
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:

concerned about being in bed with them for years forward. . I know you understand

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

> wrote:

Generally, a non-pros agreement is akin to that -- here, though, DOJ seems to be treating non-pros agreements like de=erred 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 I for the bank?

--

I=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 =trictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this co=munication 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 strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this communication 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 thereof, including all attachments. copyright -all rights reserved

</=iv>