

From: Joi ito <[REDACTED]>

To: Jeffrey Epstein <jeevacation@gmail.com>

Subject: Re:

Date: Sat, 15 Dec 2018 19:34:35 +0000

Cool. While I can't predict the result, I think it would most likely be net positive.

- Joi

> On Dec 15, 2018, at 14:26, J <jeevacation@gmail.com> wrote:

>

> ken starr

>

> On Sat, Dec 15, 2018 at 2:21 PM Joi ito <[REDACTED]> wrote:

> Hmm. This is well written and I think would be positive for you. Was this written by one of them or something your team wrote? Would the really sign this?

>

> - Joi

>

>> On Dec 15, 2018, at 13:46, J <jeevacation@gmail.com> wrote:

>>

>> op ed signed by either ken starr, or ken dershowitz and other defense lawyeres. . thoughts is it worth it?

>> "Sweetheart deal! " So goes the critique of the resolution of a long-ago case involving our former client --

and now-friend -- Jeffrey Epstein. The critique is profoundly misplaced, supported neither by the law or the facts, nor by the structure of our constitutional republic. To the contrary, Jeffrey was subjected to an

unprecedented federal intrusion into a quintessentially local criminal matter in south Florida. His offense to the

social order -- involving sex for hire -- was entirely a matter entrusted to laws of the several States, not the

federal government. His conduct -- a classic state offense --was being treated exactly that way by able, honest

prosecutors in Palm Beach County, but the overweening federal government intruded where it did not belong.

And now, over ten years after the fact, the current assault on federal decision-makers at the time, including now-

Secretary of Labor Alex Acosta (then the United States Attorney in south Florida), condemns the federal authorities for not going far enough.

>>

>> The critics are entirely wrong. Neither the facts nor the law support the misguided criticisms being leveled by journalists and politicians at federal officials from over a decade ago -- including the highest levels of the Justice Department in Washington, D.C. .

>>

>> Here are the key facts: Jeffrey Epstein, a successful self-made businessman with no prior criminal history whatever, engaged in illegal conduct that amounts to solicitation of prostitution. That was wrong, and it was reasonably viewed as a violation of Florida state law. Although no coercion, violence, alcohol, drugs or the like were involved, some of the women had misrepresented themselves as over the age of 18. Those facts were carefully assessed by experienced state prosecutors who aggressively enforce state criminal laws. No one turned a blind eye to potential offenses to the public order. To the contrary, the Palm Beach State Attorney's Office conducted an extensive 15-month investigation, led by the chief of the Sex Crimes Division. Mr. Epstein was then indicted by a state grand jury on a single felony count of solicitation of prostitution.

>>

>> During that intense investigation, the state prosecutors extensively gathered and analyzed the evidence, met face-to-face with many of the asserted victims, considered their credibility -- or lack thereof -- and considered the extent of exculpatory evidence. Then, after months of elaborate negotiations, the state prosecutors believed they had reached a reasoned resolution of the matter that vindicated the public interest -- a resolution entirely consistent with that of cases involving other similarly-situated defendants.

>>
>> Then, in came the feds. The United States Attorney's Office tried, to no avail, to fit Mr. Epstein's situation into its vision of what it viewed as a commercial trafficking ring, targeting minors. But this was anything but, and at long last, the federal authorities acknowledged that stark reality and grudgingly agreed to defer prosecution to the state. But there was a huge catch. In the face of our arguments sharply condemning their overreach, the federal prosecutors insisted on many unorthodox requirements that tugged at fundamental values of due process. For example, the agreement required Mr. Epstein to pay an undisclosed list of asserted victims \$150,000 each. Even more, the feds insisted that Jeffrey pay for an attorney to represent such unidentified victims if any chose to filed civil litigation against him. When asked what possible legal authority supported this extravagant exercise of national power, the feds lamely cited a wildly inapposite case from Alaska involving cocaine and forced on-the-street prostitution. Apples and oranges.

>>
>> Under the federally-forced deal, Jeffrey was sentenced to jail. That would not have been the case under the agreed-upon state disposition of this non-violent, consensual commercial arrangement. Jeffrey complied, served that sentence, and in the process was treated exactly the same as other state-incarcerated individuals. His conduct was exemplary, and so characterized by the state custodial authorities. He continued his work, including his many philanthropic efforts.

>>
>> Our friend Jeffrey Epstein has paid his debt to society. He has also paid out millions of dollars to the asserted victims and their highly-creative lawyers. For over ten years, he has lived an exemplary life, including carrying on his wide-ranging philanthropies. Those of us who represented him in the Florida proceedings -- for customary professional fees -- now count him as a trusted friend.

>>
>> On Sat, Dec 15, 2018 at 6:42 AM Joi ito <[REDACTED]> wrote:
>> Sure. I'm in pajamas but Skype is good. Starting it up.

>>
>>> On Dec 15, 2018, at 06:39, J <jeevacation@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>
>>> skype?
>>>
>>>
>>> On Sat, Dec 15, 2018 at 5:49 AM Joi ito <[REDACTED]> wrote:
>>> I'm up. Let me know when/where to call.

>>>
>>>> On Dec 13, 2018, at 09:33, J <jeevacation@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>> florida
>>>>
>>>> On Thu, Dec 13, 2018 at 10:32 AM Joi Ito <[REDACTED]> wrote:
>>>> Nyc?
>>>>
>>>> Sent from my iPhone
>>>>

>>>> On Dec 13, 2018, at 09:17, J <jeevacation@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>> ok
>>>>>
>>>>> On Thu, Dec 13, 2018 at 10:16 AM Joi Ito <[REDACTED]> wrote:
>>>>> Call this weekend?
>>>>>
>>>>> Sent from my iPhone
>>>>>

>>>>> On Dec 11, 2018, at 07:35, J <jeevacation@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>>>

>>>> i have an idea for caleb and john.
>>>>
>>>> --
>>>> 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
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> --
>>>> 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