
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, December 20, 2018 8:33 PM
To: jeevacation@gmail.com
Subject: Re:

Ok. I will go over it= I am happy to do it; but I don't have a big name and the name might=help. I do worry about starr honestly, again because of the specific=nature of his trouble - dismissed and being sued for allegedly overlooking=sexual harassment. Can you think of a comparable right winger who mi=ht do it?

I am still not convinced that this is a good idea altogether and I thi=k it encourages new attacks, however unfair and however much they ignore w=at is written. They don't care about the facts. I am not the l=ast bit worried about them attacking me if I write it; but the question is=whether the best thing is this or let it die down again.

I suppose in favor of doing it is that anyone can renew it with some n=w angle anytime; so why not at least get the facts and true broad picture =ut there whether anyone cares to know the truth or not. There might =e some people who genuinely are opining out of ignorance and care and woul= not keep up the attacks or support them if they knew the facts. I b=lieve that is a small universe; but why shouldn't you get to say your piec= (through an objective third party)?

-----riginal Message-----

From: J <jeevacation@gmail.com>
To: David Schoen <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Thu, Dec 20, 2018 3:06 pm
Subject: Re:

h both, plus the alternatice is that you write=one as not part of the dfense team using it as inspiration ?

On Thu, Dec 20, 2018 at 3:04 PM <[REDACTED]> > wrote:

Let me understand: The piece below, pe=haps reworked a bit, would be signed by Starr and perhaps go in the WAPo? That could be a good move. Starr has his own problems of course=and that might be one point of attack which could undercut the piece espec=ally given the nature of Starr's problems. So i want you to consider=that.

Then the second thing is you want me to take a look at it and see abou= reworking or if I think it needs reworking or I am misunderstanding that =art and you think it is ready to go and are just asking me about starr sig=ing idea?

-----riginal Message-----

From: J <jeevacation@gmail.com>
To: David Schoen <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Thu, Dec 20, 2018 2:53 pm

&nbs=; david , what if instead of this signed by ken starr. &n=sp; if you felt inspired as you were not part of the defense team an= re worked this into a pro prosecutor piece for the wash post.

"Sweethear= deal!" So goes the attack on the resolution of the more than a decade ago federal investigation involving our client Jeffrey Epstein. The=20 attack is profoundly misplaced, supported neither by the law nor the facts. Nor is it supported by the structure of our constitutional republic. To the contrary, Jeffrey was subjected to an extremely aggressive federal intrusion into what would typically be considered a quintessentially local criminal matter in south Florida. The&nbs=;offense investigated — at its core, sexual favors for hire — has long been treated=as a matter entrusted to laws of the several States, not the federal government. =20 The conduct — for which Jeffrey took full respo=sibility — was a classic state offense and was treated exactly that way by able, honest prosecutors in Palm Beach County. Nevertheless, without a reques= from the state prosecutors, the federal government intervened. For their o=n opportunistic reasons, many are now criticizing the federal decision-makers at the time, including now-Secretary of Labor Alex Acosta (then-United States Attorney in south Florida), for not going far enough.

The critics are wrong on the facts and the law. They also ignore a fact going to the heart of fundamental fairness: In the decade since =aying his debt to society, Jeffrey Epstein has led a life characterized by responsible citizenship, numerous acts of generosity and good deeds.=/div>

Here are the true key facts: Jeffrey Epstein, a successful self-made=20 businessman with no prior criminal history whatsoever, engaged in illegal conduct that amounted to solicitation of prostitution. That conduct was wrong and a violation of Flo=ida state law. Although no coercion, violence, alcohol, drugs or the like were=20 involved, some of the women he paid were under the age of 18. Those facts were carefully assessed by experienced state sex crime prosecutors who aggressively enforce state criminal laws. No one turn=d a blind eye to potential offenses to the public order. To the contrary, the Palm Beach State Attorney's Office conducted an extensive fifteen-month investigation, led by the chief of the Sex Crimes Division. Mr. Epstein was then indicted by the state grand jury on a=20 single felony count of solicitation of prostitution.

During that intense investigation, the state prosecutors extensively gathered and analyzed the evidence, met face-to-face with many of the asserted=20 victims, considered their credibility — or lack thereof — a=d considered the extent of exculpatory evidence, including sworn testimony&nb=p;from many that they lied about being eighteen years old to be allowed into Mr. Epstein's home. After months of negotiations, the state prose=utors believed they had reached a reasoned resolution of the matter that vindicated the public interest — a resolution entirely consistent w=th that of cases involving other similarly-situated defendants. The syst=m worked as it should have.

Then, in came the feds. The United States Attorney's Office extensively an= aggressively investigated whether Mr. Epstein had engaged in a commercial human trafficking ring, targeted minors, or used the intern=t or traveled interstate in the process. But that's not w=at this was and that's not what happened. That is precisely why&=bsp;the federal authorities' ultimate decision to defer prosecution to the sta=e was the right one.

However, the federally-demanded resolution was not without conditions. The federal prosecutors insisted on various unorthodox requirements that M=. Epstein's experienced defense team had never seen imposed on any=20 defendant anywhere. Under the federally-forced deal, Jeffrey was required to request that the state prosecutors demand the impositi=n of a thirty-month sentence that included both jail time and=the strictest conditions of probation: lifetime sex-offender registration. Those draconian measures were far more than warranted by the state gra=d jury's indictment and would not have otherwise been required =nder the previously agreed-upon state disposition. As part of this highly unusu=l deal, the government required Jeffrey to pay for a highly experi=nced group of attorneys to bring claims against him on behalf of a governme=t list of asserted victims. Jeffrey was required to waive the right to challenge those claims without being provided the asserted victim's=20 identities by the government until after he was incarcerated. Importantly, the feds' decision to decline prosecution in deference to the state in exchange for these

extraordinary requirements w=s reviewed and approved at the multiple levels of the U.S. Department of Justice. = Jeffrey took full responsibility, complied with the feds'=demands, served his sentence, and in the process was treated exactly the same=20 (including his time served) as any other state-incarcerated individuals. His conduct while in custody was exemplary, and so characterized by the state custodial authorities.

Jeffrey Epstein has paid his debt to society. The challenges to his Agreement=20 with the Government must also be understood as challenges to the millions Mr. Epstein paid to the asserted victims and their lawyers pursuant to that agreement. Amongst the beneficiaries of the Epstein-Federal Government Agreement were the many victims who collectively received many millions as a result of the conditions imposed on Mr. Epstein that prevented him from meaningfully contesting civil liability — moneys that would be at issue if requests to invalidate the agreement were granted.

Our nation faces vitally important challenges, many involving the treatment of women and basic human dignity. Voices are rightly being raised speaking truth to power, especially about women in the workplace. But=20 Jeffrey's offenses of yesteryear, which were entirely outside of th= workplace, have long since been redressed by the criminal justice system. He fully and faithfully has performed every pr=mise and obligation required of him by state and federal authorities. In the=20 spirit of the bedrock American belief in second chances and fundamental fairness, that chapter in Jeffrey's otherwise-productive and charitable life should be allowed to close once and for all.

--

please note

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

including all attachments. copyright -all rights reserved

--

please note

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

including all attachments. copyright -all rights reserved