

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE  
FIFTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT IN  
AND FOR PALM BEACH COUNTY,  
FLORIDA

Case No. 50-2009CA040800XXXXMBAG

JEFFREY EPSTEIN,

Plaintiff/Counter-Defendant,

v.

SCOTT ROTHSTEIN, individually, and  
BRADLEY J. EDWARDS, individually,

Defendants/Counter-Plaintiff.

---

**JEFFREY EPSTEIN'S RESPONSES AND OBJECTIONS TO  
NOTICE OF TAKING VIDEO DEPOSITION DUCES TECUM**

Plaintiff/Counter-Defendant Jeffrey Epstein ("Epstein"), pursuant to Florida Rule of Civil Procedure 1.350(b), responds and objects to the Duces Tecum contained in Counter-Plaintiff Bradley J. Edwards' ("Edwards") June 20, 2018, Notice of Taking Video Deposition Duces Tecum, and states:

**THE LIMITED SCOPE OF EPSTEIN'S DEPOSITION**

On May 23, 2018, the Court held a hearing on Edwards' Motion to Permit him to Take the Limited Deposition of Epstein. (**Exhibit A** - Transcript). While the Court has not yet entered an Order, it granted Edwards' request to take Epstein's deposition on the following limited topics:

- Whether and to what extent Epstein reviewed any of the alleged privileged materials prior to March 2018. (**Exhibit A**, 19:7-12.)
- Whether and to what extent Epstein reviewed any of the alleged privileged materials after March 2018. (**Exhibit A**, 19:7-12.)

- Whether Epstein has any knowledge regarding compliance with the Court's verbal rulings on the record at the March 8, 2018, hearing regarding destruction of those documents Edwards has claimed are privileged. (**Exhibit A**, 19:13-18.)
- Whether and to what extent Epstein has shared any of the alleged privileged materials with anyone other than his attorneys. (**Exhibit A**, 19:19-22.)
- Which, if any, of the alleged privileged materials Epstein plans to use to testify at trial. (**Exhibit A**, 19:22-20:2.)

While the Court has allowed Epstein's limited deposition, document discovery was not addressed by the parties or the Court at the hearing and, in fact, discovery is closed.

#### **EDWARDS' DUCES TECUM**

Edwards' Duces Tecum requests Epstein to produce:

All communications and all records relating to all communications concerning or containing information derived from documents or data over which a claim of privilege was asserted by or on behalf of Bradley J. Edwards.

\* "Documents" shall include, but not be limited to all non-identical copies of writings, drawings, graphs, charts, photographs, phono-records, recordings, and/or any other data compilations from which information can be obtained, translated, if necessary, by the party to whom the request is directed through detection devices into reasonably usable form. "Documents" also include all electronic data as well as application metadata and system metadata. All inventories and rosters of your information technology (IT) systems—e.g., hardware, software and data, including but not limited to network drawings, lists of computing devices (servers, PCs, laptops, PDAs, cell phones, with data storage and/or transmission features), programs, data maps and security tools and protocols.

Edwards seeks: (1) documents that are protected by the attorney-client privilege; (2) documents that have been sealed; and (3) access to Epstein's computers and electronic devices.

## **EPSTEIN'S RESPONSE AND OBJECTION**

### **A. General Response.**

Epstein's current trial counsel, Link & Rockenbach, PA, received the disc which is the subject of Epstein's deposition from Epstein's former counsel, Fowler White, in February 2018. Epstein never received the disc nor did he know of the disc's existence before that time.

At the March 8, 2018 hearing, this Court directed the parties to seal the disc and ensure no further dissemination of the documents Edwards claimed were privileged. Link & Rockenbach, PA, took immediate steps to comply with this Court's March 8, 2018, directives as set forth in Epstein's Notices of Compliance. The disc has been sealed and Edwards' privilege claims are currently the subject of Epstein's request that the Court conduct an *in camera* review to make a determination as to whether the documents are privileged as claimed by Edwards.

In any event, Epstein objects to the Duces Tecum because discovery is closed and Edwards did not obtain permission to reopen discovery for any purpose other than to take Epstein's limited deposition. Epstein also objects because the Duces Tecum seeks documents and information protected by the attorney-client privilege and work product doctrine and are not relevant to the limited issues of the deposition.

### **B. The Duces Tecum Seek Privileged, Protected and Sealed Documents**

Notwithstanding that document discovery has not been reopened, even if the Court allowed the discovery the scope of permissible discovery in civil cases is set by Florida Rule of Civil Procedure 1.280(b):

Unless otherwise limited by order of the court in accordance with these rules, the scope of discovery is as follows: . . . Parties may obtain discovery regarding any matter, not privileged, that is relevant to the subject matter of the pending action[.]

Fla. R. Civ. P. 1.280(b)(1) (emphasis added).

The sweepingly broad nature of the request—all communication and all records relating to all communications—inappropriately requires disclosure of documents protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product doctrine, as well as documents which have been (and remain) sealed by Order of this Court or destroyed at the Court’s direction.

Under Florida law, “[a] client has a privilege to refuse to disclose, and to prevent any other person from disclosing, the contents of confidential communications when such other person learned of the communications because they were made in the rendition of legal services to the client.” § 90.502(2), Fla. Stat. “The purpose of the attorney-client privilege is to encourage clients to make full disclosure to their attorneys,” and “protects . . . those disclosures necessary to obtain informed legal advice.” *Fisher v. United States*, 425 U.S. 391, 403 (1976).

The work-product privilege is set forth in Florida Rule of Civil Procedure 1.280, which states work product is discoverable only upon a showing of undue hardship and need, although mental impressions or legal opinions are always protected:

(4) *Trial Preparation: Materials.* Subject to the provisions of subdivision (b)(5) of this rule, a party may obtain discovery of documents and tangible things otherwise discoverable under subdivision (b)(1) of this rule and prepared in anticipation of litigation or for trial by or for another party or by or for that party’s representative, including that party’s attorney, consultant, surety, indemnitor, insurer, or agent, *only upon a showing that the party seeking discovery has need of the materials in the preparation of the case and is unable without undue hardship to obtain the substantial equivalent of the materials by other means.* In ordering discovery of the materials when the required showing has been made, *the court shall protect against disclosure of the mental impressions, conclusions, opinions, or legal theories of an attorney or other representative of a party concerning the litigation.*

*Butler v. Harter*, 152 So. 3d 705, 711 (Fla. 1st DCA 2014) (citing Fla. R. Civ. P. 1.280(b)(4) (bold/underline emphasis added)).

Here, the information requested by Edwards, on its face, is protected by both the attorney-client privilege and work product doctrine. While not all communications between lawyer and client are deemed privileged, a request for “all communications,” as Edwards makes here, necessarily includes information that is confidential and attorney-client privileged. And, as required to assert the work product protection, at least one reason for obtaining or preparing any such materials and data was in anticipation of this litigation or for trial. *See Marshalls of MA, Inc. v. Minsal*, 932 So. 2d 444, 448 (Fla. 3d DCA 2006) (“As there is substantial competent record evidence that the incident reports in question were prepared in anticipation of foreseeable litigation, which is uncontested by any competent evidence, we conclude that the trial court’s finding that the reports were not protected by work product, is unsupported by the record and departs from the essential requirements of the law in this jurisdiction. The fact that there was evidence that the reports may also have been prepared in order for [the defendant] to identify areas of concern does not alter this finding, as it does not eliminate the work product privilege.”) (emphasis added; citation omitted); *Federal Express Corp. v. Cantway*, 778 So. 2d 1052, 1053 (Fla. 4th DCA 2001) (indicating that documents keep their work product protection even if they were prepared for an additional reason not in anticipation of litigation as long as the anticipation of litigation was *one* of the reasons for preparing the documents).

**C. Edwards’ Request for Electronic Data is an Invasion of Epstein’s Privacy and Seeks Irrelevant, Confidential and Privileged Information**

Finally, Epstein objects to Edwards’ request as to “all electronic data as well as application metadata and system metadata. All inventories and rosters of your information technology (IT) systems—e.g., hardware, software and data, including but not limited to network drawings, lists of computing devices (servers, PCs, laptops, PDAs, cell phones, with data storage and/or transmission features), programs, data maps and security tools and protocols.” Such a

request is an invasion of Epstein's privacy, seeks irrelevant and confidential information, is overly broad, could result in the inadvertent disclosure of attorney-client privilege information and attorney work product, and is far outside the scope of the Court's oral ruling.

Edwards seeks unprecedented access into Epstein's computer systems and electronic devices which in no way supports his claim for damages. As the First District has explained:

Generally speaking, Florida Rule of Civil Procedure 1.280 allows for the discovery of matters that are relevant and admissible, or reasonably calculated to lead to admissible evidence, including electronically stored information. *See Fla. R. Civ. P. 1.280(b)(1), (b)(3), 1.350* (2013); *see also Fla. R. Civ. P. 1.280(d)* (addressing limitations on the discovery of electronically stored information). But where personal information is involved as in this case, the trial courts' discretion to permit discovery "must be balanced against the individual's competing privacy interests to prevent an undue invasion of privacy." *McEnany v. Ryan*, 44 So. 3d 245, 247 (Fla. 4th DCA 2010). Courts have reversed rulings for not adequately accounting for privacy interests in the inspection of electronic storage devices. *See, e.g., Holland [v. Barfield]*, 35 So. 3d [953,] 955 [Fla. 5th DCA 2010] (reversing an order allowing the inspection of a computer hard drive and cellphone SIM card); *Menke v. Broward Cnty. Sch. Bd.*, 916 So. 2d 8, 12 (Fla. 4th DCA 2005) (reversing an order allowing the inspection of all computers in a household).

. . . privacy rights do not completely foreclose the prospect of discovery of data stored on electronic devices. Rather, limited and strictly controlled inspections of information stored on electronic devices may be permitted. *See Menke*, 916 So. 2d at 11 ("[Rule 1.350 is] broad enough to encompass requests to examine [electronic information storage devices] but only in limited and strictly controlled circumstances"); *cf. Friedman v. Heart Inst. of Port St. Lucie, Inc.*, 863 So. 2d 189, 194 (Fla. 2003) (finding that privacy rights limit compelled disclosure to that which is necessary to determine contested issues). Both *Holland* and *Menke*, for instance, would have allowed for inspections of the devices involved (computers and cellphones) if: (1) there was evidence of destruction of evidence or thwarting of discovery; (2) the device likely contained the requested information; and (3) no less intrusive means existed to obtain the requested information. *Holland* 35 So. 3d at 955; *Menke*, 916 So. 2d at 12.

*Antico v. Sindt Trucking, Inc.*, 148 So. 3d 163, 166 (Fla. 1st DCA 2014) (emphasis added).

Here, access to Epstein's computer systems and electronic devices should not be allowed absent any evidence whatsoever that Epstein destroyed any materials (other than as directed by this Court) or thwarted discovery, and because his devices are unlikely to contain the requested information. Far less intrusive means of discovery – Epstein's limited deposition, as the Court permitted -- should be the only discovery allowed.

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I certify that the foregoing document has been furnished to the attorneys listed on the Service List below on July 18, 2018, through the Court's e-filing portal pursuant to Florida Rule of Judicial Administration 2.516(b)(1).

LINK & ROCKENBACH, PA  
1555 Palm Beach Lakes Boulevard, Suite 930  
West Palm Beach, Florida 33401  
(561) 847-4408; (561) 855-2891 [fax]

By: /s/ Scott J. Link

Scott J. Link (FBN 602991)

Kara Berard Rockenbach (FBN 44903)

Primary: [Scott@linkrocklaw.com](mailto:Scott@linkrocklaw.com)

Primary: [Kara@linkrocklaw.com](mailto:Kara@linkrocklaw.com)

Secondary: [Tina@linkrocklaw.com](mailto:Tina@linkrocklaw.com)

Secondary: [Troy@linkrocklaw.com](mailto:Troy@linkrocklaw.com)

*Trial Counsel for Plaintiff/Counter-Defendant  
Jeffrey Epstein*

## SERVICE LIST

<p>Jack Scarola Karen E. Terry David P. Vitale, Jr. Searcy, Denny, Scarola, Barnhart &amp; Shipley, P.A. 2139 Palm Beach Lakes Boulevard West Palm Beach, FL 33409 <a href="mailto:mep@searcylaw.com">mep@searcylaw.com</a> <a href="mailto:jsx@searcylaw.com">jsx@searcylaw.com</a> <a href="mailto:dvitale@searcylaw.com">dvitale@searcylaw.com</a> <a href="mailto:scarolateam@searcylaw.com">scarolateam@searcylaw.com</a> <a href="mailto:terryteam@searcylaw.com">terryteam@searcylaw.com</a> <i>Co-Counsel for Defendant/Counter-Plaintiff</i> <i>Bradley J. Edwards</i></p>	<p>Philip M. Burlington Nichole J. Segal Burlington &amp; Rockenbach, P.A. Courthouse Commons, Suite 350 444 West Railroad Avenue West Palm Beach, FL 33401 <a href="mailto:pmb@FLAppellateLaw.com">pmb@FLAppellateLaw.com</a> <a href="mailto:njs@FLAppellateLaw.com">njs@FLAppellateLaw.com</a> <a href="mailto:kbt@FLAppellateLaw.com">kbt@FLAppellateLaw.com</a> <i>Co-Counsel for Defendant/Counter-Plaintiff</i> <i>Bradley J. Edwards</i></p>
<p>Bradley J. Edwards Edwards Pottinger LLC 425 N. Andrews Avenue, Suite 2 Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301-3268 <a href="mailto:brad@epllc.com">brad@epllc.com</a> <i>Co-Counsel for Defendant/Counter-Plaintiff</i> <i>Bradley J. Edwards</i></p>	<p>Marc S. Nurik Law Offices of Marc S. Nurik One E. Broward Boulevard, Suite 700 Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33301 <a href="mailto:marc@nuriklaw.com">marc@nuriklaw.com</a> <i>Counsel for Defendant Scott Rothstein</i></p>
<p>Jack A. Goldberger Atterbury, Goldberger &amp; Weiss, P.A. 250 Australian Avenue S., Suite 1400 West Palm Beach, FL 33401 <a href="mailto:jgoldberger@agwpa.com">jgoldberger@agwpa.com</a> <a href="mailto:smahoney@agwpa.com">smahoney@agwpa.com</a> <i>Co-Counsel for Plaintiff/Counter-Defendant</i> <i>Jeffrey Epstein</i></p>	<p>Paul Cassell 383 S. University Salt Lake City, UT 84112-0730 <a href="mailto:cassellp@law.utah.edu">cassellp@law.utah.edu</a> <i>Limited Intervenor Co-Counsel for L.M., E.W. and Jane Doe</i></p>
	<p>Jay Howell Jay Howell &amp; Associates 644 Cesery Blvd., Suite 250 Jacksonville, FL 32211 <a href="http://jayhowell.com">jayhowell.com</a> <i>Limited Intervenor Co-Counsel for L.M., E.W. and Jane Doe</i></p>

# EXHIBIT A

NOT A CERTIFIED COPY

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE  
FIFTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT, IN  
AND FOR PALM BEACH COUNTY, FLORIDA

Case No. 502009CA040800XXXXMB

JEFFREY EPSTEIN,

Plaintiff/Counter-Defendant,

vs.

SCOTT ROTHSTEIN, individually;  
BRADLEY EDWARDS, individually,

Defendants/Counter-Plaintiffs.

---

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

DATE TAKEN: Wednesday, May 23rd, 2018  
TIME: 9:00 a.m. - 9:18 a.m.  
PLACE 205 N. Dixie Highway, Room 10D  
West Palm Beach, Florida  
BEFORE: Donald Hafele, Presiding Judge

This cause came on to be heard at the time and place aforesaid, when and where the following proceedings were reported by:

Sonja D. Hall  
Palm Beach Reporting Service, Inc.  
1665 Palm Beach Lakes Boulevard, Suite 1001  
West Palm Beach, FL 33401  
(561) 471-2995

1

## 2 APPEARANCES:

3

For Plaintiff/Counter-Defendant:

4

LINK & ROCKENBACH, P.A.  
1555 Palm Beach Lakes Boulevard, Suite 301  
West Palm Beach, FL 33401  
By KARA BERARD ROCKENBACH, ESQUIRE  
By SCOTT J. LINK, ESQUIRE

5

6

7

For Defendant/Counter-Plaintiff:

8

9

10

SEARCY, DENNEY, SCAROLA, BARNHART &  
SHIPLEY, P.A.  
2139 Palm Beach Lakes Boulevard  
West Palm Beach, FL 33409  
By DAVID P. VITALE JR., ESQUIRE

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 MR. VITALE: Good morning, Your Honor.

2 MS. ROCKENBACH: Good morning, Your  
3 Honor.

4 THE COURT: Good morning. We are back  
5 on a motion by Edwards to take a limited  
6 deposition of Mr. Epstein. I have read as  
7 much as material as I could, including most  
8 of the transcript of the proceeding that  
9 transpired in front of Judge Ray, the  
10 bankruptcy judge who did allow the  
11 deposition to be taken.

12 And I presume it's going to be taken by  
13 members of your office, Mr. Vitale.

14 MR. VITALE: Yes, sir.

15 THE COURT: So what did you need beyond  
16 what Judge Ray has authorized?

17 MR. VITALE: What Judge Ray has  
18 authorize is a deposition related to  
19 Mr. Epstein's possession of the disc.

20 What we are concerned with is  
21 enforcement of Your Honor's order regarding  
22 the 724 filed exhibits that you have  
23 stricken for use at trial. Forty-seven of  
24 those, at least, are privileged documents  
25 that were listed on our privilege log since

1 2010.

2 Now through the court filings that's  
3 been made in the recent months there's been  
4 two representations.

5 The first representations is that  
6 Mr. Epstein, as an individual, as a witness,  
7 did not review or become aware of the  
8 privileged materials until March of 2018.

9 So at a minimum, even if they weren't  
10 already stricken, they would be irrelevant  
11 from a probable cause determination because  
12 they could not have led to a probable cause  
13 to initiate the lawsuit in 2009 and continue  
14 until 2012.

15 The second representation that has been  
16 made is that Mr. Epstein was provided a  
17 subset of the privileged documents which he  
18 did review prior to our March 5th trial  
19 date.

20 THE COURT: How much prior?

21 MR. VITALE: My understanding -- and  
22 I'm sure Mr. Link or Ms. Rockenbach can  
23 correct me if I'm wrong -- it would have  
24 been within weeks prior to the original  
25 March 13th trial date. He was provided a

1 subset of the documents.

2 Now, what we are concerned about is  
3 that although there's been representations  
4 in court filings that Mr. Epstein was  
5 ordered by this trial court to destroy the  
6 records, there's been no affidavit or  
7 evidence put forth that he has complied with  
8 that order.

9 THE COURT: Who is he?

10 MR. VITALE: He being Mr. Epstein, sir.  
11 We do not know what privileged material  
12 Mr. Epstein reviewed. We do not know the  
13 depth of his review. We do not know who he  
14 may have shared those privileged materials  
15 with.

16 Now, I don't make any suggestion that  
17 opposing counsel will knowingly put a  
18 third-party witness on the stand with  
19 evidence -- that had knowledge of our  
20 privileged materials. But if Mr. Epstein  
21 gave privileged materials to the third-party  
22 witness, that could occur.

23 So what we would like to be able to do  
24 is take a very limited deposition.

25 Mr. Epstein is already going to be in Palm

1 Beach County. We would like to know what  
2 privileged materials he reviewed. Again,  
3 these are privileged materials that have  
4 been on our privileged log since 2010. We  
5 would like to know the timing of that  
6 review. We would like to know whether he  
7 still possesses the privileged materials, or  
8 whether he has complied with the Court's  
9 order.

10 And the reason, Your Honor, is because  
11 if Mr. Epstein on the witness stand starts  
12 giving answers that go to his knowledge of  
13 privileged materials, we need to be in a  
14 position to object, move to strike. And  
15 Your Honor needs to be in a position to be  
16 able to timely rule on those objections or  
17 motions.

18 Right now we simply don't know what he  
19 knows. We don't know what privileged  
20 materials he has.

21 THE COURT: How do you see that as  
22 going beyond Judge Ray's order? In other  
23 words, essentially three areas of inquiry  
24 whether Mr. Epstein reviewed any of the  
25 documents prior to March 8th, 2018, I

1 believe would be encompassed in Judge Ray's  
2 order by permitting the limited deposition.

3 Whether he did or didn't comply with the  
4 Court's order of destroying the records,  
5 would be essentially a very, very limited  
6 inquiry that may touch on Judge Ray's order  
7 allowing a limited deposition.

8 Did he share any privileged materials  
9 with anyone other than -- from what I  
10 recall, Mr. Link's representations -- or  
11 Mr. Link and Ms. Rockenbach and/or  
12 Mr. Goldberger -- again, I think is  
13 encompassed fairly within Judge Ray's scope  
14 of allowing the limited deposition.

15 So let me hear -- so is there anything  
16 else that you want to add, other than the  
17 three areas that I've covered? Maybe I  
18 missed an area that you had mentioned.

19 MR. VITALE: Yes, sir. The  
20 clarification I would make is that those  
21 three areas, I would term them procedural.

22 It's simply when did he review? Did he  
23 share them? What we are looking for is an  
24 ability at this trial to enforce the Court's  
25 order to ensure that nothing comes through

1           the backdoor that isn't allowed through the  
2           front door; is to understand the substance  
3           of what exactly -- which privileged  
4           materials that he reviewed, which privileged  
5           materials he may attempt to utilize in  
6           answers to questions in an attempt to get  
7           privileged materials in through the  
8           backdoor.

9           If he reviewed them, let's say,  
10          February 26th, I need to know what he  
11          reviewed so I can understand his answers on  
12          the stand, and Mr. Scarola or I could be in  
13          a position -- or Ms. Terry -- to object and  
14          to move to strike and say, Judge, we took  
15          his deposition on June 30th, and question  
16          and answer on what he reviewed and here is  
17          what he told us he reviewed. You can see  
18          the answer he just gave is derived from the  
19          privileged materials that he is not  
20          permitted to use under this Court's orders.  
21          That would be --

22           THE COURT: Do we even know if he is  
23          going to testify at trial in this case?

24           MR. VITALE: There's been no  
25          clarification. We are proceeding as if he

1           will be testifying. We have been not been  
2           told definitively that he is not.

3           THE COURT: Ms. Rockenbach?

4           MS. ROCKENBACH: Thank you, Your Honor.  
5           Kara Rockenbach on behalf of Jeffrey  
6           Epstein. Your Honor hit the nail on the  
7           head.

8           First point. There are four reasons  
9           why this court should deny Mr. Edwards'  
10           motion. And the first one is squarely what  
11           Your Honor pointed out, which is this is a  
12           matter before the bankruptcy court.

13           Bankruptcy Judge Ray has already issued  
14           an order. And you are correct, the  
15           deposition of Mr. Epstein is going forward  
16           to determine --

17           THE COURT: Have you set a date yet?

18           MR. LINK: Your Honor, we have  
19           exchanged four or five different dates. We  
20           have six counsels, so we don't have a date  
21           set. But the evidentiary hearing in front  
22           of Judge Ray is in August, so the depo will  
23           take place before then, Judge.

24           THE COURT: Thanks.

25           MS. ROCKENBACH: So that's the first

1 reason why. And that alone should allow  
2 this Court to deny this request that really  
3 has no other purpose.

4 The second reason is none of the  
5 materials about which Mr. Edwards seeks to  
6 depose Mr. Epstein about have even been  
7 determined by this Court to be privileged or  
8 not. We have requested an in-camera  
9 instruction of these documents. So there  
10 hasn't even been a determination of  
11 privilege.

12 Number three, Mr. Scarola's -- or  
13 Vitale's stated purpose in the motion and  
14 then here before Your Honor makes no sense.  
15 The purpose or the alleged justification to  
16 take Mr. Epstein's deposition in this case  
17 is pursuant to the motion that they filed to  
18 allow Edwards to identify and object to at  
19 trial all attempts by Epstein to utilize  
20 privileged materials, these are very  
21 skilled, able trial lawyers. They know how  
22 to object. They do not need to take  
23 Mr. Epstein's deposition to determine what  
24 objections they should make at trial.

25 And the second or corollary reason that

1           was stated in the motion -- stated again  
2           this morning -- is they need Mr. Epstein's  
3           deposition in order for this Court to know  
4           how to rule at trial on the admissibility of  
5           evidence. Your Honor is well capable of  
6           enforcing your own orders and rulings, and  
7           so those stated reasons just have no merit.

8           But the last and most significant  
9           reason that is important -- because I don't  
10           think Your Honor has seen it yet -- if I may  
11           approach?

12           Mr. Link and I filed two notices of  
13           compliance with the Court.

14           MR. VITALE: May I have a copy?

15           MS. ROCKENBACH: I'm sorry. The notice  
16           of compliance that Counsel referred to this  
17           morning.

18           MR. LINK: There are two copies there.

19           THE COURT: I have two copies. They  
20           are not of the same thing.

21           MR. LINK: I think there are copies of  
22           each.

23           MS. ROCKENBACH: Sorry about that.

24           THE COURT: No. That's okay. I got  
25           you.

1 MS. ROCKENBACH: But these are the  
2 notices of compliance that we have filed.

3 Your Honor, we went above and beyond  
4 because this court has not actually entered  
5 a written order on Edwards' motion to strike  
6 the exhibits or deemed them privileged.

7 THE COURT: That hasn't been before me.  
8 That hasn't been argued yet, has it?

9 MS. ROCKENBACH: It was. It was the  
10 March 8th hearing where these exhibits came  
11 to light and we discussed them. And Your  
12 Honor made specific oral rulings and we  
13 detailed them in those two notices of  
14 compliance. There was no objection filed by  
15 Mr. Edwards whatsoever about our detailed --  
16 and we cited to the hearing transcript to be  
17 completely accurate with Your Honor's  
18 rulings.

19 So there was never a requirement by  
20 Your Honor that we certify compliance with  
21 the rulings. Your Honor took our word as  
22 officers of the court as to how we handled  
23 the document. And then we went further to  
24 assist and cooperate, without court order,  
25 to seal the documents and then further to

1 | destroy the documents.

2                   And those two notices of compliance  
3                   identify -- I think there are 14 bullet  
4                   points and --

9 MS. ROCKENBACH: We are waiting for --  
10 Your Honor has indicated that you are giving  
11 us special set time on, I think, the July  
12 trial docket. And one of the issues is the  
13 motion for in camera for Your Honor to  
14 determine.

24 MR. LINK: Your Honor, can I comment on  
25 the non-written order so the Court

1           understands what happened?

2           THE COURT:    Okay.

3           MR. LINK:    As much as I hate to raise  
4           the subject, the reason the Court didn't  
5           enter an order is because of the stay and --

6           MR. VITALE:   Competing orders were  
7           submitted.

8           MR. LINK:    Yeah, competing orders were  
9           submitted, but then the case was stayed,  
10          Your Honor.  So it's not as though you were  
11          not going to enter an order on your oral  
12          rulings, but we went ahead and complied with  
13          your oral rulings anyway.  That's why we  
14          don't have a written order, Judge.

15          THE COURT:    I don't remember -- I  
16          shouldn't say I don't remember -- there's so  
17          much going on -- this may be what you're  
18          talking about.  What I try to do with breaks  
19          and video depos and things like that in the  
20          trial is try and go through some of this  
21          stuff and get some work done.

22          That's the competing orders on motion  
23          to strike Epstein's untimely supplemental --

24          MR. LINK:    Yes, Your Honor.

25          MS. ROCKENBACH:   That's it.

1                   THE COURT: Does the timeliness  
2                   issue -- is that still -- becomes an issue  
3                   or is that moot?

4                   MS. ROCKENBACH: It's moot.

5                   MR. VITALE: It's not moot, Your Honor.  
6                   It's still an issue.

7                   THE COURT: I guess I can enter the  
8                   order, but then it can be dealt with  
9                   otherwise, I presume.

10                  MR. LINK: Your Honor, I can tell you  
11                  we have fully complied with the Court's  
12                  ruling, and we believe all these issues are  
13                  teed up again through Mr. Vitale's office  
14                  and our office for the hearings in July. I  
15                  think the Court will see all of these issues  
16                  again at those hearings.

17                  THE COURT: That was just an extra copy  
18                  with submission to the Court. I don't need  
19                  it.

20                  MS. ROCKENBACH: So just to close, Your  
21                  Honor, Judge Ray has already addressed the  
22                  issue, and it is not necessary for  
23                  Mr. Epstein to be deposed any broader than  
24                  Judge Ray has already indicated.

25                  And, in fact, Your Honor, as you went

1 through the three items expressed by  
2 Plaintiff's Counsel, Judge Ray is addressing  
3 that. So to have Mr. Epstein be deposed so  
4 that Counsel can determine what trail  
5 objections to make or how this Court should  
6 rule on admissibility is not the subject of  
7 a motion for a deposition or another  
8 deposition of Mr. Epstein.

9 If it is, in fact, about compliance,  
10 well then, it would have been titled a  
11 motion to seek determination whether we  
12 complied with the Court's rulings.

13 We have. And that's why I submitted to  
14 Your Honor the two notices of compliance  
15 which Your Honor didn't request those,  
16 didn't order those. We did that, really,  
17 just to show our good faith in compliance  
18 with the Court's oral rulings.

19 So we ask that Your Honor deny the  
20 request to take another deposition of  
21 Mr. Epstein.

22 THE COURT: Thank you.

23 Last word.

24 MR. VITALE: Yes, Your Honor. This is  
25 not an admissibility issue. We understand

1       that Your Honor is more than capable of  
2       determining which of the 47 privileged  
3       documents are admissible based on Your  
4       Honor's current order. They are not  
5       admissible.

6           I have no qualms -- and I'm not  
7       standing here suggesting that Mr. Link or  
8       Ms. Rockenbach are going to attempt to admit  
9       exhibits that you have ruled are  
10      inadmissible.

11       Our concern is that Mr. Epstein, as a  
12      party, has reviewed a subset of our  
13      privileged materials, privileged materials  
14      that have been listed on our privilege log  
15      for eight years.

16       Our concern is that, on the witness  
17      stand in response to questions, he will  
18      utilize knowledge that he gained from the  
19      privileged materials he has reviewed in  
20      order to get that evidence in through the  
21      backdoor that Your Honor will not allow in  
22      through the front door.

23       The only way for Mr. Scarola or myself  
24      or Ms. Terry to properly object is to know  
25      what specific subset of privileged materials

1 he's reviewed so I can understand when he  
2 gives an answer, we can object and we can  
3 point you to a deposition transcript saying,  
4 Your Honor, we asked him what he reviewed.  
5 Here is what he reviewed. We asked him if  
6 he had any other knowledge of this topic  
7 outside of privileged materials, he said,  
8 No. That testimony should be stricken and  
9 the witness should be admonished.

10 So it's not an issue of admissibility.  
11 It's our ability to identify what he's  
12 reviewed to prevent these things. As Your  
13 Honor has said, they're not coming in  
14 through the front door. And your Honor made  
15 it clear in the oral ruling on March 8th  
16 that they will not come in through the  
17 backdoor. We need to understand what he's  
18 reviewed in order to make those objections.

19 THE COURT: Well, based upon the fact  
20 that there is going to be, at least from my  
21 perception and my limited exposure to these  
22 emails, a continued insistence, I will  
23 presume by Mr. Epstein, on the utilization  
24 of some of those emails; and the fact that  
25 these emails have come to light subsequent

1 to the trial court -- my orders relative to  
2 not permitting the floodgates to open and,  
3 again, with respect to discovery that should  
4 have been taken prior -- here I don't  
5 believe that's something that would be  
6 subject to that order, meaning, consistent  
7 with Judge Ray's ruling -- I too will allow  
8 Mr. Epstein to be -- on a limited basis --  
9 questioned regarding his review of any of  
10 the documents in question prior to  
11 March 18th or subsequent thereto to the  
12 present time.

13 Whether or not he has any knowledge  
14 regarding the compliance of the Court's  
15 order regarding destroying of the records,  
16 that's not necessarily going to be  
17 admissible at trial, although I think it's  
18 discoverable.

19 Whether or not he shared any of the  
20 allegedly privileged materials with anyone  
21 other than Mr. Link, Ms. Rockenbach or  
22 Mr. Goldberger; and which, if any, materials  
23 he plans to use to testify at trial, if he  
24 so testifies, the last issue can be avoided  
25 if there is a representation on the record

1           that Mr. Epstein will not testify at any  
2           trial proceedings in this case.

3           However, absent such a stipulation, he  
4           will be compelled to answer questions as to  
5           what, if any, of those materials he plans to  
6           use, even if he doesn't have those materials  
7           in his possession any longer. It would be  
8           based upon his review.

9           So that would be the limited areas of  
10          inquiry that I would allow in conjunction  
11          with Judge Ray, and to be consistent,  
12          essentially, with the spirit and intent of  
13          Judge Ray's ruling, as well as a corollary  
14          to what we are looking for in this  
15          particular case relative to those materials.

16          So, if you can, in preparing an order,  
17          Mr. Vitale, track the Court's ruling, I  
18          would appreciate it.

19          I wish you all a very pleasant rest of  
20          the week.

21          Is there anything else that's  
22          remaining, because I think there were two  
23          hearings that were set? Is there something  
24          else? This is it?

25          MR. LINK: I believe this is the only

1       one, Your Honor.

2       THE COURT: Thank you for your  
3       respective participation and arguments. I  
4       appreciate that very much. Thank you.

5       - - -

6       (The above proceedings were  
7       concluded at 9:18 a.m.)

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COURT CERTIFICATE

4 STATE OF FLORIDA )  
5 COUNTY OF PALM BEACH ) : SS

7 I, SONJA D. HALL, certify that I was  
8 authorized to and did stenographically report the  
9 foregoing proceedings and that the transcript is a  
10 true record of my stenographic notes.

13 Dated this 31st day of May 2018.

SONJA D. HALL