Inference Defined (Presumptions)

An inference is a deduction or conclusion which you... are permitted to draw... from the facts which have been established by either direct or circumstantial evidence. In drawing inferences, you should exercise your common sense.

... [Y]ou are permitted to draw, from the facts which you find to be proven, such reasonable inferences as would be justified in light of your experience.

18 United States Code Section 1503

(a) Whoever . . . corruptly . . . influences, obstructs, or impedes, or endeavors to influence, obstruct or impede, the due administration of justice, shall be punished as provided in subsection (b).

(b) The punishment for an offense under this section is

. . .

(3) . . . imprisonment for not more than 10 years, a fine under this title, or both.

18 United States Code Section 1512

(b) Whoever knowingly . . . corruptly persuades another person, or attempts to do so, or engages in misleading conduct toward another person, with intent to –

(1) influence, delay, or prevent the testimony of any person in an official proceeding;

(2) cause or induce any person to --

(A) withhold testimony, or withhold a . . . document . . . from an official proceeding;

. . .

shall be fined under this title, or imprisoned for not more than ten years or both.

18 United States Code Section 1515

(a) As used in sections 1512 . . . of this title and this section --

(3) the term "misleading conduct" means --

(A) knowingly making a false statement;

(B) intentionally omitting information from a statement and thereby causing a portion of such statement to be misleading, or intentionally concealing a material fact, and thereby creating a false impression by such statement;

***

SKADDEN, ARPS, SLATE, MEAGHER & FLOM LLP
1440 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-2111
TEL: (202) 371-7000
FAX: (202) 393-5760

DIRECT DIAL
(202) 371-7100

BOSTON
CHICAGO
HOUSTON
LOS ANGELES
NEWARK
NEW YORK
SAN FRANCISCO
WILMINGTON

BRUSSELS
FRANKFURT
HONG KONG
LONDON
MOSCOW
PARIS
SINGAPORE
SYDNEY
TOKYO
TORONTO

September 30, 1998

UNDER SEAL

VIA FACSIMILE AND U.S. MAIL

Honorable Susan Webber Wright
United States District Court for the
Eastern District of Arkansas
600 West Capitol Avenue
Little Rock, Arkansas 72201-3325

Re: Jones v. Clinton, Civil Action No. LR-C-94-290

Dear Judge Wright:

As you are aware, Ms. Monica Lewinsky submitted an affidavit dated January 7, 1998 in the above-captioned case in support of her motion to quash the subpoena for her testimony. This affidavit was made part of the record of President Clinton's deposition on January 17, 1998.

It has recently been made public in the Starr Report that Ms. Lewinsky testified before a federal grand jury in August 1998 that portions of her affidavit were misleading and not true. Therefore, pursuant to our professional responsibility, we wanted to advise you that the Court should not rely on Ms. Lewinsky's affidavit or remarks of counsel characterizing that affidavit.

Very truly yours,

Robert S. Bennett

cc: Donovan Campbell, Jr., Esq.

Evidence of Truth

There are two types of evidence from which you may find the truth as to the facts of a case -- direct evidence and circumstantial evidence.... The law makes no distinction between the weight you should give to either kind of evidence, nor does circumstantial evidence require a greater degree of certainty than direct evidence.