To: Jeffrey Epstein[jeevacation@gmail.com]
From: drsra
Sent: Mon 6/28/2010 2:49:16 PM

Thoughts on Brad Edwards deal. There are probably several undercurrents going on at same time: 1) Brad wants to vindicate himself in the unethical dealings of RRA, and he needs to "prove" you're a bad guy, not an ATM everybody at RRA thought they could rig to spew $, 2) Brad wants to get you to drop the lawsuit against him, or at least to undermine it, in part by proving you are a bad guy, 3) Brad needs money and sees you as the quickest way to get it, 4) Brad has oversold the case to himself and his client, so it is hard or impossible to be realistic about it now, 5) Critton is feeding all off the above indirectly, and maybe even directly, 6) Critton has a large streak of resentment that centers, in part, around his being "forced" to sue another lawyer "Lawyers don't sue lawyers in this town." This causes him to undermine realistic settlement efforts because a big settlement allows a) you to be "punished" for forcing him to sue Brad, b) helps out fellow plaintiff lawyers and makes a demonstration of loyalty to his peer group (same as the Scarola settlement), c) a big settlement justifies his billings because it shows how complicated and delicate the situation was on one hand, while proving you are a bad guy who got off easy on the other because you had great lawyers (ie, him).

All of this makes it hard to negotiate because you are working with more than more set of dynamics, all of which are stacked against you, but of which only some are honestly acknowledged.

Your task is to decide how best to end it for you and this will require resisting the urge to get pulled into the pissing match. That you will definitely lose because the leagl system will always support its own.

Call me if you need me.

S