

Congress of the United States
Washington, DC 20515

October 7, 2026

The Honorable Todd W. Blanche
Attorney General
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

The Honorable Kashyap Patel
Director
Federal Bureau of Investigation
935 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20535

Dear Attorney General Blanche and Director Patel:

For decades, Jeffrey Epstein and Ghislaine Maxwell operated a massive multibillion-dollar international sex trafficking ring that victimized more than 1,000 women and girls. Nonetheless, you have claimed that neither the Department of Justice (DOJ) nor the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) has any evidence to prosecute or even *investigate* a single person for their role in this gigantic conspiracy.

Fifteen months ago, on July 6, 2025, six months after President Donald Trump took office, DOJ and FBI insisted in a joint memorandum that federal law enforcement had no “evidence that could predicate an investigation” into any possible co-conspirators.¹ Then-Deputy Attorney General Todd Blanche doubled down on this wild claim a few weeks later, stating: “The joint statement by the DOJ and FBI of July 6 remains as accurate today as it was when it was written.”² Director Kash Patel claimed in front of Congress that “there is no credible information” that Epstein trafficked young women to anybody else and that “if there were, I would bring the case yesterday that he trafficked to other individuals.”³

These statements were demonstrably false. Members of Congress have reviewed unredacted versions of certain documents in the Epstein files on computer terminals at DOJ. Despite DOJ’s infamous efforts to make the review process as cumbersome and restrictive as possible,⁴ we have identified key documents that indicate the existence of possible co-conspirators clearly worthy of further investigation and potential prosecution.

¹ Memorandum on Review of Investigative Holdings Relating to Jeffrey Epstein, U.S. DEPT. OF JUSTICE & FED. BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION (July 6, 2025), <https://www.justice.gov/opa/media/1407001/dl>.

² Jeremy Roebuck, et al., *Justice Dept. Seeks Meeting with Ghislaine Maxwell Amid Epstein Outrage*, WASH. POST (July 22, 2025), <https://www.washingtonpost.com/national-security/2025/07/22/justice-epstein-ghislaine-maxwell-trump/>.

³ Testimony of FBI Director Kash Patel, *Oversight of the Federal Bureau of Investigation*, at 2:26:14, S. COMM. ON JUDICIARY (Sept. 16, 2025), <https://www.judiciary.senate.gov/committee-activity/hearings/oversight-of-the-federal-bureau-of-investigation-09-16-2025>.

⁴ Letter from The Hon. Jamie Raskin, Ranking Member, H. Comm. on the Judiciary, The Hon. Robert Garcia, Ranking Member, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform, and The Hon. Pramila Jayapal, Ranking Member, Subcomm. on Immigration Integrity, Security, and Enforcement, to The Hon. Pamela J. Bondi, Attorney General, U.S. Dep’t of Justice (Feb. 13, 2026), https://oversightdemocrats.house.gov/imo/media/doc/2026-02-13_raskin_rgarcia_jayapal_to_bondi_doj_re_member_surveillance_epstein_files.pdf.

Records in the DOJ's Epstein files indicate that, throughout 2014, Jeffrey Epstein groomed a young foreign model and aspiring vocalist—referred to as “Jane Doe” in this letter—by offering her advice and help with her plans to attend school and develop her career in the United States. Instead of helping her pursue nursing or the arts, Epstein pressured her to take sex education and massage courses. In exchange for arranging her visas and paying her educational and medical expenses, Epstein “employed” Jane Doe while he sexually abused her. Epstein then attempted to convince her to “become a mistress”—although it is not clear to whom—rather than pursue gainful employment outside of his control.

By all appearances, Epstein was trafficking this young woman across state and international lines by mid-2014. Epstein had his assistant, Lesley Groff, arrange several private flights for Jane Doe to travel from Europe to Canada and a series of destinations across the United States, including New York, Florida, New Mexico, and his Caribbean island. Before one of these visits, Jane Doe sent Epstein a picture of herself giving a woman, possibly Ghislaine Maxwell, a nude massage.

Epstein used his relationship with Leon Botstein to convince Jane Doe that she could have a successful musical career after modeling. In May 2014, Epstein sent Jane Doe to meet Botstein, then the President of Bard College and Director of the American Symphony Orchestra and other Bard music programs, ostensibly for him to assess her musical talents and provide her with educational guidance. We have reviewed one startling email, redacted by DOJ, sent from Botstein's Bard email account, President@Bard.edu, to Epstein that reads: **“Is [Jane Doe] for me, or are you keeping her for yourself.”**⁵

From: "jeffrey E." <jeevacation@gmail.com>
To: Jeffrey Epstein <jeevacation@gmail.com>
Subject: Fwd:
Date: Thu, 15 May 2014 12:33:06 +0000

----- Forwarded message -----
From: President <[REDACTED]>
Date: thu May 15, 2014 at 12:45AM
Subject: Re:
To: "jeffrey E." <jeevacation@gmail.com>

Is [REDACTED] for me, or are you keeping her for yourself. I need some help. I am only available on sat. I will be all the help I can to her but you need to help me.

----- Original Message -----
From: "jeffrey E." <jeevacation@gmail.com>
To: "President" <[REDACTED]>
Sent: thurs 6 AM

OK understood

⁵ Despite redacting Botstein's email, DOJ failed to redact her name hundreds of times, seemingly at random. We are providing under separate cover a list of documents that both contain her name and remain unredacted, in the hope that, nearly a year after Congress passed the Epstein Files Transparency Act, you will follow the law and fully redact information that reveals her identity. In the meantime, we have not cited the relevant documents to preserve whatever small shred of her anonymity that remains.

It appears that Botstein was referring to his meeting with Jane Doe scheduled to take place two days later on Saturday, May 17, 2014, when Botstein was supposed to assess Jane Doe's singing ability.

Epstein further leaned on Botstein to convince Jane Doe's parents of his legitimacy, just as he did with the leery parents of other survivors. A couple of weeks after Epstein sent Jane Doe to Botstein, Epstein asked Botstein for four orchestra tickets, apparently for Jane Doe's parents and the parents of another woman who "works" for him to attend a Bard concert abroad. Epstein gave Botstein instructions on how to charm the parents, telling him to shake their hands and that "any special treatment [would] be appreciated." Following the concert, a Bard administrator forwarded an email exchange and photos from the concert to Botstein: "Jeffrey Epstein's guests. Another woman in the group took the photo."

It is hard to construct any kind of innocent explanation for Botstein's question and the surrounding events. Botstein asked the most famous sexual predator of our time about a woman Epstein was trafficking: "**Is [Jane Doe] for me, or are you keeping her for yourself.**" We know that Epstein was neither a college president recruiting students nor a symphony director recruiting players, so what would it mean for Botstein to ask Epstein whether Jane Doe was for him or whether Epstein was "keeping her for yourself"?

In any event, this evidence, and the facts laid out in the Epstein files, surely meet and exceed the federal law enforcement standard for initiating a criminal *investigation*: the existence of evidence that a crime "may have occurred."⁶ These facts strongly indicate that a crime may have occurred. Yet, you have done nothing, and launched no investigation, about this incident which you and your staff must have known of for at least 18 months. In so doing, you have effectively permitted a potential co-conspirator of Jeffrey Epstein to stay in a position of power over young students, faculty, and staff for an additional year at least.

At the most basic level, this episode also demonstrates your fundamental dereliction of duty in failing to protect survivors during the release of materials pursuant to the Epstein File Transparency Act (EFTA). This woman's name was indiscriminately unredacted *hundreds of times* in the Epstein files. Her face was unredacted in pictures. Yet, despite this outrageous recklessness with respect to a survivor or deliberate exposure of personally identifying information, you were apparently careful to redact Leon Botstein's email address in an incriminating email. Why was her name released? Why, by contrast, was his email redacted? Who directed this disparate treatment, contrary to law, and who were they working to protect?

We now urge you—once again—to undertake a serious investigation, rather than a cover-up, of the countless potential crimes suggested in evidence in the Epstein files. This would require you to abandon your risible lie that there is *no* evidence in the Epstein files that could predicate an investigation into third parties. **Investigate Leon Botstein. Investigate Leon**

⁶ *The Attorney General's Guidelines for Domestic FBI Operations*, U.S. DEPT. OF JUSTICE (2008), 21, <https://www.justice.gov/archive/opa/docs/guidelines.pdf>.

Black, Jes Staley, Les Wexner, Sultan Ahmed bin Sulayem, Richard Kahn, Darren Indyke, Lesley Groff, Larry Visoski, and others.

Congress should not have to continue to do your job for you.

We also urge you to comply immediately and in full with the requirements of the EFTA. **Release all the files**, including the millions of pages that you have so far withheld illegally, **unredact the names of everyone but the victims**, and drop your absurd claims of privilege. Allow congressional staff to view these files. Every day in which you refuse to comply with the EFTA's requirement that you release the complete Epstein files compounds the injustice done to the country generally and specifically the survivors. Every day that passes reduces the time for investigation and prosecution in cases where the statute of limitations clock is ticking. Every passing day threatens the loss of, and damage to, evidence that could be used by state and local prosecutors to bring cases against Epstein and Maxwell's co-conspirators who have yet to face any accountability or justice.

While we restate these requests in good faith so that survivors may finally see justice, we can have no confidence, alas, that you will decide to honor either of them. Ultimately, we understand that your outrageous abandonment of your responsibilities is not about Leon Botstein. It is about protecting another individual who appears frequently in the Epstein files who also may have been a co-conspirator in Jeffrey Epstein's brutal and sickening sex trafficking operation. And yet you continue to show the world that you would rather let a dozen, even 100, or 1,000 human sex traffickers go free than allow the possibility of an honest investigation of the conduct of one man.

Very truly yours,



Jamie Raskin
Ranking Member
House Committee on the Judiciary



Madeleine Dean
Member of Congress

cc: The Honorable Jim Jordan, Chairman
House Committee on the Judiciary

Brandon Weber, Chair, Board of Trustees
Bard College

Jonathan Becker, Acting President
Bard College