



would allow readers to discern the identity of a given nonparty-- to be appropriate and (2) ordered the parties to proceed with unsealing the materials in the manner set forth by the Court's orders of July 28 and July 29. (See dkt. nos. 1077, 1079.) The Court elected not to issue that order so that it could address the requests contained in Ms. Maxwell's letter and any additional issues raised in Ms. Giuffre's response.

First, Ms. Maxwell's request to submit her own proposed redactions to the Court under seal for in camera review is denied. As Ms. Maxwell well knows, the Court on July 23 ordered the parties to prepare the relevant materials for unsealing by today. While Ms. Maxwell gripes that Ms. Giuffre submitted her proposed redactions to the Court "late on July 29," (dkt. no. 1083 at 1), Ms. Giuffre at a minimum gave the Court time to conduct a review of her proposed redactions while preserving the original schedule for unsealing. By contrast, Ms. Maxwell at 2:00 p.m. informed the Court that she is "finalizing her proposed redactions" and that she will be ready to provide them to the Court at some undefined point "today." (Id. at 2.) On top of this--and despite the Court's instruction that the parties work together to ensure that the materials were properly redacted by the appointed time--Ms. Maxwell apparently has not provided to Ms. Giuffre her proposed

redactions, either. (Dkt. no. 1084.) For reasons that should be plain, this is entirely unworkable.<sup>1</sup>

Second, the Court adheres to its planned order, see supra at 1, and approves as appropriate Ms. Giuffre's proposed redactions to the sealed materials. The Court does so, however, subject to several caveats. Ms. Maxwell contends that Ms. Giuffre's "proposed redactions contain errors which reveal the names of [n]onparties, including alleged victims." (Id.) Ms. Giuffre suggests in her response that any unredacted nonparty names may have already been released by the Court of Appeals, but otherwise acknowledges that it is possible there were errors in her proposed redactions. (Dkt. no. 1084.) To the extent that nonparty names appear on pages that have already been unsealed by the Court of Appeals they need not be redacted. To the extent that nonparty names appear on pages that have not been publicly released, those names shall be redacted. Names of nonparties' family members that could be used

---

<sup>1</sup> Just yesterday, the Court admonished Ms. Maxwell for filing an "eleventh-hour request for reconsideration" on grounds that could have been raised well before the Court ordered the relevant documents unsealed. (Dkt. no. 1079.) The Court is troubled--but not surprised--that Ms. Maxwell has yet again sought to muddy the waters as the clock ticks closer to midnight.

to identify the nonparties, to the extent that they are not already public, shall be redacted.<sup>2</sup>

Counsel shall accordingly proceed with unsealing the relevant materials by the method prescribed in the Court's July 28 Order (dkt. no. 1077) and modified by this order and by the Court's July 29 Order (dkt. no. 1079).<sup>3</sup>

**SO ORDERED.**

Dated: New York, New York  
July 30, 2020



---

LORETTA A. PRESKA  
Senior United States District Judge

---

<sup>2</sup> Ms. Maxwell further suggests that Ms. Giuffre "proposes to unseal information which will indirectly both identify a [n]onparty and also implicate such [n]onparty either as an alleged perpetrator or victim of misconduct." (Dkt. no. 1083 at 3.) The Court does not share these concerns after reviewing Ms. Giuffre's proposed redactions. However, the Court notes that Ms. Maxwell has primarily raised issues related to nonparties named in Doe 1's and Ms. Maxwell's depositions. As discussed in the Court's July 29 Order (dkt. no. 1079), those deposition transcripts and documents that quote from or disclose information contained in the transcripts will not be unsealed until August 3. The parties are free to confer and attempt to reach agreement on additional redactions to those materials.

<sup>3</sup> As discussed in the July 29 Order, counsel may today proceed with posting on the public docket any materials that do not quote from or disclose information from the deposition transcripts of Ms. Maxwell and Doe 1. Those transcripts, along with materials that quote from or disclose information contained in the transcripts, will be unsealed on August 3, pending further order from the Court of Appeals staying their release.