

---

**From:** Kathy Ruemmler [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 14, 2014 12:03 PM  
**To:** jeffrey E.  
**Subject:** Re:

Yes, that is not an acceptable outcome.

On Oct 14, 2014 8:00 AM, "jeffrey E." <jeevacation@gmail.com> wrote:

concernred about being in bed with them for years foward. . . =C2◆ i know you understand

On Tue, Oct 14, 2014 at 7:57 AM, Kathy Ruemmler [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] > wrote:

Generally, a non-pros agreement is akin to=that -- here, though, DOJ seems to be treating non-pros agreements like deferred pros agreements. That is one of the questions I want to explor= today.

On Oct 14, 2014 7:42 AM, "jeffrey E." <jeevacation@mail.com> wrote:

would there be an equivalent of an alford plea =C2◆ for the bank?

--

◆=A0 please note

The information=contained in this communication is confidential, may be attorney-client=privileged, may constitute inside information, and is intended only for=br>the use of the addressee. It is the property of

JEE

Unauthorized =se, disclosure or copying of this communication or any part thereof is =strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by return e-mail or b= e-mail to jeev=cation@gmail.com <mailto:jeevacation@gmail.com> , and destroy this communication and all copies the=eof, including all attachments. copyright -all rights reserved

--

=C2◆ please note

The information contained in this communication is confidential, may be attorney-client privileged, may constitute inside information, and is intended only for

JEE

Unauthorized use= disclosure or copying of this communication or any part thereof is str=ctly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this commu=ication in error, please notify us immediately by return e-mail or by e-mail to jeevacation@gmail.com <mailto:jeevacation@gmail.com> , and destroy this communication and all copies thereo=, including all attachments. copyright -all rights reserved

</=iv>