

From: "jeffrey E." <jeevacation@gmail.com>

To: Brad Edwards <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Re: settlement purposes only

Date: Tue, 15 Sep 2015 09:53:53 +0000

thanks for your response -re dersh. as you sent an offer of judgement for 199k and so did paul , if he paid both, would that be it.? I think we should try for a global settlement. if we can't get there we can retreat to pieces. re cvra. as they are representing victims in gnenaral. , getting money to walk away would be a pr issue and not be appropriate. legally it is not difficult. however the pr for you , the case and paul would need to drive the solution , what could the govt do to satisfy your needs? . the edwards epstein case. my proposal was that you choose a number from zero to 1.7 and if the case returns to trial . you get it. , and if it doesnt i get it. if this is not acceptable. please propose something you think is fair . talk at 3

On Mon, Sep 14, 2015 at 8:23 PM, Brad Edwards <[REDACTED]> wrote:

I think you answered 4, which is that this is not one of the issues we are talking about. That's all I needed to know as we define what issues you and I are discussing. Boies can handle and continue to investigate issues related to [REDACTED] separate and apart from anything we do. As long as we agree on that, and consequently that no action he files will cause us to start over, then that is fine.

With Dershowitz, a public jury verdict in my favor is the only realistic way to vindicate Paul and me. Me crafting a statement for him to reluctantly read cannot undo his going on every national television program and appearing at local conventions calling for me to be disbarred. I have seen enough of him to know that even if he made a statement he would continue to talk and dilute the impact of any positive statement. He knows his statements were directed at the wrong people, that they were false and intentionally damaging, and that a trial cannot possibly go well for him. But yet he has done nothing to attempt to mitigate the damages. I'll keep thinking about this one but the fact is that he went out of his way to create an unresolvable problem.

So are we talking now about 1 and 2 only? Lets confirm that before I make any proposal. 1 is very easy. 2 is complicated and something I have not put much thought into because I wasn't sure we agreed on the basics.

Sent from my iPhone

On Sep 13, 2015, at 6:59 PM, jeffrey E. <jeevacation@gmail.com> wrote:

1,2, 3, easy to understand, 4 , not sure what you mean , ? wexner? dersh? . I would appreciate it if you would send me your proposal . to settle each , for all etc. . you said you would work on language that was acceptable to you and paul re dersh, , has that changed?

On Sun, Sep 13, 2015 at 5:26 AM, Brad Edwards <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Jeff,

I thought we made some progress at the mediation. I agreed that if a "global resolution," as you put it, is possible, the only way to get there is to speak with one another directly, at least at this stage.

With that said, and like I said on our last telephone call, we took steps backward during that call, meaning that we got further away from resolution. You've repeatedly made the point that your time is valuable, and in that same

vein, I have to say that mine is, too. So, if we are going to seriously attempt to resolve all issues, then we are going to have to communicate more clearly about what the issues are and start by agreeing on some necessary basic components of any comprehensive resolution.

The first thing that I think needs to be clear and understood between us if these discussions are going to be productive, is that you are going to have to pay considerable money to resolve the issues. While I thought that was initially understood, our last conversation suggested otherwise. Some of the things I believe you want to resolve are more complicated than just money. However, if we are not in agreement on that basic first component of any settlement, then there is no reason to think through the other complications and your time and mine is better spent doing other things.

To discuss how much money it would take to resolve all issues, let's first define, as clearly as possible, the universe of issues you would like to bring to an end with complete and certain finality. I understand generally that from your perspective this includes all matters that in any way could consume your time because it relates to you or any associations you have or had. And I know you have vaguely defined those things, but clarity is essential.

Feel free to add to, elaborate on, or subtract from the list below.

(1) Edwards v Epstein - the malicious prosecution action, which includes a claim for punitive damages. We both understand the current legal posture of the case. I see no need to discuss the possibility of me owing you fees. We have already done that one; to do it again is a time-wasting discussion at this point. With the resolution of this case comes certain other issues such as confidentiality (which I don't want and you may not either, I am not sure) and the ability to tell the story in the future (which you said you don't care about so I think we are on the same page there, but I need to know if we are not).

(2) CVRA - The resolution of this case is going to require mental energy and significant time. We can attempt that, but we shouldn't unless we are in initial general agreement about the cost associated with disposing of this lawsuit. Because of the complications with this one, we should not spend a second trying to figure this out, or engaging other legal minds to assist, if we are not in agreement on the basic conditions of any settlement up to this point.

(3) Dershowitz - Your proposed statement will not resolve that case. Is he going to go on national news and apologize with the same intensity and frequency that he made the crazy defamatory claims? You have said yourself that you don't care to resolve this case, so it seems best to just leave this one alone and let it end however it is going to end. If we come up with a resolution of the other cases, in the spirit of global settlement maybe we'll find a solution to this one. But if we don't, this case that you don't care about will not control the rest of our discussions.

(4) Issues related to [REDACTED] - You have spent considerable time talking about her. I know how you feel about her and that your position is that much of what she is saying is not true. I heard you loud and clear. But also much of what she is saying is undeniably true. Either way, this is another subject over which I have some control although, as you know, I am working with NY counsel on this so any resolution will require input from them. I also know that because of your release, you have no additional direct personal exposure, so if you want to treat this similarly to the Dershowitz case and leave it alone, that is fine with me as well. I understood that you wanted to assist in the resolution of any matters that will consume any of your future time, so you let me know if this is one of those things.

So, I told Leslie I was available to speak Tuesday, but in order to avoid Tuesday being wasted time for both of us I thought it best to send you these basic "get-to-the-point" comments. I hope you can appreciate that and also the fact that I share your desire to avoid time-wasting exercises.

Consistent with our agreement and all of our discussions, this is being sent for confidential settlement purposes only and is not to be shared outside of that context.

Brad

From: jeffrey E. <jeevacation@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 9, 2015 12:42 AM
To: Brad Edwards
Subject: settlement purposes only

after much back and forth, language similar to . alan . i was furious and angry , and in the heat of the moment said some things that i wish i hadn't/ ? brad and paul. in hindsight we regret adding alan to the case

--

please note

The information contained in this communication is confidential, may be attorney-client privileged, may constitute inside information, and is intended only for the use of the addressee. It is the property of JEE

Unauthorized use, disclosure or copying of this communication or any part thereof is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by return e-mail or by e-mail to jeevacation@gmail.com, and destroy this communication and all copies thereof, including all attachments. copyright -all rights reserved

--

please note

The information contained in this communication is confidential, may be attorney-client privileged, may constitute inside information, and is intended only for the use of the addressee. It is the property of JEE

Unauthorized use, disclosure or copying of this communication or any part thereof is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by return e-mail or by e-mail to jeevacation@gmail.com, and destroy this communication and all copies thereof, including all attachments. copyright -all rights reserved

--

please note

The information contained in this communication is confidential, may be attorney-client privileged, may constitute inside information, and is intended only for the use of the addressee. It is the property of JEE

Unauthorized use, disclosure or copying of this communication or any part thereof is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by return e-mail or by e-mail to jeevacation@gmail.com, and destroy this communication and all copies thereof, including all attachments. copyright -all rights reserved