

Senator Peter Welch
Senate Judiciary Committee
Written Questions for Dani Bensky
Hearing on “The Nomination of the Honorable Todd Blanche to be Attorney General of the
United States”
July 16, 2026

1. **Mr. Blanche supervised the Department’s release of records related to Jeffrey Epstein. Even though attorneys notified the Department that survivors would require their personally identifying information to be protected, the release exposed survivors’ names, contact information, addresses, and employment information, along with other identifying details.**
 - a. **On December 19, 2025, while he was the Deputy Attorney General, Mr. Blanche wrote in a letter to Members of Congress, “Protecting victims is of the highest priority for President Trump, the Attorney General, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the Department of Justice.” Did Mr. Blanche or his office ever commit to you or other survivors that the Department would protect the personally identifying information of survivors? Please explain.**

Yes, and the Department of Justice failed to honor that commitment. DOJ repeatedly assured survivors that our identities would be protected. It was at DOJ’s request that survivors’ attorneys compiled a list of the names of hundreds of Jeffrey Epstein’s survivors. That list was provided with the express understanding that every individual on it would be redacted prior to the release of the Epstein files. That did not happen.

The gravity of that failure was compounded during our meeting with Mr. Blanche. Alessandra Serrano, the DOJ National Coordinator for Trafficking who was present, asked us, the survivors, whether there was anything in the public Epstein files that still required redaction and to let the DOJ know if so—a question that should never have needed to be asked after the release, let alone more than 6 months later. My attorney responded that the day prior to our meeting, her firm submitted to DOJ an additional redaction request regarding a publicly available Epstein document that continued to expose survivors’ personal identifying information. We should not have to keep making these requests—DOJ made a commitment, broke it, and has yet to account for that failure or offer meaningful recourse for the harm that was caused to the survivors.

When asked about the personal information that was not previously redacted in the Epstein files, Mr. Blanche and Ms. Serrano emphasized that they can “only look at moving forward,” and that they “cannot change the past.” The harm has already been done to us, the survivors, and DOJ’s posture of moving on without accountability is unacceptable.

b. Did Mr. Blanche or his office ever provide survivors of Jeffrey Epstein and Ghislaine Maxwell with an explanation of how the disclosures occurred and what steps the Department took to remedy the harm they caused?

No. Neither Mr. Blanche nor his office has ever provided an explanation for how the initial disclosures occurred, and none has been provided for all of the failures since. Rather than taking accountability, Mr. Blanche and Ms. Serrano stated they “can’t change the past” and asked the survivors—the very people harmed—to identify and let them know what, if anything, still needs to be redacted. That responsibility has always belonged to, and remains with, DOJ, not the survivors.

The ongoing nature of DOJ’s failure cannot be overstated. Since the initial release of the files, my attorneys have been forced to repeatedly notify the DOJ of instances of unredacted personally identifying information—both mine and that of many other Epstein survivors. Unredacted files remained publicly accessible on the DOJ Epstein Library site as recently as the day before our meeting with Mr. Blanche. DOJ has had more than 6 months to address this but has not.

When asked directly about DOJ’s commitment to making survivors whole from the harm caused by the disclosures, their response was dismissive and final. Ms. Serrano stated there was “nothing” they can do or say to make survivors whole. Mr. Blanche also refused to commit to a meeting with survivors to discuss financial remediation for the exposure of their personally identifying information, telling us that he agreed only to a conversation—not to “be told to commit” things. That distinction speaks for itself. We the survivors came to the meeting with Mr. Blanche seeking accountability and a path forward; DOJ offered us neither.

c. You testified that your attorney and another law firm submitted 350 victims’ names to the Department of Justice as names that needed to be redacted. Can you please describe the time and expense of those efforts and explain the reason you submitted these names to Department officials?

The time and expense have been substantial, though they should never have been necessary. My attorneys, along with survivors’ attorneys at other firms, have devoted significant attorney time and resources to doing work DOJ should have done before the Epstein files were ever released to the public. Since the initial release, my attorneys alone have notified and followed up with the DOJ on at least 70 separate occasions regarding unredacted survivor information, each time requesting that DOJ apply redactions it was already informed of and obligated to apply.

As I stated, prior to the public release of the files, and at DOJ’s own request, survivors’ attorneys worked together to compile and submit a list of hundreds of survivors’ names, an effort that demanded significant attorney resources. Despite making that request, DOJ still allowed survivors’ identifying information to be publicly released. Survivors and their attorneys

submitted those names because DOJ asked them to and because there was an explicit understanding that our protection would follow it. It did not.

The result is that we have been forced to absorb the ongoing cost in attorney time, in resources necessary to correct a failure that was entirely DOJ's responsibility to prevent, and in the continued exposure of our most sensitive personal information.

- d. You testified that you saw your name each time the documents were released. Can you please explain how long it took for your name and other personally identifying information to be removed from the documents each time the disclosure occurred and what the Department communicated with you about this violation of the law?**

It took nearly 4 months. Despite repeated notice from my attorneys, my name and other personally identifying information remained publicly accessible on the online Epstein Library for nearly 4 months after the Department of Justice's initial release—and DOJ communicated nothing meaningful about its already inexplicable violation.

DOJ had been put on notice of my victim status on 3 separate occasions before the initial release. In 2008, I was interviewed by the FBI in connection with the federal investigation into Epstein, at which time I informed the FBI that I was a minor when the abuse began. I was contacted by the FBI again in 2019 regarding my status as a victim. I also attended court proceedings related to the criminal case against Ghislaine Maxwell and spoke publicly about my experiences. In December 2025, at the DOJ's own request, my attorneys notified the Department of my victim status along with the names of approximately 350 other survivors.

Despite that notice, my attorneys were forced to notify the DOJ of the disclosures of my personal information on 4 separate occasions: January 30, 2026, March 7, 2026, March 14, 2026, and April 7, 2026. But this should never have been necessary in the first place. The exposed information included my name, phone number, former address, place of employment, and other identifying details. That information remained publicly available until April 8, 2026.

DOJ had assured us before the release that our names and identifying information would be protected. They were not. When we sought accountability, Mr. Blanche and Ms. Serrano told us they "can't change the past." That is not an explanation, but the absence of one.

- e. You described 100 other victims' identifying information being released to the public through the Department's document release. Based on your personal knowledge, can you share whether your experience was similar, or dissimilar, from other survivors that interacted with the Department of Justice?**

My experience was part of a pattern, not an outlier. DOJ repeatedly exposed the personal information of myself and numerous other Epstein survivors by releasing unredacted documents

despite having received notice of our identities well in advance. What happened to me happened to more than 100 other survivors.

As survivors of sexual abuse, we have been forced to watch deeply private and sensitive information related to our abuse become publicly accessible and viewable by our employers, colleagues, children, families, friends, and the world. That kind of exposure cannot be undone. Documents containing unredacted survivor information have already been downloaded and screenshotted, and that material will in all likelihood remain accessible on the internet indefinitely. DOJ's belated efforts to apply redactions it was obligated to apply prior to the release do not come close to remedying that harm. The damage was done the moment the files went public.

We left our meeting with Mr. Blanche without any meaningful commitment from DOJ to make survivors whole. This is a reflection of DOJ's demonstrated lack of good faith. Survivors came to that meeting having already absorbed months of harm, ongoing exposure, and the burden of forcing DOJ's hand at every step. What we received in return was a refusal to commit. While the harm is shared among us survivors, the accountability within DOJ has not been.

2. Following the hearing, Mr. Blanche reportedly met with Epstein survivors.

- a. You said that Mr. Blanche appeared to treat the meeting as “a mere ‘check-the-box’ exercise intended to secure votes for his confirmation.” Can you please confirm if that was your experience and, if so, explain why that was your takeaway from the meeting.**

Yes, my experience was that Mr. Blanche treated our July 16 meeting as solely a “check-the-box” exercise. Prior to that day, the other survivors and I had spent eight months requesting a meeting with Mr. Blanche or other members of the DOJ. Finally, after the first day of Mr. Blanche's confirmation hearing and after Senator Thom Tillis said he would not advance Mr. Blanche's nomination if he did not meet with Epstein survivors, we were told that Mr. Blanche would meet with us the next day.

Mr. Blanche began our meeting by saying that he was there to listen to the survivors. In my view, Mr. Blanche did very little listening. Instead, he spent the less-than-hour-long meeting diminishing our concerns, gaslighting us, arguing with us, and condescending to us. His through-line was that he could not investigate—or take any action—unless the survivors provided evidence and spoke to the FBI, which ignores the 3 million pages of documents, survivor interviews, and evidence that DOJ released earlier this year. Worse, Mr. Blanche seemed to have no personal knowledge of what was in the millions of documents that DOJ released. He did all this while denying that he said that there were no investigative leads from the Epstein files.

When presented with our concerns, which he characterized at one point as “complaining,” Mr. Blanche condescendingly explained DOJ’s purported limitations or argued that what we said was not true. When asked to commit to opening an investigation into Epstein’s co-conspirators and institutional failures generally, Mr. Blanche deflected and shifted the burden to the survivors to speak to the FBI, something that we have been doing from as early as 1996. When asked why survivors were not informed that Ghislaine Maxwell was meeting with Mr. Blanche or that Maxwell was being moved to a different, lower-security facility, Mr. Blanche told us that they were not obligated to notify the survivors. When asked to commit to individual or group meetings with survivors to discuss failed redactions, Mr. Blanche became defensive and stated that he was not at the meeting to “be told, ‘commit to this, commit to that.’”

Overall, it was clear to me that Mr. Blanche did not approach the meeting as an opportunity to engage with us in good faith but to overcome what he perceived as a barrier to his confirmation.

b. During the meeting, did Mr. Blanche accept responsibility for the Department’s release of survivor information?

No. Mr. Blanche did not accept responsibility for DOJ’s release of survivor information.

One of my primary goals for the meeting and for my testimony to the Senate Judiciary Committee was to communicate how harmful the release of survivor information was to other survivors and myself. As I mentioned in my opening statement to the Committee, DOJ released my name, personally identifying information, and disturbing and incomplete accounts of my abuse to the entire world, including my friends, family, colleagues, and the students I teach. Devastatingly, my FBI 302 report released the name of a survivor who has fought to remain anonymous for decades.

This has had an overwhelming impact on many survivors, including myself. Public exposure of the worst moments of our lives has impacted our mental and psychological health, our relationships with our family, friends, and community, and subjected us to extreme public scrutiny. Survivors across the world have lost their livelihoods and had accusatory articles written about them. We were forced to relive our past experiences each time DOJ released unredacted documents, and it is extremely difficult to put into words how re-traumatizing it is to experience those moments again and have your friends and family learn about them at the same time.

When the other survivors, my attorney, and I asked Mr. Blanche about the release of survivor names, personal information, and nude photos, Mr. Blanche never apologized, accepted responsibility, or committed to further investigation into the redaction failures. Mr. Blanche and Ms. Serrano instead responded that they “can’t change the past,” and glibly suggested that we “look at moving forward.” Mr. Blanche did not commit to further meetings, as described above,

c. During the meeting, did Mr. Blanche commit to any particular investigation, deadline, follow-up meeting, or disclosure of information to survivors? If so, please describe his commitment(s).

No. Mr. Blanche did not commit to any particular investigation, deadline, follow-up meeting, or disclosure of information to survivors. When we asked that Mr. Blanche make certain commitments as described above, he was extremely defensive and feigned surprise that we were asking for investigations, follow-up meetings, or additional disclosures. Far from springing these requests on him, the other survivors and I have consistently and publicly called for DOJ's investigation into Epstein's co-conspirators, the same co-conspirators who are being called to testify to the House Oversight Committee. We have also advocated for DOJ's investigation into institutional failures and for DOJ to take accountability for its redaction failures. I do not feel that any of these requests are being taken seriously.

The closest Mr. Blanche came to any commitment was a conditional statement offered late in the meeting, along the lines of: "So you're asking if I will commit to open an investigation? Absolutely. But I need you to meet with the FBI. Show them the evidence you have, and we will open any investigation that we can." But he did not name a single individual, co-conspirator, or lead he intended to pursue, did not commit to a timeline, and made no commitment regarding prosecutions. It was clear to me that Mr. Blanche did not approach the meeting as an opportunity to engage with us in good faith but to overcome what he perceived as a barrier to his confirmation.

Mr. Blanche's explanation for why he could not take action can be reduced to the following: survivors must provide new corroborating evidence to the FBI; DOJ is bound by legal constraints that limit what it can disclose about ongoing matters; and the confrontation clause and hearsay rules limit what evidence can be used in criminal trials. None of those constraints, individually or together, explain why DOJ has not opened a single investigation into the individuals named across 3 million pages of its own documents. Mr. Blanche never explained that absence during our meeting.

d. Did the meeting alter your assessment of Mr. Blanche's tenure in the Department of Justice? Please explain.

No. The meeting did not alter my assessment of Mr. Blanche's DOJ tenure. His DOJ released 3 million files that exposed survivors' names, nude pictures, and survivors' accounts of abuse in a way that felt intentional. That release not only retraumatized and humiliated victims but exposed survivors who had never even told their family, children, or closest friends about what happened to them. Insultingly, even after releasing this wealth of information, Mr. Blanche continues to say that there are no investigative leads in the Epstein case.

When presented with our concerns (which he characterized at one point as "complaining") Mr. Blanche condescendingly explained DOJ's purported limitations or argued

that what we said was not true. In one telling moment, when we raised his public statements about investigative leads, he denied making them, stating: “I have not said some of the things you said; the media has said that.” Multiple survivors in the room pushed back: “We heard you say that.” In a post-meeting interview, I described this pattern: “I think there were quite a few moments where he would engage us and then say, ‘Well, I never said those things,’ even though we’ve seen on media and literally, I watched a news clip of it. So we would start to talk about that, and then he would want to argue about semantics.” I have also described him as “just really condescending toward us,” and characterized that behavior as a tactic to evade responsibility.

Mr. Blanche’s dismissive attitude towards us has implications well beyond survivors of Epstein’s crimes. The Attorney General is the chief law enforcement officer of the United States. When Americans are harmed, they should be able to turn to their DOJ and know that their concerns will be heard and acted upon. What the July 16 meeting demonstrated is that Mr. Blanche’s default response to people who have suffered documented, serious harm and who come to him with specific requests is to dismiss what they are saying as complaints, redirect the burden of proof back onto the people who were already victimized, and decline to commit to anything. Fellow survivor Elizabeth Stein, speaking after the meeting, captured this concern precisely: “We’re victims of the crime of sex trafficking. And the fact that our Department of Justice will not take that seriously is beyond concerning, not just to us, but should be concerning to Americans all across this country.” I share that concern entirely.

For me, the meeting only emphasized that the American people deserve an Attorney General that will protect, respect, and listen to victims of sexual abuse. Mr. Blanche is not that person.

Questions for the Record

Dani Bensky

Sen. Adam Schiff (CA)

- 1. You testified about your and other Epstein survivors' efforts to work with attorneys to submit survivors' names to the Department of Justice in advance of the release of the Epstein files to ensure the Department would redact their records correctly. Despite your help, the Department released sensitive records including unredacted personal information.**

- a. How many times did the Department release records including your sensitive personal information?**

The Department of Justice released my information across nine separate document releases. This was not one isolated error. One of those nine releases was not even a new document — it was a reposting of a file already published once before. That single document went through three distinct states: it was first released with my name unredacted, then reposted with my name properly redacted after my attorneys intervened, and then reposted a second time with my name unredacted again. A single point of failure recurring three times over is not a clerical accident; it is evidence of a process that lacks basic controls to ensure that a redaction, once made, stays made.

My information was first released in December 2025, when DOJ published two documents identifying me: one containing my first name and phone number, and another containing my full name. From the outset, DOJ released personally identifying information about a survivor of Jeffrey Epstein's abuse without adequate safeguards.

On January 30, 2026, my attorneys formally requested the redaction of six documents. Two of these were my FBI interview transcripts, and they did not merely contain my name—they contained my full name, date of birth, home address, and telephone number, alongside intimate, deeply personal details of the abuse I suffered at Epstein's hands.

On March 7, 2026, I identified yet another document—an FBI report—in which my first name remained unredacted, and my attorney immediately requested its correction. The DOJ did not act. It took a second email from my attorney, sent on March 16, before the DOJ finally redacted my name. Nine days elapsed, and only a follow-up demand—not DOJ's own diligence—produced the result.

Despite having already redacted one of my FBI report documents in direct response to the January 30 request, that same document became publicly available again, unredacted. Once more, the intimate details of Epstein's abuse of me were accessible to anyone in the world and readily traceable back to my identity. In the same period, I independently discovered a social media page publicly listing my full name and date of birth. My attorneys requested redaction of both immediately, on April 7, 2026.

b. How did you feel when you learned the Department had released your personal records despite the steps you took to ensure they would not be released?

Since my personal information became publicly available, I have experienced a range of emotions, including outrage, disappointment, fear, humiliation, and shock. However, what has struck me most, and what continues to sit heavily with me, is a profound sense of betrayal. This betrayal cuts deeper because of the DOJ and the FBI's failure to investigate and prosecute Epstein when they first received Maria Farmer's report about Epstein's predatory behavior in 1996.

Maria's report was just the start of reporting that the DOJ and the FBI would receive about Epstein's sexual misconduct over the next thirty years. Other survivors and I relied on the federal government to protect us, to investigate Epstein, and to take action to prevent Epstein from continuing to sexually abuse and traffic young women. Even during Epstein's incarceration as a result of U.S. Attorney Alex Acosta's "prosecution," Epstein continued to abuse young girls. This is not justice.

Almost thirty years after Maria's first report and after at least a thousand of women were raped, assaulted, and trafficked, the federal government finally took action. In 2019, the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Southern District of New York indicted Epstein.

This betrayal by our government is further compounded by years of inaction, apathy, and indifference to the irreversible harm that the thousands of survivors and I have faced because the government did not protect us. The government failed us, and when given the opportunity to reveal the depth and nature of Epstein's network and abuse, what happened instead was another violation of our trust.

What should have been a success for me and other survivors turned into a nightmare. The worst days of my life were on display for my friends, family, colleagues, and the public to read. Even with the untimely redactions, the unredacted versions live on private websites for people to find. I could not be more disappointed and devastated by how this administration, and particularly Mr. Blanche, treated me and my fellow survivors.

c. Why do you believe the Department continued to release your personal information?

It is clear to me that protecting survivors was not the DOJ's priority. My attorneys gave DOJ advance notice, in writing, of exactly what needed to be redacted. For some survivors, myself included, the DOJ and the FBI did not even need my attorneys to tell them who I was—they already knew, because they had interviewed me directly on two separate occasions as a victim. I was identified by the FBI and was enrolled in the Victim's Notification System (The VNS) since 2008. Despite years of notice, and despite the specific notices given in December

2025, this kept happening. When an agency has been told this many times, by this many people, in this much detail, and the same failure still repeats itself, that is not incompetence alone. It also appears to me that certain perpetrators or enablers are being protected, and that betrayal cuts even deeper. It suggests to me that safeguarding survivors was never treated as a priority on par with whatever protections were being extended to the perpetrators and enablers who moved through Epstein's orbit.

d. Do you believe there should be consequences for the Department officials that permitted the release of your personal information?

Yes. Fellow survivors have been publicly identified, lost jobs, and received threats as a direct result of these disclosures. To my knowledge, no official has faced any consequences for causing that harm. If DOJ cannot discipline its own personnel for repeatedly exposing survivors of sexual abuse after receiving explicit written warnings, then survivors like me are left to conclude that these protections exist only on paper.

My fellow survivors, other crime victims, and our broader community deserve more than assurances that this will not happen again. We deserve accountability. That means identifying those responsible, imposing appropriate discipline, and taking meaningful steps to make survivors whole. Until that happens, this betrayal will continue to undermine our trust in the institutions that were supposed to protect us.

2. What does the Department's handling of the Epstein Files under Blanche say about his fitness to serve as the nation's top law enforcement officer?

The Department of Justice's handling of the Epstein files under Mr. Blanche raises serious concerns about his fitness to serve as the nation's top law enforcement officer. As a crime victim, I expected the DOJ to protect my privacy, safeguard my safety, and take seriously its obligations to survivors. Instead, survivors spent months trying to secure a meeting with Mr. Blanche, even after he and the DOJ were on notice about repeated disclosures of sensitive information. Mr. Blanche continued to ignore survivors until his confirmation process was at risk.

Even more troubling, the DOJ repeatedly exposed survivors' identities and personal information despite receiving explicit written notice of the survivors' names to be redacted. The consequences of failing to protect victims were not hypothetical. Fellow survivors have been outed, lost jobs, and received threats as a direct result of these disclosures.

Leadership is measured not only by what happens on your watch, but by how you respond when people are harmed. Rather than meet with the victims, Mr. Blanche treated the release of the Epstein files like a political event that needed to be managed rather than as one *the* nation's top law enforcement office that needed to be investigated, open prosecutions, and protect crime victims from further harm.

Mr. Blanche's handling of the Epstein files demonstrated a failure to protect vulnerable people, a failure to listen to those harmed, and a failure to ensure accountability when preventable injuries occurred. Those failures raise serious questions about whether Mr. Blanche has shown the judgment, leadership, and commitment to victims and that this position demands, particularly when it comes to pursuing politically disfavored cases and addressing sex trafficking by powerful people.

3. During the hearing, you noted that, before Blanche's confirmation hearing, you and other Epstein survivors attempted to meet with Blanche "through multiple channels and he never responded."

a. Can you describe your attempts to secure a meeting with Blanche before his confirmation hearing?

I, along with other Epstein survivors, spent approximately eight months attempting to secure a meeting with Mr. Blanche or other representatives of the Department of Justice. Throughout that period, we made repeated requests for a conversation, yet neither Mr. Blanche nor anyone from the DOJ responded to us even once before his confirmation hearing. As survivors whose privacy and safety were directly affected by the DOJ's actions, the absence of any response was deeply disappointing.

b. When did you receive an invitation to meet with Todd Blanche?

After the first day of Mr. Blanche's confirmation hearing, Senator Thom Tillis publicly stated that he would not advance Mr. Blanche's nomination unless he met with Epstein survivors. Shortly thereafter, we were informed that Mr. Blanche would meet with us the following day. This was the first time, after months of unanswered requests, that we received any indication that Mr. Blanche would speak with us.

4. You spoke publicly after Todd Blanche finally met with you and other Epstein survivors following his confirmation hearing. In public statements, you described the meeting as a "mere 'check-the-box' exercise intended to secure votes for his confirmation."

a. During your meeting, what justification, if any, did Blanche provide for failing to respond to survivors' prior requests to meet with him?

Mr. Blanche offered no justification for his failure to respond to survivors' prior requests to meet. He opened the meeting by stating that he was there to listen, that he had been on the Hill that day visiting senators, and that "someone told me you were all here today and wanted to meet with me." That framing presented the meeting as an incidental coincidence rather than a long-overdue response to our repeated requests. He also mentioned that he had "tried to use the Senate" to arrange a meeting but that it "didn't work out," and that he had "moved some things around" so that we could talk that day.

He offered no explanation for the approximately eight months during which he and the Department of Justice failed to respond to our requests. His only implicit justification was procedural: he stated repeatedly that he had met with attorneys representing victims and that direct engagement ran through legal counsel. That explanation does not account for his failure to engage substantively with our counsel during those eight months. The meeting itself occurred only because Senator Tillis drew a line in the sand, not because Mr. Blanche reached out.

b. During your meeting, did Blanche apologize for failing to meet with you in the past?

No. Mr. Blanche did not apologize for failing to meet with survivors prior to the confirmation hearing, nor did he offer any acknowledgment that survivors were owed a meeting earlier.

He opened the meeting by saying he was there to listen, but that framing was not accompanied by any acknowledgment that he should have listened months earlier. He did not express regret, offer an apology, or take responsibility for having ignored our repeated requests. When survivors and our attorneys raised the release of survivor names, personal information, and nude photos, Mr. Blanche never apologized, accepted responsibility, or committed to further investigation into the redaction failures.

In a subsequent public interview, I described the meeting as “a tick-the-box meeting, which is exactly what it felt like.” That characterization reflects not only the absence of any commitment or accountability, but also the absence of any acknowledgment that survivors were owed an apology for being ignored for nearly a year.

c. How did Blanche respond when you asked him to follow-up on investigative leads?

Mr. Blanche’s response to questions about investigative leads was evasive and ultimately placed the burden of investigation on survivors rather than on the DOJ.

During the meeting, I pressed him directly on his obligation as a career prosecutor to follow up on leads. I asked whether, as a career prosecutor, he would follow up on credible leads from the FBI. He agreed with me that leads “should be followed up.” I then asked him why he was putting the burden on the victim, to come to him with stacks of evidence from 20 to 30 years ago, when he and the DOJ already had their statements from years back, plus millions and millions of pages of evidence from the Epstein files.

Despite conceding that point in principle, Mr. Blanche’s consistent position throughout the meeting was that survivors must first go to the FBI with evidence (even if they had already done so previously) and that he lacked the authority to open criminal cases independently. He repeatedly deflected, stating that the only way to make cases is through the FBI and that survivors needed to provide corroborating evidence to federal agents.

The survivors and I challenged Mr. Blanche on his prior public statements that there were “no investigative leads” from the Epstein files. When he tried to claim that he “never said that” there were no leads, I told him directly: “You literally said those exact words.” But he insisted that this was a mischaracterization, claiming he had not said “there are no investigative leads,” but rather that “based on everything we have, we don’t have enough evidence.” [In a post-meeting interview](#), I described this pattern: “I think there were quite a few moments where he would engage us and then say, ‘Well, I never said those things,’ even though we’ve seen on media and literally, I watched a news clip of it. So we would start to talk about that, and then he would want to argue about semantics.”

d. During your meeting, did Blanche make any commitments to you, including whether he plans to prosecute anyone involved in Epstein’s sex trafficking ring?

No. Mr. Blanche did not commit to any particular investigation, deadline, follow-up meeting, or disclosure of information to survivors.

When survivors and our attorneys asked Mr. Blanche to make commitments, including committing to a follow-up meeting, opening an investigation into Epstein co-conspirators, or engaging in negotiations about financial redress for the harm caused by the redaction failures, Mr. Blanche stated that he had not come to the meeting to “be told, ‘commit to this, commit to that.’”

When I asked him whether he could commit to a continuing dialogue on investigative leads and whether DOJ could show good faith by opening at least one investigation, he did not respond to me directly. Alessandra Serrano, the DOJ National Coordinator for Trafficking who was present, reiterated her own commitment to meet with individual survivors and their attorneys, but stated she could not meet with survivors without their counsel present.

The closest Mr. Blanche came to any commitment was a conditional statement offered late in the meeting, along the lines of: “So you’re asking if I will commit to open an investigation? Absolutely. But I need you to meet with the FBI. Show them the evidence you have, and we will open any investigation that we can.” But he did not name a single individual, co-conspirator, or lead he intended to pursue, did not commit to a timeline, and made no commitment regarding prosecutions. It was clear to me that Mr. Blanche did not approach the meeting as an opportunity to engage with us in good faith but to overcome what he perceived as a barrier to his confirmation.

e. Following your meeting, Blanche told reporters your meeting was not “all cordial” because “there’s something that they want that I don’t think I can give them, which is some form of justice.” Did Blanche explain to you why he does not believe he can give you some form of justice?

Mr. Blanche's post-meeting comment to reporters, that there is "something that they want that I don't think I can give them, which is some form of justice," was not a formulation he used during our meeting directly. However, the substance of that position was present throughout the meeting in the pattern of statements he made about the limits of what he could or would do.

Throughout the meeting, Mr. Blanche's consistent position was that DOJ lacked sufficient evidence to pursue prosecutions and that survivors needed to return to the FBI with their accounts for investigations to proceed. He told us if we just gave him "good evidence," then DOJ will "arrest somebody, and "indict them," and then "put them in prison." He acknowledged that survivors have already "gone to the FBI for 20 years, and that's bullshit," and that we "got screwed over by the FBI." Yet even while making that admission, he offered no concrete path to accountability. He acknowledged the institutional failure; he did not accept responsibility for correcting it.

Mr. Blanche's explanation for why he could not take action can be reduced to the following: survivors must provide new corroborating evidence to the FBI; DOJ is bound by legal constraints that limit what it can disclose about ongoing matters; and the confrontation clause and hearsay rules limit what evidence can be used in criminal trials. None of those constraints, individually or together, explain why the DOJ has not opened a single investigation into the individuals named across 3 million pages of its own documents. Mr. Blanche never explained that absence during our meeting.

f. What more could Blanche do to secure justice for you and other Epstein survivors?

Mr. Blanche could take several concrete steps that remain within his authority and that do not require survivors to re-live their abuse for the benefit of an institution that has already failed them repeatedly.

First, DOJ should open formal investigations into Epstein's known co-conspirators and enablers. During our meeting, I pressed Mr. Blanche on this directly and said if he "could commit to just one investigation," then we "would all feel better in this DOJ and administration." But he offered nothing in response. DOJ's own 3 million pages of documents, along with survivor interviews and referrals from the House Oversight Committee, contain evidence sufficient to warrant opening investigations. DOJ need not wait for survivors to walk into FBI field offices again.

Second, Mr. Blanche should commit to formal follow-up meetings with survivors and their counsel, focused specifically on identifying the investigative leads that exist in the documentary record DOJ has already released. When asked during our meeting to commit to individual or group meetings with survivors to discuss failed redactions, Mr. Blanche became defensive and stated that he was not at the meeting to "be told to commit" to things.

Third, DOJ should engage in a good-faith negotiation with survivors about financial redress for the harm caused by the repeated redaction failures. Survivors' counsel raised this directly during the meeting, noting that the DOJ had engaged in this kind of process with the Larry Nassar survivors and other groups, and that it was well within DOJ's authority to convene such a meeting. Mr. Blanche did not commit to doing so.

Fourth, Mr. Blanche should publicly and formally acknowledge DOJ's thirty-year institutional failure to investigate Epstein and his network, not as a general statement of agreement offered in a private meeting under political duress, but as an official acknowledgment that carries accountability with it. During the meeting, he conceded that the case "was not handled at all properly from even before 2007" and that "the lack of investigation is something I cannot fix." Those admissions are significant. What is missing is any official record of accountability attached to them. A genuine commitment to justice requires more than private agreement.

5. What details of your meeting with Todd Blanche do you consider important for the Senate Judiciary Committee to consider in examining his nomination to be Attorney General?

The Senate Judiciary Committee should understand that the July 16 meeting, viewed in its entirety, demonstrated the same patterns of conduct that characterized Mr. Blanche's tenure at the Department of Justice before the meeting took place: a preference for political calculation over genuine engagement with survivors, a resistance to accountability, and an unwillingness to make even modest commitments to the people most harmed by DOJ's failures.

The circumstances of the meeting itself are significant. The meeting was convened only after Senator Thom Tillis publicly stated that he would not advance Mr. Blanche's nomination unless he met with Epstein survivors. For approximately eight months prior, Mr. Blanche and DOJ had not responded to survivors even *once*. At the opening of the meeting, Mr. Blanche framed the gathering as something that had come about because "someone told me you were all here today and wanted to meet with me," as though the meeting were an informal coincidence rather than the result of months of ignored requests and ultimately a political ultimatum. That framing is itself significant: it reflects an unwillingness to acknowledge, even implicitly, that survivors were owed a meeting long before the confirmation hearing placed his nomination at risk.

Mr. Blanche's conduct during the meeting reinforced those concerns. He began the meeting by saying he was there to listen to survivors. In my view, he did very little listening. Instead, he spent the hour-long meeting diminishing our concerns, arguing with us, and condescending to us. His through-line was that he could not investigate, or take any action, unless the survivors provided evidence and spoke to the FBI, which ignores the 3 million pages of documents, survivor interviews, and evidence that DOJ released earlier this year. Worse, Mr. Blanche appeared to have no personal knowledge of what was in the millions of documents that

DOJ released. He did all this while denying that he had said there were no investigative leads from the Epstein files.

When presented with our concerns (which he characterized at one point as “complaining”) Mr. Blanche condescendingly explained DOJ’s purported limitations or argued that what we said was not true. In one telling moment, when we raised his public statements about investigative leads, he denied making them, stating: “I have not said some of the things you said; the media has said that.” Multiple survivors in the room pushed back: “We heard you say that.” In a post-meeting interview, I described this pattern: “I think there were quite a few moments where he would engage us and then say, ‘Well, I never said those things,’ even though we’ve seen on media and literally, I watched a news clip of it. So we would start to talk about that, and then he would want to argue about semantics.” I have also described him as “just really condescending toward us,” and characterized that behavior as a tactic to evade responsibility.

The absence of any commitments is equally telling. Mr. Blanche did not commit to any particular investigation, deadline, follow-up meeting, or disclosure of information to survivors. When we asked that he make certain commitments, he was extremely defensive and stated that he was not at the meeting to be told to commit to “this or that.” When asked to commit to opening an investigation into Epstein’s co-conspirators and institutional failures generally, Mr. Blanche deflected and shifted the burden to survivors to speak to the FBI, something that we have been doing from as early as 1996. When asked why survivors were not informed that Ghislaine Maxwell was meeting with Mr. Blanche or that Maxwell was being moved to a different, lower-security facility, Mr. Blanche told us that they were not obligated to notify survivors. When asked to commit to individual or group meetings with survivors to discuss failed redactions, Mr. Blanche became defensive and stated that he was not at the meeting to be told to commit to anything.

The meeting also confirmed what survivors already suspected: that Mr. Blanche views his engagement with survivors as a political constraint to be managed rather than a genuine obligation. I have described the meeting publicly as “a tick-the-box meeting, which is exactly what it felt like,” and I have stated clearly that “that meeting was really not any sort of meeting where anything was accomplished.” DOJ described the meeting publicly as a “productive, initial discussion.” The survivors in that room experienced something fundamentally different.

One specific exchange merits the Committee’s attention. When I asked Mr. Blanche whether, as a career prosecutor, he would agree that it is the prosecutor’s job, not the victim’s job, to follow up on investigative leads, he agreed with me (“should be followed up, yes”). Yet that concession did not translate into any concrete commitment to do so. That exchange illustrated the defining problem with Mr. Blanche’s approach throughout the meeting: he was willing to agree with survivors in the abstract while offering nothing of substance in practice.

What the Committee must also reckon with is what Mr. Blanche’s conduct in that room reveals about how he would exercise the authority of the Attorney General. When survivors

came to him with documented harm, verified records of exposure, and specific requests for action, he labeled our concerns “complaining.” When we asked him to show good faith by committing to a single investigation, he told us he had not come to be “told, commit to this, commit to that.” When we asked him to simply acknowledge the gravity of the redaction failures, he deflected and argued semantics. When a survivor asked him directly to commit to a continuing dialogue on investigative leads, he did not answer her. The consistent pattern in that room was that legitimate grievances, grounded in documented fact and personal harm, were treated as an inconvenience rather than as the substance of the job.

That pattern has implications well beyond survivors of Epstein’s crimes. The Attorney General is the chief law enforcement officer of the United States. When Americans are harmed, they should be able to turn to their DOJ and know that their concerns will be heard and acted upon. What the July 16 meeting demonstrated is that Mr. Blanche’s default response to people who have suffered documented, serious harm and who come to him with specific requests is to dismiss what they are saying as complaints, redirect the burden of proof back onto the people who were already victimized, and decline to commit to anything. Fellow survivor Elizabeth Stein, speaking after the meeting, captured this concern precisely: “We’re victims of the crime of sex trafficking. And the fact that our Department of Justice will not take that seriously is beyond concerning, not just to us, but should be concerning to Americans all across this country.” I share that concern entirely.

An Attorney General who understands his role to require the vigorous pursuit of justice for crime victims would not need a Senate confirmation ultimatum to sit down with them. He would not walk into that meeting and characterize survivors’ requests for commitments as an inappropriate imposition. He would not label the documented harm of real people as complaints to be endured rather than wrongs to be remedied. And he would not leave without offering a single concrete step toward accountability.

For me, the meeting only emphasized that the American people deserve an Attorney General who will protect, respect, and listen to victims of sexual abuse. If the nation’s top law enforcement officer treats the legitimate concerns of crime victims as complaints, then victims of crime, and all Americans who may one day need to turn to their government for justice, have reason to be deeply worried about who will be there to answer that call. Mr. Blanche is not that person.