

# PLANNING FOR A COVER-UP IN A HOUSE WITH SMALL CHILDREN AND OTHER STORIES OF HOW TODD BLANCHE IS HELPING A SEX TRAFFICKER

CNN has a story about how Trump's impeachment defense attorney, his criminal defense attorney, the flunkie who helped frame Hillary Clinton, and his Chief of Staff will go to JD Vance's home – where he is raising three children under the age of 10 – to discuss how to make Donald Trump's sex trafficking problem go away.

They apparently believe that Todd Blanche can hold his own in an interview with Joe Rogan, who has long smelled the rat in this cover-up.

The administration's handling of the Epstein case, as well as the need to craft a unified response, is expected to be a main focus of the dinner, three sources familiar with the meeting told CNN. The meeting will include White House chief of staff Susie Wiles, Vice President JD Vance, Attorney General Pam Bondi, FBI Director Kash Patel and Blanche.

With the exception of Vance, the White House considers those officials the leaders of the administration's ongoing strategy regarding the Epstein files, two of the sources said.

The meeting comes as Trump's administration is considering releasing the contents of Blanche's interview last month with Maxwell. Two officials told CNN that the materials could be made

public as early as this week.

There have also been internal discussions about Blanche holding a press conference or doing a high-profile interview, possibly with popular podcaster Joe Rogan, according to three people familiar with the discussions, though those conversations are preliminary. Rogan, who endorsed Trump on the eve of last fall's election, has been highly critical of the Trump administration's handling of the Epstein case and previously called their refusal to release more information about Epstein a "line in the sand."

To be fair to Blanche, though, he *has* managed to serve his client, and convicted sex trafficker Ghislaine Maxwell, well so far.

Yesterday, Maxwell's attorney, David Markus, submitted his – well-justified – opposition to releasing the grand jury materials for Ghislaine Maxwell's case, the ones that would feature a broad swath of victims. He as much as conceded that this *might have* provided a way to review the grand jury files (another benefit Blanche tried to offer), but now that Judge Paul Engelmeyer denied that request, he's opposed to the unsealing request.

Although the government did not oppose allowing the defense to review the grand jury material to assess whether to object to its release, the Court denied that request. As a result, Ghislaine Maxwell has not seen the material and cannot take an informed position. Given that she is actively litigating her case and does not know what is in the grand jury record, she has no choice but to respectfully oppose the government's motion to unseal it.

Maxwell's opposition is likely enough, by

itself, to rule against release of the Maxwell transcripts, which would include far more detail than Epstein's would.

Little noticed is the line in the DOJ filing describing DOJ telling third parties – not victims – if they appear in the grand jury transcripts.

In addition, the Government is in the process of providing notice to any other individuals identified in the transcripts.

Meanwhile, DOJ confessed yesterday that they have *still* not notified all the victims identified in the transcripts, and only just started to notify the victims covered under the relevant victim notification law.

Seventh, regarding the Government's approach to victim notification of the instant proceedings, as noted in its July 29 submission, the Government has provided notice of the unsealing motions to all but one of the victims who are referenced in the grand jury transcripts at issue in the motions. The Government still has been unable to contact that remaining victim. With respect to victims who are not identified in the grand jury transcripts but who have previously received victim notifications in the Maxwell and Epstein matters, the Government will over the coming days alert those victims to the fact of the unsealing motions.

That letter was posted the same day as this letter from Brad Edwards, who likely represents the largest number of known victims. He accuses the government of violating the Crime Victims' Rights Act generally, as well as losing track of some victims who are likely implicated in the Epstein and Maxwell grand juries but only came to be represented by Edwards after their

testimony. He describes that “yesterday” (that is, Monday), he contacted the government about the other victims and they responded, which suggests this newfound focus on other victims is a response to Edwards’ efforts.

Given our history fighting for the enforcement of the CVRA on behalf of Jeffrey Epstein’s many victims, we were quite surprised to learn that the government sought the unsealing of grand jury materials before this Court without first conferring with the victims or their counsel, a step required by the CVRA and reinforced by *Doe v. United States*, 08-80736 (S.D. Fla.). That case, litigated pro bono by undersigned counsel for more than a decade, arose precisely because the government previously violated the rights of many of these very same victims. It is especially troubling that, despite the outcome of that litigation, the government has once again proceeded in a manner that disregards the victims’ rights—suggesting that the hard-learned lessons of the past have not taken hold. This omission reinforces the perception that the victims are, at best, an afterthought to the current administration.

Of significant concern, the same government that failed to provide notice to the victims before moving this Court to unseal the grand jury materials is now the government representing to this Court that it has provided appropriate notice to the victims or their counsel and has conducted a proper review and redaction of the materials it seeks to release. Several clients have contacted us expressing deep anxiety over whether the redactions were in fact adequate. Consequently, **we requested yesterday that the government identify which of our clients were referenced to the grand**

**jury. The government responded promptly and provided clarification.** However, we have strong reason to believe that additional individuals—whom we also represent—were likely referenced in those materials but were not identified to us by the government.

It remains unclear whether notice was instead provided to prior counsel, whether their omission was a government oversight, whether the government does not consider them to be victims, or whether these individuals were, in fact, not mentioned to the grand jury. Regardless of the explanation, this ambiguity raises a serious issue that must be resolved before any materials are publicly released. [my emphasis]

You know who wouldn't have fucked up this process? The prosecutor Pam Bondi fired on Trump's authority just as this cover-up began, Maurene Comey.

The asymmetric treatment is pissing off the victims. Annie Farmer's attorney describes that the intent to redact third party names "smacks of a cover up."

Any effort to redact third party names smacks of a cover up. The Government does not elaborate on what protocol it is using to redact other "third party" names or which types of individuals it seeks to protect in this way. To the extent the Government for some reason seeks to redact the names of other Epstein and Maxwell affiliates on the basis that these individuals "neither have been charged or alleged to be involved" in their crimes, the Court should exercise its independent authority to ensure that any redactions are tailored to serve compelling interests. See generally *Brown v. Maxwell*, 929 F.3d 41, 50 (2d Cir. 2019)

(even if materials are not considered judicial documents to which a presumption of public access applies, “a court must still articulate specific and substantial reasons for sealing such material”).

I have a feeling Judge Richard Berman (who has been posting victim letters as they come in) will not take kindly to a grand jury unsealing in which people like Donald Trump and Prince Andrew get notice, but the victims do not.

This may change as Congress gets involved. Perhaps in an attempt to stave off the Massie-Khanna bid for true transparency that will ripen over the August recess, James Comer announced a bunch of subpoenas for people not named Alex Acosta or Donald Trump.

Oversight Chair James Comer (R-Ky.) announced that he was summoning nearly a dozen former officials to appear for depositions on the Epstein investigation – a list that includes former President Bill Clinton and former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton.

Former U.S. Attorneys General William Barr, Alberto Gonzales, Jeff Sessions, Loretta Lynch, Eric Holder and Merrick Garland, as well as former FBI Directors Robert Mueller and James Comey were also tapped to give testimony in connection to the case.

Comer was required to send the subpoenas after a Democratic-led subcommittee vote in July.

The move is the latest in a broader battle over the Epstein files, which took the Trump administration by storm last month as anger boiled over from within MAGA circles about the administration’s handling of the case.

The committee’s subpoena of Bill Clinton

in particular seems more symbolic than substantive. No former president has ever testified to Congress under the compulsion of a subpoena – and lawmakers have tried only twice before: once in 1953, when the House Un-American Activities Committee subpoenaed Harry Truman, and once in 2022, when the Jan. 6 select committee subpoenaed Donald Trump.

While this is the rare Epstein development that Fox has covered, there's so much about this request that reeks of a cover-up it may well backfire.



But as Lisa Rubin describes, there's also a subpoena to DOJ – the price of the Clinton testimony – that does make demands that would, among other things, cover the transcript of the Ghislaine Maxwell interview.

By ABC's description, Blanche got Ghislaine to perform like a trained seal, asking her to describe what he did in her presence, but not asking her about what he did when he learned she had "stolen" one of Trump's spa girls and forced her into sex slavery.

During her nine hours speaking with Deputy Attorney General Todd Blanche last month, Ghislaine Maxwell said nothing during the interview that would be harmful to President Donald Trump, telling Blanche that Trump had never done anything in her presence that would

have caused concern, according to sources familiar with what Maxwell said.

The Trump administration, meanwhile, is considering publicly releasing the transcripts from the interview, multiple sources familiar with the internal discussions told ABC News.

There are a lot of moving parts.

Including Ghislaine, to her new cozier digs, where the other inmates, including one whose daughter was trafficked, are already expressing disgust that Todd Blanche put a sex trafficker among their midst.

Julie Howell, 44, who is serving a one-year sentence for theft, told The Telegraph that “every inmate I’ve heard from is upset she’s here”.

“This facility is supposed to house non-violent offenders,” she added. “Human trafficking is a violent crime.”

[snip]

Inmates at FPC Bryan are worried about their own safety, given the widespread threats against Maxwell and lack of tight security on the prison grounds.

Howell said: “We have heard there are threats against her life and many of us are worried about our own safety because she’s here.”

Her comments will only fuel concern that could be targeted at the facility, preventing her testimony about Epstein from ever seeing the light of day.

Maxwell was allegedly moved under the cover of darkness because she had been “bombarded” with death threats from rapists who accused her of being a “snitch”, according to the Mail on Sunday.



Multiple outlets, including that CNN story, report that Trump's close advisors think they've weathered this crisis because their mobsters – people like Charlie Kirk and Benny Johnson – have been distracted by other things.

One official told CNN that some of the conversation within the White House has focused on whether making the details from the interview public would bring the Epstein controversy back to the surface. Many officials close to Trump believe the story has largely died down.

We shall see.

As I wrote here, Trump and Blanche have the power to silence Maxwell, if the rapists calling her a snitch don't get to her first.

But the moving parts and sheer cynicism of the cover-up may backfire.