

yes.” The court also asked Belohlavek if the juvenile victim’s parents or guardian agreed with the plea, and Belohlavek stated that because the victim was no longer under age 18, Belohlavek spoke with the victim’s counsel, who agreed with the plea agreement.<sup>363</sup>

Both Villafañá and the FBI case agent were present in the courtroom gallery to observe the plea hearing. Later that day, Villafañá met with Goldberger and gave him the list of 31 individuals the government was prepared to name as victims and to whom the § 2255 provision applied.

In her 2015 CVRA case declaration, Wild stated that, “I did not have any reason to attend that hearing because no one had told me that this guilty plea was related to the FBI’s investigation of Epstein’s abuse of me.” She stated that she “would have attended and tried to object to the judge and prevent that plea from going forward,” had she known that the state plea “had some connection to blocking the prosecution of my case.” Similarly, CVRA petitioner Jane Doe #2 stated that “no one notified me that [Epstein’s] plea had anything to do with my case against him.”

An attorney who represented several victims, including one whom the state had subpoenaed for the potential July trial, told OPR that he was present in court on June 30, 2008, in order to serve a complaint upon Epstein in connection with a civil lawsuit brought on behalf of one of his clients. The USAO had not informed him about the plea hearing.<sup>364</sup> Moreover, the attorney informed OPR that, although one of the victims he represented had been interviewed in the PBPD’s investigation and had been deposed by Epstein’s attorneys in the state case (with the Assistant State Attorney present), he did not recall receiving any notice of the June 30, 2008 plea hearing from the State Attorney’s Office.<sup>365</sup> Similarly, another of the victims the state had subpoenaed for the July trial told OPR through her attorney that she received subpoenas from the State Attorney’s Office, but she was not invited to or aware of the state plea hearing. Belohlavek told OPR that she did not recall whether she contacted any of the girls to appear at the hearing, and she noted that given the charge of solicitation of prostitution, they may not have “technically” been victims for purposes of notice under Florida law but, rather, witnesses. On July 24, 2008, the State Attorney’s Office sent letters to two victims stating that the case was closed on June 26, 2008 (although the plea occurred on June 30, 2008) and listed Epstein’s sentence. The letters did not mention the NPA or the federal investigation.

## **XII. SIGNIFICANT POST-PLEA DEVELOPMENTS**

### **A. Immediately After Epstein’s State Guilty Pleas, Villafañá Notifies Some Victims’ Attorneys**

Villafañá’s contemporaneous notes show that immediately after Epstein’s June 30, 2008 guilty pleas, she attempted to reach by telephone five attorneys representing various victims in

<sup>363</sup> Villafañá, who was present in court and heard Belohlavek’s representation, told OPR that she had no information as to whether or how the state had notified the victims about the plea hearing.

<sup>364</sup> Villafañá did contact this attorney’s law partner later that day.

<sup>365</sup> When interviewed by OPR in 2020, this same attorney indicated that he was surprised to learn that despite the fact that his client was a minor at the time Epstein victimized her, she was not the minor victim that the state identified in the information charging Epstein.