

**Subject:** FW: records management (Epstein investigation)

**Date:** Fri, 07 Jun 2019 19:33:22 +0000

**Importance:** Normal

---

[REDACTED]

I am sure you are familiar with the Epstein case, we recently received the case file from MM. The USAO SDNY is requesting the case file be sent to a third party vendor so the documents can be scanned. Apparently this has been done numerous times in the past with other FBI files (see below). With a file this size I think their request makes sense as they want to have the file in a digital format for scanning, cataloguing, and indexing purposes. Does Miami have any objection to us releasing the file in its entirety so SDNY can utilize a vetted third party vendor to scan the files? I have cc'd the NYO CDC, [REDACTED], so she can weigh in on the discussion.

Thanks,

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, May 20, 2019 3:55 PM  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: records management (Epstein investigation)

Sean,

Thanks very much again for talking with us earlier, and we wanted to get you the example cases as promised—it's a number of cases so hopefully that's helpful. I think the ideal would be for the materials to come directly to us so our paralegals can manage the process with the vendor (unless the documents are already on their way to the New York field office), and then we can send them either to you or back to Florida once they've been scanned.

The following investigations have been with our office and FBI where we've used outside vendors, including for original and highly sensitive documents (such as medical records, personnel records, etc.):

*U.S. v. Chambers,*  
*U.S. v. Adelglass,*  
*U.S. v. Ng Lap Sen*  
*U.S. v. Tortora,* org  
*U.S. v. Ashraf Has*  
*U.S. v. Goldbrener*  
*U.S. v. Vargas,* hea  
*U.S. v. Krupkin,* do  
*U.S. v. Cruz,* overc

[REDACTED]

In terms of the vendor, we choose from a small number of organizations that work with us regularly, and they keep all the information strictly confidential (by contractual requirement, most importantly, though also from a desire to be able to

EFTA00037279

continue to get work with us). I'm not aware of any instances where that has been a problem.

Please do let us know if any other info would be helpful, and we're also happy to chat with anybody who wants to talk with us about it, and hopefully we can finalize this week.

thanks again

