

JPMorganChase

October 10, 2025

Confidential Treatment Requested

The Honorable Ron Wyden
Ranking Member, Committee on Finance
221 Dirksen Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Senator Wyden:

I write on behalf of JPMorgan Chase & Co. (“JPMC” or the “Firm”) in response to your letter dated September 24, 2025. The Firm deeply regrets having had Epstein as a client and would never have continued doing business with him if it believed he engaged in ongoing criminal conduct. We appreciate the opportunity to address the important issues raised in your letter regarding Jeffrey Epstein, whom JPMC fired as a client in 2013, six years before he was arrested by the federal government on sex trafficking charges.

Initially, your letter raises concerns about alleged financial compliance issues at JPMC. These concerns are unwarranted. JPMC takes seriously its compliance obligations and has a broad and deep record demonstrating its commitment to those obligations. The Firm is steadfastly committed to participating in national and international efforts to combat money laundering, the funding of terrorist activities, and other illegal activities. JPMC’s risk-based global Anti-Money Laundering Compliance Program is designed to comply with AML laws and regulations in the U.S. and other jurisdictions in which it operates. The Firm is continually learning, adapting, and improving its controls, including putting frameworks in place to help guide business decisions and identify instances of heightened risk. JPMC has always worked closely with law enforcement agencies to help combat human trafficking, as well as other crimes, and remains dedicated to finding new ways to advance this important mission.

We also seek to correct misunderstandings in your letter. With the exception of former JPMC executive Jes Staley, the Firm’s executives (current and former) are respected professionals who acted with integrity and would never have allowed Epstein to remain a client if they knew of his ongoing crimes. With respect to the testimony of the Chairman and CEO of JPMC, Jamie Dimon,¹ there was broad and extensive discovery in the litigation, with over a million pages of documents produced and none established Mr. Dimon’s knowledge of Epstein prior to 2019. Mr. Dimon testified truthfully that he did not recall knowing anything about Epstein as a client of the Firm until 2019, and a couple

¹ Provided in *Government of the United States Virgin Islands v. JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A.*, 22-cv-10904-JSR (S.D.N.Y.) and *Doe v. JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A.*, 22-cv-10019 (S.D.N.Y.) (collectively, the “Litigation”).

JPMorganChase

of cherry-picked snippets of emails where he was neither the sender nor recipient do not change that. The authors of those emails confirmed in sworn testimony he was not involved in any review of Epstein and numerous current and former employee witnesses swore in testimony they had no interactions with Mr. Dimon related to Epstein. The only individual who purported to claim otherwise is Mr. Staley, who has been sued by the Firm for deceptive efforts to maintain Epstein as a client and who has been banned from senior roles by a United Kingdom court regarding his relationship with Epstein, finding he “lacked credibility,” and gave “inconsistent ... answers when he felt that it would suit his case.”²

Finally, your letter asks for information related to records that are subject to the strict confidentiality requirements imposed by the Bank Secrecy Act (“BSA”) and its implementing regulations. *See* 31 U.S.C. § 5318(g)(2); 31 C.F.R. § 1020.320(e). JPMC is not legally permitted to comment on any such filings that the Firm may or may not have made with respect to Epstein or his associates, including the various dates of any such filings. We understand that you have been in contact with the U.S. Treasury Department regarding these matters. Accordingly, we respectfully request that you direct your inquiries related to whether and when any such filings were made by JPMC to the relevant regulators.

We trust that this letter provides clarity and context to the issues addressed above.

Sincerely,



JPMorgan Chase

² *See* Between James Edward Staley and The Financial Conduct Authority ¶¶ 68, 70, 71, 500, 509, 511 (Upper Tribunal (Tax & Chancery) 26 June 2025), https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/685d21fec2633bd820a92a52/Staley_v_FCA_decision_for_release.pdf; *see also id.* ¶¶ 71, 500, 509, 511.