

orig
Blind

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

CASE NO.: 08-CV-80380-MARRA-JOHNSON

JANE DOE NO. 4,

Plaintiff,

v.

JEFFREY EPSTEIN,

Defendant.

**DEFENDANT EPSTEIN'S RESPONSE & OBJECTIONS
TO PLAINTIFF'S AMENDED FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES**

Defendant, JEFFREY EPSTEIN, by and through his undersigned attorneys,
serves his responses and objections to Plaintiff's December 9, 2008 Amended First Set
Of Interrogatories To Defendant Jeffrey Epstein, attached hereto.

Certificate of Service

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true copy of the foregoing has been sent by fax and
U.S. Mail to the following addressees this 26th day of January, 2009:

Adam D. Horowitz, Esq.
Jeffrey Marc Herman, Esq.
Stuart S. Mermelstein, Esq.
18205 Biscayne Boulevard
Suite 2218
Miami, FL 33160
305-931-2200
Fax: 305-931-0877
ahorowitz@hermanlaw.com
jherman@hermanlaw.com
lriviera@hermanlaw.com
Counsel for Plaintiff Jane Doe #4


Jack Alan Goldberger
Atterbury Goldberger & Weiss, P.A.
250 Australian Avenue South
Suite 1400
West Palm Beach, FL 33401-5012
561-659-8300
Fax: 561-835-8691
jagesq@bellsouth.net
Co-Counsel for Defendant Jeffrey Epstein

COMPOSITE EXHIBIT "C"

orig. signature page
to Herman
cc: 16, 18, 21

Jane Doe No. 4 v. Epstein
Page 2

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
ROBERT D. CRITTON, JR., ESQ.
Florida Bar No. 224162
rcrit@bclclaw.com

MICHAEL J. PIKE, ESQ.
Florida Bar #617296
mpike@bclclaw.com

BURMAN, CRITTON, LUTTIER & COLEMAN
515 N. Flagler Drive, Suite 400
West Palm Beach, FL 33401
561/842-2820 Phone
561/515-3148 Fax

(Co-Counsel for Defendant Jeffrey Epstein)

Jane Doe No. 4 v. Epstein
Page 3

**DEFENDANT JEFFREY EPSTEIN'S ANSWERS AND OBJECTIONS TO
PLAINTIFF'S AMENDED FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES**

Interrogatory No. 1. Identify all employees who performed work of services inside the Palm Beach Residence.

Answer: Defendant is asserting specific legal objections to the interrogatories as well as his U.S. constitutional privileges. I intend to respond to all relevant questions regarding this lawsuit, however, my attorneys have counseled me that I cannot provide answers to any questions relevant to this lawsuit and I must accept this advice or risk losing my Sixth Amendment right to effective representation. Accordingly, I assert my federal constitutional rights under the Fifth, Sixth, and Fourteenth Amendments as guaranteed by the United States Constitution. Drawing an adverse inference under these circumstances would unconstitutionally burden my exercise of my constitutional rights, would be unreasonable, and would therefore violate the Constitution. In addition to and without waiving his constitutional privileges, Defendant objects as the interrogatory is overbroad and seeks information that is neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending action nor does it appear reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Plaintiff's Complaint alleges a time period of "in or about 2002-2003." Plaintiff's interrogatory seeks information for a time period from January 1, 2003 until present. Also, see "Employee" as defined in paragraph g of Plaintiff's interrogatories.

Interrogatory No. 2. Identify all Employees not identified in response to interrogatory no. 1 who at any time came to Defendant's Palm Beach Residence.

Answer: Defendant is asserting specific legal objections to the interrogatories as well as his U.S. constitutional privileges. I intend to respond to all relevant questions regarding this lawsuit, however, my attorneys have counseled me that I cannot provide answers to any questions relevant to this lawsuit and I must accept this advice or risk losing my Sixth Amendment right to effective representation. Accordingly, I assert my federal constitutional rights under the Fifth, Sixth, and Fourteenth Amendments as guaranteed by the United States Constitution. Drawing an adverse inference under these circumstances would unconstitutionally burden my exercise of my constitutional rights, would be unreasonable, and would therefore violate the Constitution. In addition to and without waiving his constitutional privileges, Defendant objects as the interrogatory is overbroad and seeks information that is neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending action nor does it appear reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Plaintiff's Complaint alleges a time period of "in or about 2002-2003." Plaintiff's interrogatory seeks information for "all Employees" "who at any time" came to the residence. Also, see "Employee" as defined in paragraph g of Plaintiff's interrogatories.

Jane Doe No. 4 v. Epstein
Page 4

Interrogatory No. 3. Identify all persons who came to the Palm Beach Residence and who gave a massage or were asked to give a massage to Defendant.

Answer: Defendant is asserting specific legal objections to the interrogatories as well as his U.S. constitutional privileges. I intend to respond to all relevant questions regarding this lawsuit, however, my attorneys have counseled me that I cannot provide answers to any questions relevant to this lawsuit and I must accept this advice or risk losing my Sixth Amendment right to effective representation. Accordingly, I assert my federal constitutional rights under the Fifth, Sixth, and Fourteenth Amendments as guaranteed by the United States Constitution. Drawing an adverse inference under these circumstances would unconstitutionally burden my exercise of my constitutional rights, would be unreasonable, and would therefore violate the Constitution. In addition to and without waiving his constitutional privileges, Defendant objects as the interrogatory is overbroad and seeks information that is neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending action nor does it appear reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Plaintiff's Complaint alleges a time period of "in or about 2002-2003."

Interrogatory No. 4. Identify all persons who came to the New York Residence and who gave a massage or were asked to give a massage to Defendant.

Answer: Defendant is asserting specific legal objections to the interrogatories as well as his U.S. constitutional privileges. I intend to respond to all relevant questions regarding this lawsuit, however, my attorneys have counseled me that I cannot provide answers to any questions relevant to this lawsuit and I must accept this advice or risk losing my Sixth Amendment right to effective representation. Accordingly, I assert my federal constitutional rights under the Fifth, Sixth, and Fourteenth Amendments as guaranteed by the United States Constitution. Drawing an adverse inference under these circumstances would unconstitutionally burden my exercise of my constitutional rights, would be unreasonable, and would therefore violate the Constitution. In addition to and without waiving his constitutional privileges, Defendant objects as the interrogatory is overbroad and seeks information that is neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending action nor does it appear reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Plaintiff's Complaint alleges a time period of "in or about 2002-2003."

Interrogatory No. 5. Identify all persons who came to the New Mexico Residence and who gave a massage or were asked to give a massage to Defendant.

Answer: Defendant is asserting specific legal objections to the interrogatories as well as his U.S. constitutional privileges. I intend to respond to all relevant questions regarding this lawsuit, however, my attorneys have counseled me that I cannot provide answers to any questions relevant to this lawsuit and I must accept this advice or risk losing my Sixth Amendment right to effective representation. Accordingly, I assert my

Jane Doe No. 4 v. Epstein
Page 5

federal constitutional rights under the Fifth, Sixth, and Fourteenth Amendments as guaranteed by the United States Constitution. Drawing an adverse inference under these circumstances would unconstitutionally burden my exercise of my constitutional rights, would be unreasonable, and would therefore violate the Constitution. In addition to and without waiving his constitutional privileges, Defendant objects as the interrogatory is overbroad and seeks information that is neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending action nor does it appear reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Plaintiff's Complaint alleges a time period of "in or about 2002-2003."

Interrogatory No. 6. Identify all persons who came to the St. Thomas Residence and who gave a massage or were asked to give a massage to Defendant.

Answer: Defendant is asserting specific legal objections to the interrogatories as well as his U.S. constitutional privileges. I intend to respond to all relevant questions regarding this lawsuit, however, my attorneys have counseled me that I cannot provide answers to any questions relevant to this lawsuit and I must accept this advice or risk losing my Sixth Amendment right to effective representation. Accordingly, I assert my federal constitutional rights under the Fifth, Sixth, and Fourteenth Amendments as guaranteed by the United States Constitution. Drawing an adverse inference under these circumstances would unconstitutionally burden my exercise of my constitutional rights, would be unreasonable, and would therefore violate the Constitution. In addition to and without waiving his constitutional privileges, Defendant objects as the interrogatory is overbroad and seeks information that is neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending action nor does it appear reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Plaintiff's Complaint alleges a time period of "in or about 2002-2003."

Interrogatory No. 7. List all the time periods during which Jeffrey Epstein was present in the State of Florida, including for each the date he arrive and the date he departed.

Answer: Defendant is asserting specific legal objections to the interrogatories as well as his U.S. constitutional privileges. I intend to respond to all relevant questions regarding this lawsuit, however, my attorneys have counseled me that I cannot provide answers to any questions relevant to this lawsuit and I must accept this advice or risk losing my Sixth Amendment right to effective representation. Accordingly, I assert my federal constitutional rights under the Fifth, Sixth, and Fourteenth Amendments as guaranteed by the United States Constitution. Drawing an adverse inference under these circumstances would unconstitutionally burden my exercise of my constitutional rights, would be unreasonable, and would therefore violate the Constitution. In addition to and without waiving his constitutional privileges, Defendant also objects as the interrogatory is overbroad and seeks information that is neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending action nor does it appear reasonably calculated to lead to the

Jane Doe No. 4 v. Epstein
Page 6

discovery of admissible evidence. Plaintiff's Complaint alleges a time period of "in or about 2002-2003." Plaintiff's interrogatory seeks information for a time period from January 1, 2003 until present.

Interrogatory No. 8. Identify all of Jeffrey Epstein health care providers in the past (10) ten years, including without limitation, psychologists, psychiatrists, mental health counselors, physicians, hospitals and treatment facilities.

Answer: Defendant is asserting specific legal objections to the interrogatories as well as his U.S. constitutional privileges. I intend to respond to all relevant questions regarding this lawsuit, however, my attorneys have counseled me that I cannot provide answers to any questions relevant to this lawsuit and I must accept this advice or risk losing my Sixth Amendment right to effective representation. Accordingly, I assert my federal constitutional rights under the Fifth, Sixth, and Fourteenth Amendments as guaranteed by the United States Constitution. Drawing an adverse inference under these circumstances would unconstitutionally burden my exercise of my constitutional rights, would be unreasonable, and would therefore violate the Constitution. In addition to and without waiving his constitutional privileges, Defendant also objects as the interrogatory is overbroad and seeks information that is neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending action nor does it appear reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. In addition, such information is privileged pursuant to Rule 501, Fed. Evid., and §90.503, Fla.Evid. Code. In addition, such information is protected by the provisions of the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA).

Interrogatory No. 9. List all items in Jeffrey Epstein's possession in Palm Beach, Florida, at any time during the period of these interrogatories, which were used or intended to be used as sexual aids, sex toys, massage aids, and/or vibrators, and for each, list the manufacturer, model number (if applicable), and its present location.

Answer: Defendant is asserting specific legal objections to the interrogatories as well as his U.S. constitutional privileges. I intend to respond to all relevant questions regarding this lawsuit, however, my attorneys have counseled me that I cannot provide answers to any questions relevant to this lawsuit and I must accept this advice or risk losing my Sixth Amendment right to effective representation. Accordingly, I assert my federal constitutional rights under the Fifth, Sixth, and Fourteenth Amendments as guaranteed by the United States Constitution. Drawing an adverse inference under these circumstances would unconstitutionally burden my exercise of my constitutional rights, would be unreasonable, and would therefore violate the Constitution. In addition to and without waiving his constitutional privileges, Defendant also objects as the interrogatory is overbroad and seeks information that is neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending action nor does it appear reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Plaintiff's Amended Complaint alleges a time period of "in or about 2002-2003," while Plaintiff's interrogatory seeks information from January

Jane Doe No. 4 v. Epstein
Page 7

1, 2003, until present. Further, the request is meant to embarrass and harass the Defendant.

Interrogatory No. 10. Identify all persons who provide transportation services to Jeffrey Epstein, whether as employees or independent contractors, including without limitation, chauffeurs and aircraft crew.

Answer: Defendant is asserting specific legal objections to the interrogatories as well as his U.S. constitutional privileges. I intend to respond to all relevant questions regarding this lawsuit, however, my attorneys have counseled me that I cannot provide answers to any questions relevant to this lawsuit and I must accept this advice or risk losing my Sixth Amendment right to effective representation. Accordingly, I assert my federal constitutional rights under the Fifth, Sixth, and Fourteenth Amendments as guaranteed by the United States Constitution. Drawing an adverse inference under these circumstances would unconstitutionally burden my exercise of my constitutional rights, would be unreasonable, and would therefore violate the Constitution. In addition to and without waiving his constitutional privileges, Defendant also objects as the interrogatory is overbroad and seeks information that is neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending action nor does it appear reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Plaintiff places no time limitation.

Interrogatory No. 11. Identify all telephone numbers used by Epstein, including cellular phones and land lines in any of his residences, by stating the complete telephone number and the name of the service provider.

Answer: Defendant is asserting specific legal objections to the interrogatories as well as his U.S. constitutional privileges. I intend to respond to all relevant questions regarding this lawsuit, however, my attorneys have counseled me that I cannot provide answers to any questions relevant to this lawsuit and I must accept this advice or risk losing my Sixth Amendment right to effective representation. Accordingly, I assert my federal constitutional rights under the Fifth, Sixth, and Fourteenth Amendments as guaranteed by the United States Constitution. Drawing an adverse inference under these circumstances would unconstitutionally burden my exercise of my constitutional rights, would be unreasonable, and would therefore violate the Constitution. In addition to and without waiving his constitutional privileges, Defendant also objects as the interrogatory is overbroad and seeks information that is neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending action nor does it appear reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Plaintiff's allegations claim a time period of "in or about 2002-2003" and involve Defendant's Palm Beach residence.

Interrogatory No. 12. Identify all telephone numbers of employees of Epstein, used in the course or scope of their employment, including cellular phones and land lines in any of his residences, by stating the complete telephone number and the name of the service provider.

Jane Doe No. 4 v. Epstein
Page 8

Answer: Defendant is asserting specific legal objections to the interrogatories as well as his U.S. constitutional privileges. I intend to respond to all relevant questions regarding this lawsuit, however, my attorneys have counseled me that I cannot provide answers to any questions relevant to this lawsuit and I must accept this advice or risk losing my Sixth Amendment right to effective representation. Accordingly, I assert my federal constitutional rights under the Fifth, Sixth, and Fourteenth Amendments as guaranteed by the United States Constitution. Drawing an adverse inference under these circumstances would unconstitutionally burden my exercise of my constitutional rights, would be unreasonable, and would therefore violate the Constitution. In addition to and without waiving his constitutional privileges, Defendant objects as the interrogatory is overbroad and seeks information that is neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending action nor does it appear reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Plaintiff's allegations claim a time period of "in or about 2002-2003" and involve Defendant's Palm Beach residence.

Interrogatory No. 13. List the names and addresses of all persons who are believed or known by you, your agents, or your attorneys to have any knowledge concerning any of the issues in this lawsuit; and specify the subject matter about which the witness has knowledge.

Answer: Defendant is asserting specific legal objections to the interrogatories as well as his U.S. constitutional privileges. I intend to respond to all relevant questions regarding this lawsuit, however, my attorneys have counseled me that I cannot provide answers to any questions relevant to this lawsuit and I must accept this advice or risk losing my Sixth Amendment right to effective representation. Accordingly, I assert my federal constitutional rights under the Fifth, Sixth, and Fourteenth Amendments as guaranteed by the United States Constitution. Drawing an adverse inference under these circumstances would unconstitutionally burden my exercise of my constitutional rights, would be unreasonable, and would therefore violate the Constitution. In addition to and without waiving his constitutional privileges, the interrogatory seeks information that is attorney-client and work product privileged as it seeks information known by Defendant's attorneys. The interrogatory is so overbroad that Defendant cannot reasonably form a response, including the raising of additional privileges which may apply. Without waiving any objection, see Rule 26 disclosures made by Defendant's counsel in this case.

Interrogatory No. 14. State the name and address of every person known to you, your agents, or your attorneys who has knowledge about, possession, or custody, or control of, any model, plat, map, drawing, motion picture, videotape or photograph pertaining to any fact or issue involved in this controversy; and describe as to each, what item such person has, the name and address of the person who took or prepared it, and the date it was taken or prepared.

Jane Doe No. 4 v. Epstein
Page 9

Answer: Defendant is asserting specific legal objections to the interrogatories as well as his U.S. constitutional privileges. I intend to respond to all relevant questions regarding this lawsuit, however, my attorneys have counseled me that I cannot provide answers to any questions relevant to this lawsuit and I must accept this advice or risk losing my Sixth Amendment right to effective representation. Accordingly, I assert my federal constitutional rights under the Fifth, Sixth, and Fourteenth Amendments as guaranteed by the United States Constitution. Drawing an adverse inference under these circumstances would unconstitutionally burden my exercise of my constitutional rights, would be unreasonable, and would therefore violate the Constitution. In addition to and without waiving his constitutional privileges, the interrogatory seeks information that is attorney-client and work product privileged as it seeks information known by Defendant's attorneys.

Interrogatory No. 15. Identify all persons who have made a claim, complaint, demand or threat against you relating to alleged sexual abuse or misconduct on a minor, and for each provide the following information:

- a. The person's full name, last known address and telephone number;
- b. The person's attorney, if represented;
- c. The date of the alleged incident(s);
- d. If a civil case has been filed by or on behalf of the person, the case number and identifying information.

Answer: Defendant is asserting specific legal objections to the interrogatories as well as his U.S. constitutional privileges. I intend to respond to all relevant questions regarding this lawsuit, however, my attorneys have counseled me that I cannot provide answers to any questions relevant to this lawsuit and I must accept this advice or risk losing my Sixth Amendment right to effective representation. Accordingly, I assert my federal constitutional rights under the Fifth, Sixth, and Fourteenth Amendments as guaranteed by the United States Constitution. Drawing an adverse inference under these circumstances would unconstitutionally burden my exercise of my constitutional rights, would be unreasonable, and would therefore violate the Constitution. In addition to and without waiving his constitutional privileges and without waiving such objection, with regard to subparagraph (d), Defendant's counsel states that such information is public record and equally attainable by Plaintiff.

Interrogatory No. 16. State the facts upon which you intend to rely for each denial of a pleading allegation and for each affirmative defense you intend to make in these cases.


Answer: Defendant is asserting specific legal objections to the interrogatories as well as his U.S. constitutional privileges. I intend to respond to all relevant questions regarding this lawsuit, however, my attorneys have counseled me that I cannot provide answers to any questions relevant to this lawsuit and I must accept this advice or risk

Jane Doe No. 4 v. Epstein
Page 10

losing my Sixth Amendment right to effective representation. Accordingly, I assert my federal constitutional rights under the Fifth, Sixth, and Fourteenth Amendments as guaranteed by the United States Constitution. Drawing an adverse inference under these circumstances would unconstitutionally burden my exercise of my constitutional rights, would be unreasonable, and would therefore violate the Constitution. In addition to and without waiving his constitutional privileges, no answer to the Amended Complaint has been filed by defense counsel in this case; however, Defendant does not intend to waive his constitutional privilege against self-incrimination. Defendant further objects in that Plaintiff's interrogatory attempts to obtain discovery in other cases filed by her undersigned counsel.

Interrogatory No. 17. Identify all witnesses from whom you have obtained or requested a written, transcribed or recorded statement relating to any issue in these cases, and for each, in addition to the witness's identifying information, state the date of the statement and identify the person taking the statement.

Answer: Defendant is asserting specific legal objections to the interrogatories as well as his U.S. constitutional privileges. I intend to respond to all relevant questions regarding this lawsuit, however, my attorneys have counseled me that I cannot provide answers to any questions relevant to this lawsuit and I must accept this advice or risk losing my Sixth Amendment right to effective representation. Accordingly, I assert my federal constitutional rights under the Fifth, Sixth, and Fourteenth Amendments as guaranteed by the United States Constitution. Drawing an adverse inference under these circumstances would unconstitutionally burden my exercise of my constitutional rights, would be unreasonable, and would therefore violate the Constitution. In addition to and without waiving his constitutional privileges, Defendant objects to this interrogatory in that it seeks information that is attorney-client and work product privileged. In addition, the request is overbroad in that it seeks information "relating to any issue."



STATE OF Florida)
)
COUNTY OF Palm Beach)

I hereby certify that on this day, before me, an officer duly authorized to administer oaths and take acknowledgments, personally appeared Jeffrey Epstein, known to me to be the person described in and who executed the foregoing Interrogatories who

Jane Doe No. 4 v. Epstein
Page 11

acknowledged before me that he/she executed the same, that I relied upon the following form of identification of the above-named person: personally known/identification, and that an oath was/was not taken.

WITNESS my hand and official seal in the County and State last aforesaid this 26th
day of January, 2009.

(SEAL)

NOTARY PUBLIC-STATE OF FLORIDA
 Nayanira Alanis
Commission #DD841844
Expires: DEC. 01, 2012
BONDED THRU ATLANTIC BONDING CO., INC.

Nayanira Alanis
PRINT NAME: Nayanira Alanis
Notary Public/State of Florida
Commission #: _____
My Commission Expires: _____

*Original
Filed*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

CASE NO.: 08-CV-80380-MARRA-JOHNSON

JANE DOE NO. 4,

Plaintiff,

v.

JEFFREY EPSTEIN,

Defendant.

DEFENDANT JEFFREY EPSTEIN'S RESPONSE & OBJECTIONS
TO PLAINTIFF'S AMENDED FIRST REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION

Defendant, JEFFREY EPSTEIN, by and through his undersigned counsel, serves his responses and objections to Plaintiff's Amended First Request For Production To Defendant, dated December 9, 2008.

Request No. 1. The list provided to you by the U.S. Attorney of individuals whom the U.S. Attorney was prepared to name in an Indictment as victims of an offense by Mr. Epstein enumerated in 18 U.S.C. §2255.

Response: Defendant is asserting specific legal objections to the production request as well as his U.S. constitutional privileges. I intend to produce all relevant documents regarding this lawsuit, however, my attorneys have counseled me that at the present time I cannot select, authenticate, and produce documents relevant to this lawsuit and I must accept this advice or risk losing my Sixth Amendment right to effective representation. Accordingly, I assert my federal constitutional rights under the Fifth, Sixth, and Fourteenth Amendments as guaranteed by the United States Constitution. Drawing an adverse inference

CC-16-1E-DI

Jane Doe No. 4 v. Epstein
Page 2

under these circumstances would unconstitutionally burden my exercise of my constitutional rights, would be unreasonable, and would therefore violate the Constitution. In addition to and without waiving his constitutional privileges, the information sought is privileged and confidential, and inadmissible pursuant to the terms of the deferred prosecution agreement, Fed. Rule of Evidence 410 and 408, and §90.410, Fla. Stat. Further, the request is overly broad, work product, attorney-client privileged, and confidential. In addition, the request seeks information concerning persons, not parties to this litigation, whose privacy rights are implicated.

Request No. 2. All documents referring or relating to the United States' agreement with Defendant to defer federal prosecution subject to certain conditions, including without limitation, the operative agreement between Defendant and the United States and all amendments, revisions and supplements thereto.

Response: Defendant is asserting specific legal objections to the production request as well as his U.S. constitutional privileges. I intend to produce all relevant documents regarding this lawsuit, however, my attorneys have counseled me that at the present time I cannot select, authenticate, and produce documents relevant to this lawsuit and I must accept this advice or risk losing my Sixth Amendment right to effective representation. Accordingly, I assert my federal constitutional rights under the Fifth, Sixth, and Fourteenth Amendments as guaranteed by the United States Constitution. Drawing an adverse inference under these circumstances would unconstitutionally burden my exercise of my

Jane Doe No. 4 v. Epstein
Page 3

constitutional rights, would be unreasonable, and would therefore violate the Constitution. In addition to and without waiving his constitutional privileges, the information sought is privileged and confidential, and inadmissible pursuant to the terms of the deferred prosecution agreement, Fed. Rule of Evidence 410 and 408, and §90.410, Fla. Stat. Further, the request is overly broad, work product, attorney-client privileged, and confidential. In addition, the request seeks information concerning persons, not parties to this litigation, whose privacy rights are implicated.

Request No. 3. All documents referring or relating to Defendant's agreement with the State of Florida on his plea of guilty to violations of Florida Criminal Statutes, including without limitation, the operative plea agreement and any amendments, revisions and supplements thereto.

Response: Defendant is asserting specific legal objections to the production request as well as his U.S. constitutional privileges. I intend to produce all relevant documents regarding this lawsuit, however, my attorneys have counseled me that at the present time I cannot select, authenticate, and produce documents relevant to this lawsuit and I must accept this advice or risk losing my Sixth Amendment right to effective representation. Accordingly, I assert my federal constitutional rights under the Fifth, Sixth, and Fourteenth Amendments as guaranteed by the United States Constitution. Drawing an adverse inference under these circumstances would unconstitutionally burden my exercise of my constitutional rights, would be unreasonable, and would therefore violate the Constitution. In addition to and without waiving his constitutional privileges, the

Jane Doe No. 4 v. Epstein
Page 4

information sought is privileged and confidential, and inadmissible pursuant to the terms of the deferred prosecution agreement, Fed. Rule of Evidence 410 and 408, and §90.410, Fla. Stat. Further, the request is overly broad, work product, attorney-client privileged, and confidential. In addition, the request seeks information concerning persons, not parties to this litigation, whose privacy rights are implicated. Whatever public documents exist are in the State Court file and equally accessible to Plaintiff.

Request No.4. All documents obtained in discovery or investigation relating to either the Florida Criminal Case or the Federal Criminal Case, including without limitation, documents obtained from any federal, state, or local law enforcement agency, the State Attorney's office and the United States Attorney's office.

Response: Defendant is asserting specific legal objections to the production request as well as his U.S. constitutional privileges. I intend to produce all relevant documents regarding this lawsuit, however, my attorneys have counseled me that at the present time I cannot select, authenticate, and produce documents relevant to this lawsuit and I must accept this advice or risk losing my Sixth Amendment right to effective representation. Accordingly, I assert my federal constitutional rights under the Fifth, Sixth, and Fourteenth Amendments as guaranteed by the United States Constitution. Drawing an adverse inference under these circumstances would unconstitutionally burden my exercise of my constitutional rights, would be unreasonable, and would therefore violate the Constitution. In addition to and without waiving his constitutional privileges, the

Jane Doe No. 4 v. Epstein
Page 5

information sought is privileged and confidential, and inadmissible pursuant to the terms of the deferred prosecution agreement, Fed. Rule of Evidence 410 and 408, and §90.410, Fla. Stat. Further, the request is overly broad, work product, attorney-client privileged, and confidential. In addition, the request seeks information concerning persons, not parties to this litigation, whose privacy rights are implicated. Request No. 4 seeks documents that are attorney-client and work product privileged in that it seeks "all documents obtained in discovery or investigation relating either to the Florida Criminal Case or the Federal Criminal Case" In addition, such documents are privileged and confidential as they are the subject of a pending investigation.

Request No. 5. All telephone records and other documents reflecting telephone calls made by or to Defendant, including without limitation, telephone logs and message pads.

Response: Defendant is asserting specific legal objections to the production request as well as his U.S. constitutional privileges. I intend to produce all relevant documents regarding this lawsuit, however, my attorneys have counseled me that at the present time I cannot select, authenticate, and produce documents relevant to this lawsuit and I must accept this advice or risk losing my Sixth Amendment right to effective representation. Accordingly, I assert my federal constitutional rights under the Fifth, Sixth, and Fourteenth Amendments as guaranteed by the United States Constitution. Drawing an adverse inference under these circumstances would unconstitutionally burden my exercise of my constitutional rights, would be unreasonable, and would therefore violate the

Jane Doe No. 4 v. Epstein
Page 6

Constitution. In addition to and without waiving his constitutional privileges, the information sought is privileged and confidential, and inadmissible pursuant to the terms of the deferred prosecution agreement, Fed. Rule of Evidence 410 and 408, and §90.410, Fla. Stat. Further, the request is overly broad, work product, attorney-client privileged, and confidential. In addition, the request seeks information concerning persons, not parties to this litigation, whose privacy rights are implicated. Defendant objects as the request is overbroad and seeks information that is neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending action nor does it appear reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Plaintiff's complaint alleges a time period of "in or about 2002 – 2003." Plaintiff's request seeks information for a time period of January 1, 2003 until present regarding any and all telephone records and other documents reflecting any and all telephone calls made to or by Defendant. As phrased, the request includes attorney-client and work product privileged information, as well as records and documents of calls having absolutely no relationship to any of the allegations in this action.

Request No. 6. All telephone records and other documents reflecting telephone calls made by or to Defendant, including without limitation, telephone logs and message pads, reflecting telephone calls made by or to employees.

Response: Defendant is asserting specific legal objections to the production request as well as his U.S. constitutional privileges. I intend to produce all relevant documents regarding this lawsuit, however, my attorneys have counseled me that at the present time I cannot select, authenticate, and produce

Jane Doe No. 4 v. Epstein
Page 7

documents relevant to this lawsuit and I must accept this advice or risk losing my Sixth Amendment right to effective representation. Accordingly, I assert my federal constitutional rights under the Fifth, Sixth, and Fourteenth Amendments as guaranteed by the United States Constitution. Drawing an adverse inference under these circumstances would unconstitutionally burden my exercise of my constitutional rights, would be unreasonable, and would therefore violate the Constitution. In addition to and without waiving his constitutional privileges, the information sought is privileged and confidential, and inadmissible pursuant to the terms of the deferred prosecution agreement, Fed. Rule of Evidence 410 and 408, and §90.410, Fla. Stat. Further, the request is overly broad, work product, attorney-client privileged, and confidential. In addition, as defined by Plaintiff in paragraph g of her request, the term employee is overly broad and encompasses information that is neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending action nor does it appear reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Further, the request seeks information pertaining to person who are not parties to this action and whose privacy rights are implicated.

Request No. 7. All surveillance videos, slides, film, videotape, digital recording or other audio or video depiction or image of the Palm Beach Residence.

Response: Defendant is asserting specific legal objections to the production request as well as his U.S. constitutional privileges. I intend to produce all relevant documents regarding this lawsuit, however, my attorneys have counseled me that at the present time I cannot select, authenticate, and produce documents relevant to this lawsuit and I must accept this advice or risk losing my

Jane Doe No. 4 v. Epstein
Page 8

Sixth Amendment right to effective representation. Accordingly, I assert my federal constitutional rights under the Fifth, Sixth, and Fourteenth Amendments as guaranteed by the United States Constitution. Drawing an adverse inference under these circumstances would unconstitutionally burden my exercise of my constitutional rights, would be unreasonable, and would therefore violate the Constitution. In addition to and without waiving his constitutional privileges, the information sought is privileged and confidential, and inadmissible pursuant to the terms of the deferred prosecution agreement, Fed. Rule of Evidence 410 and 408, and §90.410, Fla. Stat. Further, the request is overly broad, work product, attorney-client privileged, and confidential. In addition, the request seeks information concerning persons, not parties to this litigation, whose privacy rights are implicated. Plaintiff's complaint alleges a time period of "in or about 2002 – 2003." Plaintiff's request seeks information for a time period of January 1, 2003 until present regarding "all surveillance videos, etc., or image of the Palm Beach Residence."

Request No. 8. All documents referring or relating to Plaintiff Jane Doe No. 2, including without limitation, web pages, social networking site pages, correspondence, videotapes and audiotapes.

Response: Defendant is asserting specific legal objections to the production request as well as his U.S. constitutional privileges. I intend to produce all relevant documents regarding this lawsuit, however, my attorneys have counseled me that at the present time I cannot select, authenticate, and produce documents relevant to this lawsuit and I must accept this advice or risk losing my

Jane Doe No. 4 v. Epstein
Page 9

Sixth Amendment right to effective representation. Accordingly, I assert my federal constitutional rights under the Fifth, Sixth, and Fourteenth Amendments as guaranteed by the United States Constitution. Drawing an adverse inference under these circumstances would unconstitutionally burden my exercise of my constitutional rights, would be unreasonable, and would therefore violate the Constitution. In addition to and without waiving his constitutional privileges, the information sought is privileged and confidential, and inadmissible pursuant to the terms of the deferred prosecution agreement, Fed. Rule of Evidence 410 and 408, and §90.410, Fla. Stat. Further, the request is overly broad, work product, attorney-client privileged, and confidential.

Request No. 9. All statements taken, transcribed or recorded from any person referring or relating to Defendant's sexual conduct, massages given to Defendant or any issue in these cases.

Response: Defendant is asserting specific legal objections to the production request as well as his U.S. constitutional privileges. I intend to produce all relevant documents regarding this lawsuit, however, my attorneys have counseled me that at the present time I cannot select, authenticate, and produce documents relevant to this lawsuit and I must accept this advice or risk losing my Sixth Amendment right to effective representation. Accordingly, I assert my federal constitutional rights under the Fifth, Sixth, and Fourteenth Amendments as guaranteed by the United States Constitution. Drawing an adverse inference under these circumstances would unconstitutionally burden my exercise of my constitutional rights, would be unreasonable, and would therefore violate the

Jane Doe No. 4 v. Epstein
Page 10

Constitution. In addition to and without waiving his constitutional privileges, the information sought is privileged and confidential, and inadmissible pursuant to the terms of the deferred prosecution agreement, Fed. Rule of Evidence 410 and 408, and §90.410, Fla. Stat. Further, the request is overly broad, work product, attorney-client privileged, and confidential.

Request No. 10. All documents referring to or relating to air travel and aircraft used by Defendant, including without limitation, flight logs and flight manifests.

Response: Defendant is asserting specific legal objections to the production request as well as his U.S. constitutional privileges. I intend to produce all relevant documents regarding this lawsuit, however, my attorneys have counseled me that at the present time I cannot select, authenticate, and produce documents relevant to this lawsuit and I must accept this advice or risk losing my Sixth Amendment right to effective representation. Accordingly, I assert my federal constitutional rights under the Fifth, Sixth, and Fourteenth Amendments as guaranteed by the United States Constitution. Drawing an adverse inference under these circumstances would unconstitutionally burden my exercise of my constitutional rights, would be unreasonable, and would therefore violate the Constitution. In addition to and without waiving his constitutional privileges, the information sought is privileged and confidential, and inadmissible pursuant to the terms of the deferred prosecution agreement, Fed. Rule of Evidence 410 and 408, and §90.410, Fla. Stat. Further, the request is overly broad, work product, attorney-client privileged, and confidential. Plaintiff's complaint alleges a time period of "in or about 2002 – 2003." Plaintiff's request seeks documents for a

Jane Doe No. 4 v. Epstein
Page 11

time period of January 1, 2003 until present regarding air travel and aircraft used by Defendant.

Request No. 11. Any and all documents referring to or relating to modeling agencies, including but not limited to documents relating to or reflecting communications with female models.

Response: Defendant is asserting specific legal objections to the production request as well as his U.S. constitutional privileges. I intend to produce all relevant documents regarding this lawsuit, however, my attorneys have counseled me that at the present time I cannot select, authenticate, and produce documents relevant to this lawsuit and I must accept this advice or risk losing my Sixth Amendment right to effective representation. Accordingly, I assert my federal constitutional rights under the Fifth, Sixth, and Fourteenth Amendments as guaranteed by the United States Constitution. Drawing an adverse inference under these circumstances would unconstitutionally burden my exercise of my constitutional rights, would be unreasonable, and would therefore violate the Constitution. In addition to and without waiving his constitutional privileges, the information sought is privileged and confidential, and inadmissible pursuant to the terms of the deferred prosecution agreement, Fed. Rule of Evidence 410 and 408, and §90.410, Fla. Stat. Further, the request is overly broad, work product, attorney-client privileged, and confidential. In addition, the request seeks information concerning persons, not parties to this litigation, whose privacy rights are implicated. Plaintiff's complaint alleges a time period of "in or about 2002 – 2003." Plaintiff's request has no time limitation.

Jane Doe No. 4 v. Epstein
Page 12

Request No. 12. All photographs, videotapes, digital images and other documents depicting or showing females who, at the time thereof, were under the age of 21, which were taken or created by or for Defendant and not intended for sale commercially to the public.

Response: Defendant is asserting specific legal objections to the production request as well as his U.S. constitutional privileges. I intend to produce all relevant documents regarding this lawsuit, however, my attorneys have counseled me that at the present time I cannot select, authenticate, and produce documents relevant to this lawsuit and I must accept this advice or risk losing my Sixth Amendment right to effective representation. Accordingly, I assert my federal constitutional rights under the Fifth, Sixth, and Fourteenth Amendments as guaranteed by the United States Constitution. Drawing an adverse inference under these circumstances would unconstitutionally burden my exercise of my constitutional rights, would be unreasonable, and would therefore violate the Constitution. In addition to and without waiving his constitutional privileges, the information sought is privileged and confidential, and inadmissible pursuant to the terms of the deferred prosecution agreement, Fed. Rule of Evidence 410 and 408, and §90.410, Fla. Stat. Further, the request is overly broad, work product, attorney-client privileged, and confidential. In addition, the request seeks information concerning persons, not parties to this litigation, whose privacy rights are implicated. Plaintiff's complaint alleges a time period of "in or about 2002 – 2003." Plaintiff's request has no time limitation.

Jane Doe No. 4 v. Epstein
Page 13

Request No. 13. All photographs and painting of females which were displayed in any of Defendant's homes or residences in the time frame of these requests, including without limitation, photographs in standing or sitting frames or wall frames.

Response: Defendant is asserting specific legal objections to the production request as well as his U.S. constitutional privileges. I intend to produce all relevant documents regarding this lawsuit, however, my attorneys have counseled me that at the present time I cannot select, authenticate, and produce documents relevant to this lawsuit and I must accept this advice or risk losing my Sixth Amendment right to effective representation. Accordingly, I assert my federal constitutional rights under the Fifth, Sixth, and Fourteenth Amendments as guaranteed by the United States Constitution. Drawing an adverse inference under these circumstances would unconstitutionally burden my exercise of my constitutional rights, would be unreasonable, and would therefore violate the Constitution. In addition to and without waiving his constitutional privileges, the information sought is privileged and confidential, and inadmissible pursuant to the terms of the deferred prosecution agreement, Fed. Rule of Evidence 410 and 408, and §90.410, Fla. Stat. Further, the request is overly broad, work product, attorney-client privileged, and confidential. In addition, the request seeks information concerning persons, not parties to this litigation, whose privacy rights are implicated. Plaintiff's complaint alleges a time period of "in or about 2004 – 2005." Plaintiff's request has no time limitation.

Jane Doe No. 4 v. Epstein
Page 14

Request No. 14. Any and all documents consisting of, referring or relating to communications between Jeffrey Epstein and Haley Robson, including, but not limited to, letters, notes, text messages, messages on social networking sites, and e-mails.

Response: Defendant is asserting specific legal objections to the production request as well as his U.S. constitutional privileges. I intend to produce all relevant documents regarding this lawsuit, however, my attorneys have counseled me that at the present time I cannot select, authenticate, and produce documents relevant to this lawsuit and I must accept this advice or risk losing my Sixth Amendment right to effective representation. Accordingly, I assert my federal constitutional rights under the Fifth, Sixth, and Fourteenth Amendments as guaranteed by the United States Constitution. Drawing an adverse inference under these circumstances would unconstitutionally burden my exercise of my constitutional rights, would be unreasonable, and would therefore violate the Constitution. In addition to and without waiving his constitutional privileges, the information sought is privileged and confidential, and inadmissible pursuant to the terms of the deferred prosecution agreement, Fed. Rule of Evidence 410 and 408, and §90.410, Fla. Stat. Further, the request is overly broad, work product, attorney-client privileged, and confidential. In addition, the request seeks information concerning persons, not parties to this litigation, whose privacy rights are implicated. Plaintiff's complaint alleges a time period of "in or about 2002 – 2003." Plaintiff's request has no time limitation.

Jane Doe No. 4 v. Epstein
Page 15

Request No. 15. Any and all documents consisting of, referring or relating to communications between Jeffrey Epstein and Sarah Kellen, including, but not limited to, letters, notes, text messages, messages on social networking sites, and e-mails.

Response: Defendant is asserting specific legal objections to the production request as well as his U.S. constitutional privileges. I intend to produce all relevant documents regarding this lawsuit, however, my attorneys have counseled me that at the present time I cannot select, authenticate, and produce documents relevant to this lawsuit and I must accept this advice or risk losing my Sixth Amendment right to effective representation. Accordingly, I assert my federal constitutional rights under the Fifth, Sixth, and Fourteenth Amendments as guaranteed by the United States Constitution. Drawing an adverse inference under these circumstances would unconstitutionally burden my exercise of my constitutional rights, would be unreasonable, and would therefore violate the Constitution. In addition to and without waiving his constitutional privileges, the information sought is privileged and confidential, and inadmissible pursuant to the terms of the deferred prosecution agreement, Fed. Rule of Evidence 410 and 408, and §90.410, Fla. Stat. Further, the request is overly broad, work product, attorney-client privileged, and confidential. In addition, the request seeks information concerning persons, not parties to this litigation, whose privacy rights are implicated. Plaintiff's complaint alleges a time period of "in or about 2002 – 2003." Plaintiff's request has no time limitation.

Jane Doe No. 4 v. Epstein
Page 16

Request No. 16. Any and all documents consisting of, referring or relating to communications between Jeffrey Epstein and Nada Marcinkova, including, but not limited to, letters, notes, text messages, messages on social networking sites, and e-mails.

Response: Defendant is asserting specific legal objections to the production request as well as his U.S. constitutional privileges. I intend to produce all relevant documents regarding this lawsuit, however, my attorneys have counseled me that at the present time I cannot select, authenticate, and produce documents relevant to this lawsuit and I must accept this advice or risk losing my Sixth Amendment right to effective representation. Accordingly, I assert my federal constitutional rights under the Fifth, Sixth, and Fourteenth Amendments as guaranteed by the United States Constitution. Drawing an adverse inference under these circumstances would unconstitutionally burden my exercise of my constitutional rights, would be unreasonable, and would therefore violate the Constitution. In addition to and without waiving his constitutional privileges, the information sought is privileged and confidential, and inadmissible pursuant to the terms of the deferred prosecution agreement, Fed. Rule of Evidence 410 and 408, and §90.410, Fla. Stat. Further, the request is overly broad, work product, attorney-client privileged, and confidential. In addition, the request seeks information concerning persons, not parties to this litigation, whose privacy rights are implicated. Plaintiff's complaint alleges a time period of "in or about 2002 – 2003." Plaintiff's request has no time limitation.

Jane Doe No. 4 v. Epstein
Page 17

Request No. 17. Any and all documents consisting of, referring or relating to communications between Jeffrey Epstein and Ghislaine Maxwell, including, but not limited to, letters, notes, text messages, messages on social networking sites, and e-mails.

Response: Defendant is asserting specific legal objections to the production request as well as his U.S. constitutional privileges. I intend to produce all relevant documents regarding this lawsuit, however, my attorneys have counseled me that at the present time I cannot select, authenticate, and produce documents relevant to this lawsuit and I must accept this advice or risk losing my Sixth Amendment right to effective representation. Accordingly, I assert my federal constitutional rights under the Fifth, Sixth, and Fourteenth Amendments as guaranteed by the United States Constitution. Drawing an adverse inference under these circumstances would unconstitutionally burden my exercise of my constitutional rights, would be unreasonable, and would therefore violate the Constitution. In addition to and without waiving his constitutional privileges, the information sought is privileged and confidential, and inadmissible pursuant to the terms of the deferred prosecution agreement, Fed. Rule of Evidence 410 and 408, and §90.410, Fla. Stat. Further, the request is overly broad, work product, attorney-client privileged, and confidential. In addition, the request seeks information concerning persons, not parties to this litigation, whose privacy rights are implicated. Plaintiff's complaint alleges a time period of "in or about 2002 – 2003." Plaintiff's request has no time limitation.

Jane Doe No. 4 v. Epstein
Page 18

Request No. 18. Any and all documents and photographs placed by Defendant at any time in the period of these requests on a social networking website, including without limitation, Facebook.com and MySpace.com.

Response: Defendant is asserting specific legal objections to the production request as well as his U.S. constitutional privileges. I intend to produce all relevant documents regarding this lawsuit, however, my attorneys have counseled me that at the present time I cannot select, authenticate, and produce documents relevant to this lawsuit and I must accept this advice or risk losing my Sixth Amendment right to effective representation. Accordingly, I assert my federal constitutional rights under the Fifth, Sixth, and Fourteenth Amendments as guaranteed by the United States Constitution. Drawing an adverse inference under these circumstances would unconstitutionally burden my exercise of my constitutional rights, would be unreasonable, and would therefore violate the Constitution. In addition to and without waiving his constitutional privileges, the information sought is privileged and confidential, and inadmissible pursuant to the terms of the deferred prosecution agreement, Fed. Rule of Evidence 410 and 408, and §90.410, Fla. Stat. Further, the request is overly broad, work product, attorney-client privileged, and confidential. In addition, the request seeks information concerning persons, not parties to this litigation, whose privacy rights are implicated. Plaintiff's complaint alleges a time period of "in or about 2002 – 2003." Plaintiff's request seeks documents and photographs for a time period of January 1, 2003 until present.

Jane Doe No. 4 v. Epstein
Page 19

Request No. 19. Any and all documents reflecting or consisting of communications between Jeffrey Epstein and MC2 Models or Jean-Luc Brunel, relating or referring to females coming into the United States from other countries to pursue a career in modeling, including, but not limited to, letters, notes and e-mails.

Response: Defendant is asserting specific legal objections to the production request as well as his U.S. constitutional privileges. I intend to produce all relevant documents regarding this lawsuit, however, my attorneys have counseled me that at the present time I cannot select, authenticate, and produce documents relevant to this lawsuit and I must accept this advice or risk losing my Sixth Amendment right to effective representation. Accordingly, I assert my federal constitutional rights under the Fifth, Sixth, and Fourteenth Amendments as guaranteed by the United States Constitution. Drawing an adverse inference under these circumstances would unconstitutionally burden my exercise of my constitutional rights, would be unreasonable, and would therefore violate the Constitution. In addition to and without waiving his constitutional privileges, the information sought is privileged and confidential, and inadmissible pursuant to the terms of the deferred prosecution agreement, Fed. Rule of Evidence 410 and 408, and §90.410, Fla. Stat. Further, the request is overly broad, work product, attorney-client privileged, and confidential. In addition, the request seeks information concerning persons, not parties to this litigation, whose privacy rights are implicated. Plaintiff's complaint alleges a time period of "in or about 2002 –

Jane Doe No. 4 v. Epstein
Page 20

2003.” In addition, the request seeks documents pertaining to females who are not non-parties, and who possess privacy rights.

Request No. 20. Any and all documents referring or relating to gifts or loans to females under the age of 21, including, but not limited to, notes, receipts and car rental agreements.

Response: Defendant is asserting specific legal objections to the production request as well as his U.S. constitutional privileges. I intend to produce all relevant documents regarding this lawsuit, however, my attorneys have counseled me that at the present time I cannot select, authenticate, and produce documents relevant to this lawsuit and I must accept this advice or risk losing my Sixth Amendment right to effective representation. Accordingly, I assert my federal constitutional rights under the Fifth, Sixth, and Fourteenth Amendments as guaranteed by the United States Constitution. Drawing an adverse inference under these circumstances would unconstitutionally burden my exercise of my constitutional rights, would be unreasonable, and would therefore violate the Constitution. In addition to and without waiving his constitutional privileges, the information sought is privileged and confidential, and inadmissible pursuant to the terms of the deferred prosecution agreement, Fed. Rule of Evidence 410 and 408, and §90.410, Fla. Stat. Further, the request is overly broad, work product, attorney-client privileged, and confidential. In addition, the request seeks information concerning persons, not parties to this litigation, whose privacy rights are implicated. Plaintiff’s complaint alleges a time period of “in or about 2002 – 2003.” Plaintiff’s request has no time limitation.

Jane Doe No. 4 v. Epstein
Page 21

Request No. 21. Any and all personal calendars or schedules of or for Jeffrey Epstein from January 1, 2003 to the present.

Response: Defendant is asserting specific legal objections to the production request as well as his U.S. constitutional privileges. I intend to produce all relevant documents regarding this lawsuit, however, my attorneys have counseled me that at the present time I cannot select, authenticate, and produce documents relevant to this lawsuit and I must accept this advice or risk losing my Sixth Amendment right to effective representation. Accordingly, I assert my federal constitutional rights under the Fifth, Sixth, and Fourteenth Amendments as guaranteed by the United States Constitution. Drawing an adverse inference under these circumstances would unconstitutionally burden my exercise of my constitutional rights, would be unreasonable, and would therefore violate the Constitution. In addition to and without waiving his constitutional privileges, the information sought is privileged and confidential, and inadmissible pursuant to the terms of the deferred prosecution agreement, Fed. Rule of Evidence 410 and 408, and §90.410, Fla. Stat. Further, the request is overly broad, work product, attorney-client privileged, and confidential. In addition, the request seeks information concerning persons, not parties to this litigation, whose privacy rights are implicated. Plaintiff's complaint alleges a time period of "in or about 2002 – 2003." In addition, the request encompasses attorney-client privileged material.

Request No. 22. All documents written by Jeffrey Epstein consisting of personal thoughts, feelings or descriptions of events, incidents or occurrences in Defendant's life, including without limitation, any diaries of Jeffrey Epstein.

Jane Doe No. 4 v. Epstein
Page 22

Response: Defendant is asserting specific legal objections to the production request as well as his U.S. constitutional privileges. I intend to produce all relevant documents regarding this lawsuit, however, my attorneys have counseled me that at the present time I cannot select, authenticate, and produce documents relevant to this lawsuit and I must accept this advice or risk losing my Sixth Amendment right to effective representation. Accordingly, I assert my federal constitutional rights under the Fifth, Sixth, and Fourteenth Amendments as guaranteed by the United States Constitution. Drawing an adverse inference under these circumstances would unconstitutionally burden my exercise of my constitutional rights, would be unreasonable, and would therefore violate the Constitution. In addition to and without waiving his constitutional privileges, the information sought is privileged and confidential, and inadmissible pursuant to the terms of the deferred prosecution agreement, Fed. Rule of Evidence 410 and 408, and §90.410, Fla. Stat. Further, the request is overly broad, work product, attorney-client privileged, and confidential. In addition, the request seeks information concerning persons, not parties to this litigation, whose privacy rights are implicated. Plaintiff's complaint alleges a time period of "in or about 2002 – 2003." On its fact, the request goes beyond the scope of allowable discovery and is meant to harass, embarrass and overburden the Defendant. Further, the request is so overly broad that it includes attorney-client and work product privileged materials.

Request No. 23. All documents referring to or relating to Jeffrey Epstein's purchase or consumption of prescription medicine.

Jane Doe No. 4 v. Epstein
Page 23

Response: Defendant is asserting specific legal objections to the production request as well as his U.S. constitutional privileges. I intend to produce all relevant documents regarding this lawsuit, however, my attorneys have counseled me that at the present time I cannot select, authenticate, and produce documents relevant to this lawsuit and I must accept this advice or risk losing my Sixth Amendment right to effective representation. Accordingly, I assert my federal constitutional rights under the Fifth, Sixth, and Fourteenth Amendments as guaranteed by the United States Constitution. Drawing an adverse inference under these circumstances would unconstitutionally burden my exercise of my constitutional rights, would be unreasonable, and would therefore violate the Constitution. In addition to and without waiving his constitutional privileges, the information sought is privileged and confidential, and inadmissible pursuant to the terms of the deferred prosecution agreement, Fed. Rule of Evidence 410 and 408, and §90.410, Fla. Stat. Further, the request is overly broad, work product, attorney-client privileged, and confidential. In addition, the request seeks information concerning persons, not parties to this litigation, whose privacy rights are implicated. Plaintiff's complaint alleges a time period of "in or about 2002 – 2003." Defendant's medical condition is not at issue in this action. Such a request is meant to harass and embarrass Defendant. Further, such information is privileged pursuant to Fed. Rule 501 and §90.503, Fla. Stat. In addition, such information is protected by the provisions of the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA).

Jane Doe No. 4 v. Epstein
Page 24


Certificate of Service

WE HEREBY CERTIFY that a true copy of the foregoing has been sent via U.S. Mail and facsimile to the following addressees this 26th day of January, 2009.

Adam D. Horowitz, Esq.
Jeffrey Marc Herman, Esq.
Stuart S. Mermelstein, Esq.
18205 Biscayne Boulevard
Suite 2218
Miami, FL 33160
305-931-2200
Fax: 305-931-0877
ahorowitz@hermanlaw.com
jherman@hermanlaw.com
lriviera@hermanlaw.com
Counsel for Plaintiff Jane Doe #4

Jack Alan Goldberger
Atterbury Goldberger & Weiss, P.A.
250 Australian Avenue South
Suite 1400
West Palm Beach, FL 33401-5012
561-659-8300
Fax: 561-835-8691
jagesq@bellsouth.net
*Co-Counsel for Defendant Jeffrey
Epstein*

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
ROBERT D. CRITTON, JR., ESQ.
Florida Bar No. 224162
rcrit@bclclaw.com
MICHAEL J. PIKE, ESQ.
Florida Bar #617296
mpike@bclclaw.com
BURMAN, CRITTON, LUTTIER &
COLEMAN
515 N. Flagler Drive, Suite 400
West Palm Beach, FL 33401
561-842-2820
Fax: 561-515-3148

(Co-counsel for Defendant Jeffrey Epstein)