

From: J <jeevacation@gmail.com>
To: Steve Bannon <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Fwd: Confidential
Date: Mon, 03 Dec 2018 16:22:10 +0000

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Darren Indyke <[REDACTED]>
Date: Mon, Dec 3, 2018 at 11:19 AM
Subject: Confidential
To: Kathy Ruemmler <[REDACTED]>, Michael Wolff <[REDACTED]>
Cc: Darren Indyke <[REDACTED]>, Jeffrey Epstein <jeevacation@gmail.com>

Real story,

There were holes in the state case, your lawyers defended you the way they should have, and pointed out those holes to the state.

It was not a decision by the state not to prosecute you. It was a decision by the grand jury to charge you for solicitation.

Could the state attorney have charged you without a grand jury indictment, yes. But the benefit of a grand jury indictment was to eliminate second guessing about what the State attorney did wrong or any influence peddling, the very thing with which he was accused. The grand jury took what evidence the State attorney would have been able to bring to trial and that is the decision the grand jury came up with. Not the state, but the grand jury. The federal story is somewhat similar. Federal statutes that were not designed to attack what were exclusively state law crimes as alleged. Epstein's lawyers researched and challenged federal involvement on that basis and might have prevailed on that basis. In addition, there were issues with the state investigation regarding police reports not properly reflecting recorded interviews with the witnesses and misreporting testimony and evidence. There were issues with coming up with witnesses who were willing to testify and issues with the witnesses themselves which would have impeded the prosecution. In addition, Epstein's lawyers challenged the non-prosecution agreement vigorously. They were not looking to have it enforced, they were looking to have Acosta declare that the federal investigation was improper, and that the proposed conduct supposedly outlined in a 54 page indictment represented strained application of federal law to allegations of state law crimes, would not stand up to court challenge and so should not be pursued. Federal prosecution was not close to a slam dunk and the NPA provided real consequences, as evidenced by Epstein and his team's relentless attempts to have Acosta and those at the highest levels of justice declare the federal investigation improper.. Acosta and the higher ups at justice, while acknowledging the novel application of federal law, said that the investigation and prosecution would continue and Epstein had to take the deal or face prosecution. Contrary to reports, the federal government did not buckle and was not influenced by power or wealth; it stood pat at an onslaught of appropriate defense activity and forced Epstein to take a deal that he and his lawyers vigorously resisted. The media reports got it wrong, plain and simple.

Also, much is made of the consistency of the girls stories in the police reports. But part of the holes in the police reports was the police misreporting to create a report of consistent activity by Epstein and motivations by Epstein that were not represented by the evidence.

The whole pedophile angle, not borne out by the evidence. The real testimony now completely exaggerated and distorted, was not that JE was seeking children for sex. The girl who gave the testimony never said or implied that JE sought underage girls and in fact her testimony was that she told all the girls that they had to be 18 and make sure to tell him they were 18. So this pedophile child angle, which is intriguing and sells stories, is just not true.

The consistencies in the civil cases can also be attributed to the fact that there was a small core group of Plaintiffs lawyers representing the girls working together coordinating resources and pleadings, so that the civil pleadings in each of the cases became essentially cookie cutter.

There are explanations for much that has become distorted over the years. And there are good reasons for no comment from Epstein, including the fact that there is presently an effort underway in Federal court to invalidate Epstein's non-prosecution agreement, opening him up to criminal prosecution, as a result of which his lawyers have vehemently refused to allow him to give any comments on any of these stories, despite his desire to do so, which only serves to perpetuate the numerous factual inaccuracies, so that fiction has now become fact, numbers of witnesses have become inflated, and in fact, none of the allegations have ever been adjudicated.

As to the witnesses who blame Epstein and their interactions with him as a turning point in their lives, or say that had they not met Epstein their lives would have been vastly different, so that Jeffrey is fully and solely responsible for the way their lives turned out. It is specifically those kinds of allegations which need to be scrutinized responsibly. Epstein is certainly a convenient person to blame, but an evaluation of the lives of these women will show that interactions with him cannot be any more responsible than the multitude of factors that plagued their lives well before and after they met him, including prostitution/exotic dancing before and after him - including prostitution encouraged by parents who themselves were prostitutes, other parental travesties, including sexual abuse, domestic violence, domestic violence with the girl's own boyfriends, drug abuse, criminal behavior, all taking place both well before and after these women ever ran into Epstein.

The Epstein angle while certainly making the story really intriguing, is a misleading, fictitious and an unfortunate oversimplification of the complex web of factors. It does a disservice to real efforts to understand and combat the causes of female exploitation. Soliciting prostitution, even on a large scale, is a factor, that is punishable, and has been punished. Despite the great tabloid headlines it creates about Power, sex and corruption at the highest levels, which the real evidence reveals to be a complete sham, the story here is much more complex at a much more fundamental level and if it is to be examined and dealt with responsibly all of those factors should be fully explored and addressed.

DARREN K. INDYKE

Delray Beach, Florida 33484

Telephone:

Telecopier:

Mobile:

email:

The information contained in this communication is confidential, may be attorney-client privileged, and is intended only for the use of the addressee. It is the property of Darren K. Indyke. 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, and destroy this communication and all copies thereof, including all attachments.

Copyright of Darren K. Indyke - © 2018 Darren K. Indyke - All rights reserved.

On Dec 2, 2018, at 8:49 PM, J <jeevacation@gmail.com> wrote:

If the investigative journalist would take a break from patting each other on the back, they might want to explain to the public. how many other men received erotic massages from these girls. how many worked in the local strip clubs BEFORE they met mr epstein. how many worked in the local erotic massage parlors. how many advertised as prostitutes. They might want to disclose that the former detective in the video worked for the lawyers not the police. They might feel an obligation to point out that some of these girls brought their best friends both to mr epstein and to other men they might want to also point out that the idea that mr epstein was an informant. has absolutely no foundation in fact whatsoever. ask for one iota of proof.

IT DOES "NOT exist. The so called investigative reporters total malicious fabrication. . Mr epstein was an investor that lost money, nothing more.

--

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