

in Courtroom 11F at the Palm Beach County Courthouse, 205 North Dixie Highway, West Palm Beach, Florida. Pursuant to Florida Statutes Sections 960.001(1)(k) and 921.143(1), you are entitled to be present and to make a statement under oath. If you choose, you can submit a written statement under oath, which may be filed by the State Attorney's Office on your behalf. If you elect to prepare a written statement, it should address the following:

the facts of the case and the extent of any harm, including social, psychological, or physical harm, financial losses, loss of earnings directly or indirectly resulting from the crime for which the defendant is being sentenced, and any matter relevant to an appropriate disposition and sentence. Fl[a]. Stat. [§] 921.143(2).

Sloman told OPR that he was “proceeding under the belief that we were going to notify [the victims], even though it wasn’t a federal case. Whether we were required or not.” Sloman also told OPR that while “we didn’t think that we had an obligation to send them victim notification letters . . . I think . . . Marie and . . . the agents . . . were keeping the victims apprised at some level.”

On December 7, 2007, Villafaña prepared letters containing the above information to be sent to multiple victims and emailed Acosta and Sloman, requesting permission to send them.<sup>316</sup> Sloman, however, had that day received a letter from Sanchez, advising that Epstein’s plea hearing was scheduled for January 4, 2008, and requesting that the USAO “hold off” sending the victim notification letters until “we can further discuss the contents.” Also that day, Starr and Lefkowitz submitted to Acosta the two lengthy “independent ethics opinions” supporting the defense arguments against the federal investigation and the NPA’s use of 18 U.S.C. § 2255. Sloman responded to Villafaña’s request with an email instructing her to “Hold the letter.”<sup>317</sup> Sloman told OPR that he “wanted to push the [victim notification] letter out,” but his instruction to Villafaña was “the product of me speaking to somebody,” although he could not be definitive as to whom. Sloman further told OPR that once the NPA “looked like it was going to fall apart,” the USAO “had concerns that if we g[a]ve them the victim notification letter . . . and the deal fell apart, then the victims would be instantly impeached by the provision that you’re entitled to monetary compensation.”

On December 10, 2007, Villafaña contacted the attorney who at the time represented the victim who later became CVRA petitioner “Jane Doe #2” to inform him that she “was preparing victim notification letters.” In her 2017 declaration filed in the CVRA litigation, Villafaña noted that she reached out to Jane Doe #2’s counsel, despite the fact that the USAO no longer considered

---

<sup>316</sup> The FBI case agent had emailed Villafaña the day before stating, “The letter that is currently being revised needs to take into account that several victims have never been notified by your office or mine.” The case agent also stated, “I do not feel that [the defense] should have anything to do with the drafting or issuing of this letter. My primary concern is that we meet our federal obligations to the victims in accordance with federal law.”

<sup>317</sup> Villafaña told OPR that she did not recall asking Sloman for an explanation for not sending the letters; rather, she “just remember[ed] putting them all in the Redweld and putting them in a drawer and being disgusted.”