

logo not found or type unknown

Plaskett Urges Full Dismissal of Epstein-Linked Lawsuit, Citing Immunity and Jurisdiction

The USVI delegate to Congress remains the sole defendant after others were dismissed. She asks the court to drop the case entirely, citing sovereign immunity, lack of jurisdiction, and res judicata — a rule barring re-litigation of settled claims.

Legal / **Published On April 06, 2025 07:36 AM /**

Janeke Simon **April 06, 2025**

Image not found or type unknown



Delegate to Congress Stacey Plaskett. By. V.I. CONSORTIUM.

Congresswoman Stacey Plaskett says there's no case to answer, in her response to the amended complaint filed in the Jane Doe lawsuit against her.

In March, the USVI delegate to Congress was [left as the only defendant](#) in the lawsuit, which alleged that several top government officials knowingly enabled and benefited from Jeffrey Epstein's sex trafficking operation by providing him a safe haven in the territory. The [original lawsuit](#) was filed in 2003.

Presiding judge Arun Subramanian threw out claims against former Governors John de Jongh and Kenneth Mapp, former Attorney General Vincent Frazer, and others in the case, citing the lack of personal jurisdiction over several of the defendants, while the claim against former First Lady Cecile de Jongh was tossed due to an earlier settlement with Epstein's estate.

The court also dismissed RICO claims against Congresswoman Plaskett, but allowed claims of negligence and those alleging violations of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act (TVPA) to proceed.

However, in her answer, Ms. Plaskett once again denies all allegations against her, and asserts several affirmative defenses. First, she repeats the argument that the court does not, in fact, have personal jurisdiction over her. She also argues that the plaintiffs, named Jane Does 1 through 6, fail to state a claim on which relief may be granted. The principles of sovereign and qualified immunity are also asserted as a defense against any claims. The statute of limitations also poses a fatal barrier to the alleged victims' claims, Delegate Plaskett's response asserts. Finally, she invokes the doctrines of laches (an unreasonable delay in bringing the claim, and res judicata (prohibiting the relitigation of a cause of action once it has already been judged on its merits) as reasons for the court to dismiss the matter against her in its entirety.

She asks that Judge Subramanian dismiss the case against her with prejudice, and award her costs in the matter.