

From: "[REDACTED] (USANYS) [Contractor]" <[REDACTED]>
To: "[REDACTED]" <[REDACTED]>, "[REDACTED] (USANYS) [Contractor]" <[REDACTED]>
Cc: "[REDACTED]" <[REDACTED]>, "[REDACTED] (USANYS)" <[REDACTED]>

Subject: RE: Discovery Requests

Date: Wed, 27 Jan 2021 14:36:57 +0000

Inline-Images: image001.jpg; image002.jpg

We have all of the materials just about prepared to go out. [REDACTED] is doing a last check of the PROD011 that [REDACTED] exported to the shared and then everything will be all set.

From: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Thursday, January 21, 2021 9:40 PM
To: [REDACTED] (USANYS) [Contractor] <[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED] (USANYS) [Contractor] <[REDACTED]>
Cc: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED] (USANYS) <[REDACTED]>
Subject: RE: Discovery Requests

Thanks so much, [REDACTED], and my apologies for the delayed response. I've been traveling for work and fell behind on emails as a result. I will email defense counsel to ask them to send a link where they'd like the materials uploaded.

From: [REDACTED] (USANYS) [Contractor] <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, January 20, 2021 10:29 AM
To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED] (USANYS) [Contractor] <[REDACTED]>
Cc: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED] (USANYS) <[REDACTED]>
Subject: RE: Discovery Requests

I can upload these files for defense counsel today and will be able to load a disc for Maxwell when I'm back at the office tomorrow. I recall that the last time we produced to defense in this manner they preferred to use their FTP site. Would you mind asking them to send over a link to where they'd like the materials uploaded? Thanks!

From: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, January 19, 2021 8:27 PM
To: [REDACTED] (USANYS) [Contractor] <[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED] (USANYS) [Contractor] <[REDACTED]>
Cc: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED] (USANYS) <[REDACTED]>
Subject: RE: Discovery Requests

Thanks so much! Once you have the renumbered files, would you please prepare them for production to the defense? Ideally, they could go on a disc for Maxwell and USAfx for defense counsel, but let me know if it's too large.

From: [REDACTED] (USANYS) [Contractor] <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, January 19, 2021 1:45 PM
To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED] (USANYS) [Contractor] <[REDACTED]>
Cc: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED] (USANYS) <[REDACTED]>
Subject: RE: Discovery Requests

The materials from 6a have been re-stamped with the range: SDNY_GM_00327069.001 – SDNY_GM_00327069.794. They are currently being loaded here: <\\Usa.doj.gov\\cloud\\NYS\\StAndrews\\Shared\\USvEpstein-2018R01618\\Discovery\\GM\\13 Re-Bates>

Once we have 6b and 6c sorted out we will let you know.

From: [REDACTED] (USANYS) [Contractor]
Sent: Tuesday, January 19, 2021 10:21 AM
To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED] (USANYS) [Contractor] <[REDACTED]>
Cc: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED] (USANYS) <[REDACTED]>
Subject: RE: Discovery Requests

Hey [REDACTED],

We will take care of 6a today.

6b and 6c will require us to check the drives that we have at the office. Neither [REDACTED] nor I will be at the office today or tomorrow. I plan on going in on Thursday and will be able to check on those issues that defense points out. Not to jump to conclusions but I believe that PAE's .DAT files typically include only the beginning number in a range which would give the appearance of gaps in the production. As such there is a decent chance that defense is incorrect about the gaps as they list them although we will not know until we actually check the productions.

Thanks,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, January 15, 2021 9:02 PM
To: [REDACTED] (USANYS) [Contractor] <[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED] (USANYS) [Contractor] <[REDACTED]>
Cc: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED] (USANYS) <[REDACTED]>
Subject: FW: Discovery Requests

Hi [REDACTED] and [REDACTED],

Would you please take a look at request number 6 below and figure out how to address it? I believe you may need to work with [REDACTED] [REDACTED] for some of these issues.

Thanks,

[REDACTED]

From: Christian Everdell <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Thursday, January 7, 2021 4:13 PM
To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED] (USANYS) <[REDACTED]>
Cc: Mark S. Cohen <[REDACTED]>; Bobbi Sternheim <[REDACTED]>; Jeff Pagliuca <[REDACTED]> 'Laura Menninger' <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Discovery Requests

[REDACTED], [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] –

We write to raise a number of discovery issues. Please let us know your position on these issues at your earliest convenience.

1. In our email correspondence on 11/18/2020, you agreed to create a new hard drive containing the entire discovery production. We provided you with a 4TB hard drive for that purpose on 11/20/2020. It is very important for Ms. Maxwell to have this drive as soon as possible to prepare her defense. Do you have an update on when the drive will be ready?
2. We also informed you that the CD produced on November 18, 2020 did not work on the prison computer at the MDC (as you know, the laptop provided to Ms. Maxwell does not have a CD drive). Accordingly, we asked you to include the material on the CD in the new 4TB hard drive. We followed-up with you about this issue on December 30, 2020. **Given that the new hard drive is still not ready, we ask that you download the material on the CD onto a separate thumb drive or hard drive and provide it as quickly as possible to Ms. Maxwell at the MDC so that she can review the materials this weekend. Alternatively, you can provide an external CD drive to Ms. Maxwell at the MDC so that she can read the files on the MDC computer. We will provide whatever media device you require to facilitate this production.**
3. Unlike the November 9, 2020 discovery cover letter, the November 18, 2020 discovery cover letter (attached) does not correlate the Bates numbers to the particular "Subject Device" from which the documents were recovered. Instead, the cover letter indicates that the documents came from "SDNY_PROD015" or "SDNY_PROD016." We do not know what those terms refer to. We request that the government produce a list that correlates the Bates numbers for all of the documents in SDNY_PROD015 and SDNY_PROD016 to the particular devices from which the documents were recovered.
4. We request that the government provide an unredacted version of the FBI report, dated December 6, 2006, bearing Bates number SDNY_GM_02050812-14 (attached). We also request that the government produce a log identifying all of the redacted documents in the discovery and the bases for each of the redactions.
5. There are a few documents that seem to be missing from the discovery. For example, the AT&T documents (SDNY_GM_00001015-3637) do not seem to include subscriber information for the various phone numbers. Also, the flight logs produced by David Rodgers begin at Bates number "Rodgers000028," suggesting that Rodgers000001-000027 were not produced to us. Please produce these documents to us or provide an explanation why you are not producing them to us. Please confirm whether there are other documents that were removed from the grand jury subpoena productions that we have not yet identified and the basis for their removal.
6. There are a few Bates number/metadata issues with some of the documents:
 - a. There is an overlap between the fourth and fifth document productions. The fourth production ends at SDNY_GM_00328863, the fifth production begins at SDNY_GM_00328070. We propose renumbering the range from the fifth production (i.e., renumber SDNY_GM_00328070-328863).
 - b. The metadata load files (*.DAT) for PROD011 had a number of gaps which are detailed in the attached Excel file. We propose that you send us a new DAT file covering only the missing documents.
 - c. The metadata load files (*.DAT) for PROD015 had a gap from SDNY_GM_00723971 to SDNY_GM_00723981. We propose that you send us a new DAT file covering only the missing documents.
7. To the extent that the government has created an index of the documents produced on November 9 and November 18 that is more detailed than the production cover letters, we request that you provide a copy to the defense.
8. We request that the government provide copies of the grand jury subpoenas for documents issued by the government in this case. Also, please identify the date range of documents you requested in each subpoena.

There is one other issue we'd like to raise. An article in the Daily Beast on Monday referenced the search warrant affidavit for the cell-site simulator used to track Ms. Maxwell's cellphone before her arrest (<https://www.thedailybeast.com/how-the-fbi-tracked-down-ghislaine-maxwell-alleged-madam-of-jeffrey-epstein>). The article stated that the affidavit appeared

in a "newly unsealed court filing." I don't recall this affidavit being unsealed or referenced in anything that was filed on the court docket. Please confirm whether or not the government unsealed this affidavit or any other materials from the criminal discovery, and whether any discovery materials were released pursuant to FOIA requests.

Regards,

[REDACTED]

Christian R Everdell

COHEN & GRESSER LLP

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[view bio](#)

www.cohengresser.com

New York | Paris | Washington DC | London



CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The information contained in this e-mail may be confidential and/or privileged. This e-mail is intended to be reviewed initially by only the individual named above. If the reader of this e-mail is not the intended recipient or a representative of the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any review, dissemination or copying of this e-mail or the information contained herein is prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please immediately notify the sender by telephone and permanently delete this e-mail. Thank you.

PRIVACY: A complete copy of our privacy policy can be viewed at: <https://www.cohengresser.com/privacy-policy>