From: DAVID SCHOEN <[redacted]
Sent: Sunday, February 24, 2019 1:40 AM
To: J
Subject: Re:

On the one hand it is absurd. On the o=her hand it is potentially a very serious situation. I would need to d= some research to know just how serious the consequences realistically migh= be.

I have read in the paper that one possible r=medy plaintiffs intend to seek is the nullification of the "illegal=E2[illegible] agreement and the prosecution of a number of cases against you. &n=sp;There would seem to be a whole host of impediments to any such radical a=d outrageous course of action like that both of a legal and equitable natur=. However, I am a worst case scenario person ALWAYS and do not think a=criminal defense lawyer every should be anything but that.

</=iv>
Perhaps you have done the research already or have counsel who has a=d feel you have a sense of exactly what the worst case scenario is. I=don't know; but I also would not take anyone else's word fo= it.

The potential consequences are of course the m=st important thing insofar as any consequence directly affects you (action a=ainst Acosta etc. not really your problem). But the separate and rela=ed issue is what if anything to do about the fact that the complete story y=u have described in the prospective op-Ed drafts you have sent to me has ne=er come out - nor has anything that in any way challenges the popular rendi=ion and characterization of you as predator, monster, etc.

And as you correctly anticipated some time ago, t=at is a real problem and has perhaps been part of what has led to this snow=alling with no pushback of any kind (notwithstanding all the hot shot lawye=s you had by your side all through the deal and after - where are they now?=.

Without seeing the papers in the case now before=judge Marra I don't feel like I can give any meaningful advice on e=ther the legal or pr front. But I do know that you need some good adv=ce now and moving forward.

David

Sent from my iPhone
<=r>On Feb 23, 2019, at 3:31 PM, J <jeevacation@gmail.com <mailto:jeevacation@gmail.co=> > wrote:

Any ideas ? Putrid press amazing=how many lawyers argue for a 12 year old pkea deal be rescinded though the d=fendant fulfilled all his obligations

--

=nbsp; please note

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

JEE
Unauthorized u=e, disclosure or copying of this
communication or any part thereof is st=ictly 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-=ail to jeevacati=n@gmail.com <mailto:jeevacation@gmail.com> , and
destroy this communication and all copies thereof,<=r>including all attachments. copyright -all rights reserved

=/div>

=