

To: jeevacation@gmail.com[jeevacation@gmail.com]; (Jeffrey Epstein)[@]
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Sat 12/5/2009 1:46:44 PM
Subject: Lawsuit in RRA

I hate to say I told you so, but... Last night I read the e-mail Bob sent you. He will do EVERYTHING he can to not file. As I told you earlier, he said to me "Plaintiff lawyers don't sue plaintiff lawyers in this town." He also admitted his firm gets a lot of business from Searcy Denny and he will not do anything to risk that "for Epstein." You were not watching the feed yesterday when this happened. CMA wanted a break and after they went off the record and she left, Jack S. asked "How good are you at multitasking?" I thought it was Mark answering, but Mark later told me it was directed to Bob, who was off camera. Jack then dropped a stack of papers on the desk in view of the camera and said he needs an affidavit for fees in a case that resulted in a dismissal. This means Jack asked Bob to be his fee expert and to sign a sworn statement asserting his fees were reasonable to file in court so he could get paid. Bob will have to allege he reviewed the file and Jack's fees are reasonable. By the way, Bob gets paid for his time to "review" the file and to appear in court to testify if necessary. After the depo, Jessica and I were waiting for Story to come back to lock the office, and Mark came up. He said he hoped you did not see that exchange because they were going to refuse to file any lawsuits for you in RRA and he did not want you to see the relationship between their firm and Jack's.

If it is so unethical to sue RRA, as Bob, et. al. assert, how can all the other firms file? If you agreed to waive conflicts, you should tell Bob you withdraw that and assert ALL conflicts and make them give up all RRA related cases, civil and family. Say you waived conflicts because they assured you they would file on your behalf, and since they will not file, the conflicts return. Then they have to choose. Nothing worse for a lawyer than to be put in what we psychologists call an approach-avoidance decision. That is, which pot of somebody else's money to go after.

Steve