

Attorney's Office and in the Child Exploitation and Obscenity Section of the Justice Department. Defense attorneys next requested a meeting with me to challenge the prosecution and the venue previously presented by the prosecution in their meeting with the [blank]. The prosecution then and I met with defense counsel in Fall 2007, and I confirmed the office's position: two years, registration and restriction, or 100.

Over the next several months, the defense team presented argument after argument claiming that felony sexual proceedings against Epstein were unsupported by the evidence and in fact a basis to have said that the office's treatment of this case was motivated by a racist vendetta against a man merely because he is wealthy. They included their arguments with legal opinions from well-known legal experts. One member of the defense team wanted me to take the office's name and its forcing a good man to serve time in jail might be the subject of a book if we continued to proceed with this matter. My office systematically considered and rejected each argument, and when we did, my office's decisions were reported to Washington. As to the warning, I ignored it.

The defense strategy was not limited to legal issues. Defense retained intelligent individual prosecution and their families, looking for personal vulnerabilities that may provide a basis for disqualification. Disqualifying a prosecutor is an effective (though rarely used) strategy, so attempting the individuals most familiar with the facts and then used qualified to take a case to trial seems ill-suited for success. Defense counsel tried to disqualify me based on prosecution. I carefully reviewed, and then rejected, those arguments.

Despite this array of activities, the office held firm to the terms first presented to the [blank] in the original meeting. On June 10, 2008, after yet another last-minute appeal to Washington D.C., was rejected, Epstein pled guilty in state court. His was to serve 18 months imprisonment, register as a sexual offender for life and provide restitution to the victims.

Some may feel that the prosecution should have been tougher. Evidence that has come to light since 2007 may encourage that view. While victims have stated Epstein was doing detailed statements to civil cases seeking damages. Physical evidence has since been discovered. Had these additional statements and evidence been known, the outcome may have been different. But that was not known at the time.

A prosecution decision must be based on admissible facts known at the time. In cases of this type, those are usually difficult because victims are frightened and often decline to testify or if they do testify, they give contradictory statements. Our judgment in this case, based on the evidence known at the time, was that it was better to have a defendant serve time in jail, register as a sex offender and pay the victims restitution than risk a trial with a reduced likelihood of success. I suggested that subsequent [blank], and based on the state of the law at that time and the evidence known at that time, I would suggest that judgment again.

Epstein's treatment, while in state custody, likewise may encourage the view that the office should have been tougher. Epstein appears to have received highly unusual treatment while in jail. Although the terms of confinement in a state prison are a matter appropriately left to the