

From: J <jeevacation@gmail.com>

To: Martin Weinberg <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Re: CONFIDENTIAL and ATTORNEY CLIENT PRIVILEGE

Date: Sat, 02 Mar 2019 15:24:34 +0000

i dont have a pr expert. . i would asume ken couldl ask someone at wapo.

On Sat, Mar 2, 2019 at 10:20 AM Martin Weinberg <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Ken advises Jay will not sign (a Kirkland issue)

I have sent to Roy - but he may not review until later given his ongoing trial, we will see

Ken will sign

Ken advises Lilly as co-signatory. Do you want to connect with her?

I will include Jack with Lilly with ?

Hoping Alan has the best knowledge to get this to right person - if not would your PR expert?

See attached

Martin G. Weinberg, Esq.

20 Park Plaza

Suite 1000

Boston, MA 02116

[REDACTED] - Office

[REDACTED] - Cell

-----This Electronic Message contains information from the Law Office of Martin G. Weinberg, P.C., and may be privileged. The information is intended for the use of the addressee only. If you are not the addressee, please note that any disclosure, copying, distribution, or use of the contents of this message is prohibited.

On Sat, 3/2/19, J <jeevacation@gmail.com> wrote:

Subject: Re: CONFIDENTIAL and ATTORNEY CLIENT PRIVILEGE

To: "Martin Weinberg" <[REDACTED]>, "Darren Indyke" <[REDACTED]>

Date: Saturday, March 2, 2019, 10:14 AM

jack will

sign

On Sat, Mar 2,
2019 at 10:04 AM Martin Weinberg <[REDACTED]>

wrote:

Alan, thoughts on the

best way to get this to the right Editor?

Martin G. Weinberg, Esq.

20 Park Plaza

Suite 1000

Boston, MA 02116

[REDACTED] - Office

[REDACTED] - Cell

=====This Electronic Message
contains information from the Law Office of Martin G.
Weinberg, P.C., and may be privileged. The information is
intended for the use of the addressee only. If you are not
the addressee, please note that any disclosure, copying,
distribution, or use of the contents of this message is
prohibited.

On Sat, 3/2/19, J <jeevacation@gmail.com>
wrote:

Subject: Re: CONFIDENTIAL and ATTORNEY CLIENT PRIVILEGE

To: "Martin Weinberg" <[REDACTED]>,
"Alan Dershowitz" <[REDACTED]>

Date: Saturday, March 2, 2019, 9:44 AM

will roy

sign? lilly ,jay? and who exactly is it
delivered

to ? very well done , only issue is the 40 vs 80
?

On Sat, Mar 2,

2019 at 9:40 AM Kathy Ruemmler <[REDACTED]>

wrote:

This is great. Highly

recommend that we not let perfect be the enemy of the
good

and get this submitted ASAP while fresh and NYT Ed

Board


should feel pressure to publish.

On Mar 2, 2019, at 9:26 AM, J <jeevacation@gmail.com>

wrote:

well done thx

On Sat, Mar 2,

2019 at 9:22 AM Martin Weinberg < >

wrote:

A very quick morning

stab at a possible letter to editor.- hopefully to
motivate

edits, discussion, revisions, I think this route makes
far

more sense than uninvited Op-Eds. Also consistent with
a

draft being edited to be sent to Sen Sasse. The NYT

Editorial is enraging in its political bias - and is
deeply

damaging.

Martin G. Weinberg, Esq.

20 Park Plaza

Suite 1000

Boston, MA 02116

██████████ - Office

██████████ - Cell

=====This Electronic
Message

contains information from the Law Office of Martin G.

Weinberg, P.C., and may be privileged. The information
is

intended for the use of the addressee only. If you are
not

the addressee, please note that any disclosure,
copying,

distribution, or use of the contents of this message is
prohibited.

On Sat, 3/2/19, J <jeevacation@gmail.com>

wrote:

Subject: time sensitive

To: "Ken Starr" <[REDACTED]>,
"Martin Weinberg" <[REDACTED]>,
"Alan Dershowitz" <[REDACTED]>,
"Kathy Ruemmler" <[REDACTED]>,
"Darren Indyke" <[REDACTED]>

Date: Saturday, March 2, 2019, 12:42 AM

now that the NYT , the paper of

record has gotten so many facts and conclusions wrong.

I

thought a direct response to the editorial board was

now

appropriate. . thoughts on more than one member

of

the team on the byline?. . starting with the suggestion

that 5 professional criminal defense attorney somehow

colluded with alex acosta is preposterous. .
it

was

reviewed by many sets of eyes at DOJ / reference
sloman

letter.?

. the attack on the decision to require Epstein

to

plead in the state.rather than in fed court . was an

outcome

dictated by the fact that this was a
quintessential

state case. A florida case of sex for money.

The ages

of a minority of the women actually under 18 at the

time.

and the govt contending with the fact that many of
them

said

they had misrepresented their age to Epstein and the clubs

at which they worked. ? . There was never a sex party.

Epstein does not have parties. . he had a science

gathering and allegations were made that one of the women

was required to have sex with academics world leaders.

academics including Stephen Hawking.. ? the guest list

were used to

accuse people of sex assault.). President

Clinton

was never ever on his island. no proof , neither was

al Gore. . at

some point a newspaper , should take a step back and in

its

desire to craft a story re a trump cabinet member
and

check its facts. ? etc.

thoughts. .

--

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