

From: Jeffrey Epstein <jeevacation@gmail.com>
To: Martin Weinberg <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Re:
Date: Wed, 17 Jun 2009 01:10:02 +0000

agreed

On Tue, Jun 16, 2009 at 8:53 PM, Martin Weinberg <[REDACTED]> wrote:

I am about to begin the review - my starting point is that the rebuttal (both linguistic and documentary) needs to be so compelling that the multitude of mistakes will be apparent to a reviewer

Lets write the content and then focus on the intro which can be short and get the reviewer right to our overall assertion that each of the allegations are factually or legally non-breaches

----- Original Message -----

From: [Jeffrey Epstein](#)
To: [Martin Weinberg](#)
Cc: [Darren Indyke](#) ; [Jay Lefkowitz](#)
Sent: Tuesday, June 16, 2009 8:27 PM

I think we should begin the letter or include early on that we are troubled that it she appears so anxious to declare a breach where none exists. if one day, someone is reading this in a new context. we should stress how concerned we are that she is willing to take so many events out of context. misrepresent well established facts , and ignore clear documentary evidence to the contrary/ the nunc pro tunc as our best example.. we had nothign to do with it whatsoever, but she in this letter describes it as a breach- or something to this effect