

Our To Whom It May Concern

Yes, a police investigation was begun when a parent of a 14 year-old girl approached the Palm Beach Police. When questioned, the girl told the police that she specifically had told Mr. Epstein that she was 18 years old. Why did she lie to Mr. Epstein? When asked, she explained that she had to lie, "otherwise I knew he wouldn't let me in the house."

Yes, a 13-month investigation followed, the findings of which were presented to a Grand Jury that was actually able to hear the testimony of the "victims", themselves. The prosecutor for the Florida State Attorney's Office in this case, a veteran with over 13 years of experience in prosecuting sex crimes, determined that, in her own words, "there were no real victims here." And the Grand Jury returned an indictment for solicitation of prostitution. No more, no less.

After personally interviewing and hearing the girls in the Epstein case, experienced prosecutors determined that this was a case of prostitution. The girls had exchanged sexual activity for money. In their depositions, there is sworn testimony from these girls about how they kept records of all the payments they received from johns other than Mr. Epstein. In one case in particular, the girl kept her records in a book of psalms. Some girls admitted to receiving thousands of dollars for a night with their johns, while others claimed they got paid many hundreds of dollars for merely sitting in a hotel room and talking with them.

Many of the girls had worked in the local massage parlors or strip clubs that dotted Palm Beach, well before they ever met Mr. Epstein. By their own admissions, just like they lied to Mr. Epstein, the girls had lied convincingly about their ages to the owners of these establishments to secure their jobs because employees in these massage parlors and strip clubs had to be 18 years old to work there.

And the lies have not ended there. Like the [REDACTED] story, which the Daily Beast admits was paid for. In fact, that tale was first spun in Ms. Roberts' anonymously filed civil complaint designed to justify claims against Mr. Epstein for a substantial financial payout. Ms. Roberts lied about her dates of employment at the Mara Lago club. She lied about how old she was when she met Mr. Epstein and lied about how old she was when she met Ghislaine Maxwell. She described in exquisite detail dinners with former Vice President Al gore, and meeting and having sex with a multitude of famous and important people. However, many of these people travel with detailed diaries, and extensive security details. Almost to a one, not only have they absolutely no recollection whatsoever of any dinners, but in many cases, these high profile people, including former Vice President and Mrs. Gore, have never in their lives met or even spoken to, and certainly never visited, Mr. Epstein. These are facts which are readily verifiable.

As all the actions here took place in Mr. Epstein's home in Palm Beach, Mr. Acosta's letter accurately conveys several legal arguments which establish as a matter of law that there was no federal crime in the Epstein case, a purely local case about local prostitution offenses which have always been left to the states to enforce. Nevertheless, Mr. Acosta's office did threaten to charge Mr. Epstein with a federal crime based on nothing more than instances in which Mr. Epstein's secretaries had made telephone calls to set up appointments, in many cases simply returning the calls made by these young women themselves. The use of the telephones by Mr. Epstein's secretaries was cited as the interstate nexus which somehow justified usurping state power to federally prosecute Mr. Epstein for state prostitution offenses. Mr. Epstein was never on these telephone calls at all. There was never any discussion of intercourse on the telephone. No discussion of sex at all. No discussion of age and no illegality whatsoever. There was never any coercion or persuasion of these young women on the telephone (or at any other time for that matter). These were nothing but short confirmation telephone calls made by Mr. Epstein's secretaries and certainly nothing like the well documented undercover sting operations against the internet predators that these laws were enacted to combat.

The allegations of 12 -year olds, sex slaves, nude young photographs, and the like were all made by the same women who worked at local strip joints, had been arrested numerous times and had all admitted to having sex for money with others, before ever meeting Mr. Epstein. The risk of trial, as Mr. Acosta puts it, was indeed substantial. These were allegations that were investigated, but never, I repeat, never, charged, threatened or even explained. Essentially, they were nothing more than raw allegations made by young prostitutes in the hopes of securing a substantial payday from Mr. Epstein in their civil cases.

Mr. Epstein was placed in solitary confinement for months in a 7 by 11 foot cell with a slit in the door for food. When it was not canceled for one reason or another, Mr. Epstein was allowed outside on a fenced-in concrete pad in total isolation for one hour a day. After months of this, he was allowed the same privileges, including work release, as any other inmate. Mr. Epstein's time served was the exact same amount served as any other inmate with the same sentence. Mr. Epstein ate the same food, cleaned the same toilets, and wore the same clothes as every other inmate. To suggest, in Mr. Acosta's words, that this was not a jail sentence, merely shows ignorance of the true facts here. Moreover to suggest that there was new evidence here is simply irresponsible. And further, to suggest that there was no knowledge of these alleged crimes during the course of the 18-month federal investigation is equally irresponsible. Once they secured representation by civil attorneys to file substantial financial claims against Mr. Epstein, these girls told lie after lie on examination. To characterize these wild financially motivated allegations as evidence is laughable.

We find the several references in Mr. Acosta's letter to Mr. Epstein's wealth to be highly unethical. The proud declaration that Mr. Acosta put, in his words, a "billionaire" in jail is frankly astonishing. Had he said, "well we finally got one of those poor people or jewish people in jail", his slight would have been obvious. To appear to target a person because he is wealthy seems no less improper. Mr. Acosta's indignant reference to the "billionaire's legal super stars" and citing his intransigence in the face of their numerous legal arguments as a moment of achievement is equally troubling.

Mr. Epstein was required to agree to pay a MINIMUM of \$50,000 to each girl on a government list, but the list would be withheld from him and have to remain secret until after he was in jail. He would not be able to defend against a claim by any girl on that list, even if he never before met the girl, as turned out to be the case. Moreover, he would be required to pay for the attorney of the girls on that list to sue him, including the attorney of girls who he never met. Yes, that is correct, Mr. Epstein was required to pay for the attorney of the girls on that list, including girls he never met, to sue him. Moreover, some names of girls were actually added to the list, without Mr. Epstein's knowledge, literally months after the deal was signed and the list was supposed to have been final.

Despite all of this, Mr. Epstein has attempted to move on with his life. He was required to and did plead guilty to a charge of pimping, a charge that required him to have been living off the girls' income, which simply never occurred. Nevertheless, Mr. Epstein pleaded guilty to the charge that was required, he served a jail sentence, and he paid money to people he never met. America is a place where you get a second chance. It's now time that Jeffrey Epstein be allowed his second chance.