

**From:** "jeffrey E." <jeevacation@gmail.com>  
**To:** Martin Weinberg <[REDACTED]>  
**Subject:** Re: ATTORNEY-CLIENT and COMMON INTEREST AGREEMENT  
**Date:** Thu, 30 Apr 2015 00:06:44 +0000

---

ok you suggest to alan

On Wed, Apr 29, 2015 at 8:02 PM, Martin Weinberg <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Yes  
Thru kendall

Sent from my iPhone

On Apr 29, 2015, at 7:35 PM, "jeffrey E." <jeevacation@gmail.com> wrote:

should you reach out to [REDACTED] and get her thoughts. would she mind if alan asked how [REDACTED] was put on the list.  
?

On Wed, Apr 29, 2015 at 7:29 PM, Martin G. Weinberg <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Yes, a possible response for Alan is that her virulent allegations have never been examined. She speaks to the media – 2011 UK in particular – she then gives an "ex parte" taped interview to Scarola who is representing Edwards – she then files multiple affidavits in the CVRA all of which were stricken, none of which were able to be disputed at a hearing – and now an affidavit she is afraid of Alan – and when its time for someone to question her they move to quash

I think Kendall might have the relationships to ask that question but Alan is out of the CVRA, we remain in it, if she is ever relied upon again by Edwards in their upcoming Summary Judgment motion, we should ask the Govt to consider that not only did they properly object to her joining the case, she should be stricken as a witness given that she disqualified herself by refusing to cooperate and then got a windfall by being listed at a time we assumed there was some relationship between victims and witnesses under the Sloman formulation – and in that conversation ask how she (in contrast eg to [REDACTED] made it onto the witness list

**From:** [jeffrey E.](#)  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 29, 2015 7:18 PM  
**To:** [Martin G. Weinberg](#) ; [Alan Dershowitz](#)  
**Subject:** Re: ATTORNEY-CLIENT

slomans letter says they will review with us the list if we have questions it also said short of 40, we never got the opportunity is this an opening for alan to go in and say he would like see why [REDACTED] is on the list. . the footnote is [REDACTED] noting that they had [REDACTED] on a flight to the vi, in 2001 but the statute of limits had expired

--

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](mailto: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](mailto:jeevacation@gmail.com), and destroy this communication and all copies thereof, including all attachments. copyright -all rights reserved