

From: Christian Everdell <[REDACTED]>

To: "[REDACTED]" <[REDACTED]>

Cc: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED], "Bobbi C. Sternheim, Esq." <[REDACTED]>
Laura Menninger <[REDACTED]>, Jeff Pagliuca <[REDACTED]>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: Stip

Date: Sat, 20 Nov 2021 02:03:31 +0000

Attachments: Stipulation [REDACTED] Trial Testimony.DOCX

[REDACTED] -

Following-up on our conversation today, is the revised stipulation acceptable to the government?

From: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>

Sent: Tuesday, November 16, 2021 7:03 PM

To: Christian Everdell <[REDACTED]>

Cc: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]; Bobbi C. Sternheim, Esq. <[REDACTED]>; Laura Menninger
<[REDACTED]>; Jeff Pagliuca <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Stip

Hey Chris,

Following up on our conversation today regarding the stip, would you agree to have the sentence say that the document is a "true and accurate copy of the transcript of one witness's trial testimony, but not the full trial transcript, given on February 26"? If so, we are fine with the stip – and, of course, happy to consider other language that makes the same point.

Thanks,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
Assistant United States Attorney
Southern District of New York

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]