transcript [REDACTED]); including [REDACTED] (see Depo Transcript [REDACTED]). Under the circumstances, a claim for damages against EPSTEIN, one of [REDACTED]'s [REDACTED]" during that same period, would be so incredible and certainly not likely produce the extraordinary settlements promised to "[REDACTED]."

In [REDACTED], therefore before she was represented by [REDACTED], [REDACTED] and other attorneys at [REDACTED], [REDACTED], gave sworn taped recorded testimony to the agents of the FBI speaking of EPSTEIN in only in exceptionally glowing terms and directly contradicting all of the her central allegations on which [REDACTED]'s Civil Action against Epstein is now based. However, once in the hands of [REDACTED], [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], when faced with the prospect of a settlement or verdict which [REDACTED], himself, has brazenly claimed numerous times to EPSTEIN's attorneys to be worth tens of millions of dollars, [REDACTED]'s story changed dramatically.

For example, in her sworn statement to the FBI, [REDACTED] was insistent that [REDACTED]. (See page [REDACTED] of Sworn FBI Statement). At the conclusion of that tape recorded and sworn statement she stated: [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]. (See pages [REDACTED] of Sworn FBI Statement). In fact, [REDACTED] spoke so highly of EPSTEIN and her interactions with him that the US Attorney informed a federal court in [REDACTED] that the US Attorney could not consider [REDACTED] a victim. (See excerpt from [REDACTED] Declaration – page [REDACTED])

Yet, by [REDACTED], the date on which [REDACTED] began her deposition in the Civil Action, [REDACTED]'s new and very different tale about purported sexual misconduct under the supposed influence of EPSTEIN had been thoroughly practiced and her indoctrination into the [REDACTED] scam was complete. In her deposition in the Civil Action, [REDACTED] declared that:

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

In her sworn testimony before she met [REDACTED], [REDACTED] was emphatic that her interactions with Epstein involved no inappropriate sexual touching in any way. In fact, it was exactly the opposite:

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

However, within a month after [REDACTED] brought [REDACTED] within the fold at the end of [REDACTED], [REDACTED] filed the Civil Action alleging, among other things, sexual battery of [REDACTED] by Epstein. By the time the Complaint was [REDACTED] a [REDACTED] time in [REDACTED], after [REDACTED] joined [REDACTED], the allegations against EPSTEIN in [REDACTED]'s complaint became even more salacious. In paragraph [REDACTED] of [REDACTED]'s [REDACTED] Complaint, [REDACTED] alleges among other things, that:

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

In her sworn statement, prior to being represented by [REDACTED], [REDACTED] told investigators that [REDACTED], the individual who first brought [REDACTED] to EPSTEIN's mansion, told [REDACTED]. "[REDACTED]" (see page [REDACTED], lines [REDACTED] of FBI Sworn Statement). Nevertheless, after [REDACTED]' tutelage, [REDACTED] told a very different story:

[REDACTED]

Before meeting [REDACTED], [REDACTED] testified to the FBI: [REDACTED] [REDACTED]." (see page [REDACTED], lines [REDACTED] of Sworn FBI Statement). Yet, after she met [REDACTED], when questioned about her [REDACTED]:

[REDACTED]

Before [REDACTED] represented [REDACTED], she also testified that EPSTEIN never knew she was underage:

[REDACTED]

Yet, once again, after [REDACTED] came into the picture, [REDACTED]'s new storyline became:

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED], also hired an attorney and began litigation. Her being an employee of [REDACTED], notwithstanding,

Before [REDACTED], [REDACTED] also advised federal investigators that EPSTEIN never knew that any of the girls [REDACTED] brought to EPSTEIN's mansion were underage:

[REDACTED]

However, to bolster her claims ~~in the Civil Action~~, [REDACTED] made drastically different allegations, once [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] appeared on the scene. Instead of the 18 or 19 or 20 year old women that [REDACTED] told federal investigators she brought to EPSTEIN's mansion, ~~She now testified that [REDACTED] now claimed in her deposition that she brought [REDACTED] and alleged in paragraph [REDACTED] Complaint, filed on her behalf by [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], that:~~

[REDACTED]

Before her representation by [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], when [REDACTED] was asked how long she had been going to Epstein's mansion, [REDACTED] stated "I saw him for a good year." (see page [REDACTED] lines [REDACTED] of Sworn FBI Statement). Yet, after having the benefit of counsel from [REDACTED], [REDACTED] and others at [REDACTED], [REDACTED] claimed to have been doing so [REDACTED] "a period of over [REDACTED] years. [REDACTED] tried to stick to this script at the beginning of her deposition, stating: [REDACTED]." (see Depo Transcript [REDACTED]) However, [REDACTED] was not content to leave it that, and in the middle of her deposition, sought to expand the claimed period of association with EPSTEIN, stating that she last saw EPSTEIN, "[REDACTED] [REDACTED]." (see Depo Transcript [REDACTED])

~~[REDACTED] was also emphatic before [REDACTED] that there were absolutely no drugs involved in the Epstein case:~~

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

However, realizing that she would need an explanation as to why she returned to EPSTEIN's mansion so many times after she claimed EPSTEIN had sexually abused her, under counsel by [REDACTED], [REDACTED] and others at [REDACTED], [REDACTED] rewrote the EPSTEIN tale and included outlandish claims of drug abuse in her deposition testimony:

[REDACTED]

Yet, under persistent questioning from EPSTEIN's counsel in [REDACTED]'s deposition, even [REDACTED] had to admit, consistent with her previous testimony to the FBI, that EPSTEIN had no involvement whatsoever with any claimed drug or alcohol usage:

[REDACTED]

A final example of how [REDACTED]'s representation by [REDACTED] and involvement in the [REDACTED] scam compromised [REDACTED]'s testimony in the Civil Action can be found in [REDACTED]'s characterization of others [REDACTED] brought to the Epstein mansion. In her sworn statement prior to [REDACTED]' involvement, [REDACTED] described those she brought to EPSTEIN's mansion as eager for the opportunity and content with their experiences:

[REDACTED]

However, after she became [REDACTED]' client and the Civil Actions were brought to [REDACTED], [REDACTED] flipped her statements 180 degrees. In her deposition in her [REDACTED] dollar Civil Action, not surprisingly, [REDACTED] re-characterized the experiences of those she brought:

[REDACTED]