

From: "████████ (USANYS)" <████████>
To: "████████ (USANYS)" <████████>, "████████ (USANYS)"
[Contractor]" <████████>
Cc: "████████ (USANYS)" <████████>, "████████ (USANYS)"
<████████>, "████████ (USANYS)" <████████>

Subject: RE: Epstein and SDNY in 2016

Date: Mon, 12 Oct 2020 21:01:13 +0000

Agreed. To my knowledge, we've never spoken to █████ about or heard about a second meeting or a meeting about a perjury charge, so while I don't know that such a meeting occurred, I'm not sure we're in a position right now to push back.

From: █████ (USANYS)
Sent: Monday, October 12, 2020 4:54 PM
To: █████ (USANYS) [Contractor]
Cc: █████ (USANYS) ; █████ (USANYS) ; █████ (USANYS) ; █████ (USANYS)
Subject: Re: Epstein and SDNY in 2016

Don't think there much we can do here so I'd leave it alone.

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 12, 2020, at 4:37 PM, █████ (USANYS) [Contractor] <████████> wrote:

Stephen Brown is filing his story shortly on the Epstein investigation (which includes discussion of the apparent decision by the Office in 2016 not to pursue the matter). If there's any guidance you think we can and should provide, please let us know in the next hour.

From: █████ (USANYS) [Contractor]
Sent: Friday, October 9, 2020 11:15 AM
To: █████ (USANYS) <████████>; █████ (USANYS) <████████>;
████ (USANYS) <████████>; █████ (USANYS) <████████>
Cc: █████ (USANYS) <████████>
Subject: FW: Epstein and SDNY in 2016

Stephen Brown at the Daily News is working on a story for next Tuesday about Epstein, Maxwell, and pitches made by victims' lawyers to █████ in 2016 that "went nowhere." His email below explains further. His actual questions are at the end of his email. He has no expectations about guidance, but would appreciate any. Don't know if we should be forwarding this to █████ presumably Stephen could contact her on his own.

From: Brown, Stephen <████████>
Sent: Thursday, October 8, 2020 4:40 PM
To: █████ (USANYS) [Contractor] <████████>
Subject: Epstein and SDNY in 2016

Hi Jim, Here's a rundown of the story I'm working on. Am seeking guidance from SDNY on the office's thinking at the time, if FBI was looped in, and who the decision-maker was on this. Apologies for the long email but I figure better to provide as much detail as possible. My editors are pretty interested in this one.

On Feb. 29, 2016, Epstein victims' attorneys Stan Pottinger, Brad Edwards and Peter Skinner met with then-AUSA █████ and pitched her on an investigation of the Epstein scheme. I'm told █████ had questions about establishing venue, the South Florida NPA, statute of limitations issues and the general DOJ tradition of not second-guessing another US Attorney. She wondered if the attorneys were proposing an investigation of new conduct, or rather a re-do of the South Florida case. (This is all from sources familiar).

According to Edwards's book, the team of attorneys left the meeting feeling hopeful.

The AUSA acted confident that a case would be brought against Epstein for crimes committed against █████ and others in New York. Of course, first

she had to have facts, witnesses, evidence, and victims of a New York crime. We assured the prosecutor that the number of victims in New York far exceeded those discovered in Florida. The group walked out excited that New York was finally going to bring a case against Epstein. I said to David and Pete, "Don't hold your breath, the Southern District obviously doesn't know who they're dealing with yet."

The effort went nowhere, as far as the victims' attorneys know. Then, after attorneys David Boies and Sigrid McCawley took Maxwell's depositions in the [REDACTED] case, Boies re-approached SDNY, I'm told. The meeting took place in August or September between Boies, Pottinger and Kramer. They pitched SDNY on charging Maxwell with perjury. They also believed Epstein, who was paying Maxwell's legal bills, was in a perjury conspiracy. They saw this as a work-around to [REDACTED] concerns about the NPA etc.

But that also went nowhere. Obviously everything changed after the Miami Herald articles and SDNY opened an investigation under Berman.

In addition to the headline that SDNY initially passed on tackling the case, this story will also note how the contact between victims' attorneys and SDNY relates to the perjury counts in Maxwell's criminal case. She's said in filings she was the victim of a "perjury trap," presumably set by Boies in cahoots with SDNY. (From her perspective).

Questions:

Why didn't SDNY pursue the Epstein case in 2016?

Why didn't it pursue perjury counts?

Did SDNY contact the FBI or South Florida prosecutors about Epstein during that period?

Who was the decision maker after Kramer met with the victims' attorneys?

Did Preet make the call?

This story is tentatively scheduled for Tuesday, so this is not super urgent. Hope to hear from you tomorrow.

Thanks,

Stephen Rex Brown

Manhattan Federal Court reporter

NY DAILY NEWS