

Contact: Gloria Allred
Phone: 323-653-6530
Email: gallred@amglaw.com

Statement of Attorney Gloria Allred regarding remarks by Harvey Weinstein's defense attorney, Arthur Aidala, concerning her client Mimi Haley

On May 23, 2024, the District Attorney of New York County through Assistant DA Nicole Blumberg wrote a letter to the Honorable Curtis Farber concerning recent out of court statements by Harvey Weinstein defense counsel Arthur Aidala to the media regarding my client, Mimi Haley, (AKA Miriam Haley).

Mimi was the key prosecution witness in the prior criminal case against Harvey Weinstein. She bravely testified and was cross examined by the defense.

Based on her testimony under oath and other evidence, the jury decided beyond a reasonable doubt that defendant Weinstein was guilty of criminal sexual assault of Ms. Haley and the judge sentenced him to 20 years in New York State prison.

Recently, the New York Court of Appeals vacated that conviction and the conviction of 3rd degree rape of another victim which carried an additional sentence of 3 years.

The New York Court of Appeals then ordered a new trial. The victim of 3rd degree rape (whom I do not represent) stated that she would testify again, but my client, Mimi and I, held a press conference at which Mimi announced that she had not yet made that important decision regarding testifying.

Less than a week later as indicated in the DA's letter to the court Mr. Aidala following the court appearance of Mr. Weinstein made the following statement outside of court to the media which the DA included in their letter to the Court.

"Moments after Mr. Weinstein was sentenced a lawsuit was filed and she got a significant check from an insurance company not from Mr.

Weinstein but from an insurance company. So, the first question, if she dares to come and show her face here, will be tell this jury how you lied to the last jury when you said you had no financial interest in the outcome of this case when moments after the sentencing you filed a lawsuit and collected a tremendous sum of money".²

As noted by the DA in an important footnote to this letter, (footnote 2), this statement is false. Ms. Haley did file a civil lawsuit against the defendant but not until December 30, 2020, nine months after her testimony and eight months after the guilty verdict. The suit, which sought compensation for the pain, suffering, and economic injuries caused by defendant's sexual assault, was voluntarily dismissed and discontinued with prejudice less than a year later. Haley did not receive any payment with respect to her lawsuit and, instead, participated in a civil bankruptcy settlement from a class action lawsuit for women who experienced sexual misconduct and workplace harassment by the defendant.

The DA went on to quote Mr. Aidala's statements at his press conference about my client, Mimi Haley.

"The Mimi Haley count, it's very serious, but as they said, you know the DA's office isn't going to look at her and see whether she perjured herself,³ because we believe that she did. We're going to look into that and investigate it and see if that is something that could be brought up. Her cross-examination will be prepared for months, literally. And we are already starting. I mean John Esposito, who is a former Manhattan assistant district attorney, he is already reading the transcripts. We are going to dice it, slice it and make sure that that jury hears everything from the day they met, until the day she cashed the check of the lawsuit. The check from the lawsuit that she swore under oath to these 12 jurors that she didn't want, and she wasn't going to get. So, she lied. She lied to those jurors."

Accusing my client of lying under oath is a very serious allegation, and I agree with the District Attorney that making such an allegation, which I wish to emphasize is false, violates Rule 3.6 of the New York Rules of Professional Conduct which govern the conduct of all lawyers who are licensed in New York.

I find Mr. Aidala's conduct toward my client particularly egregious, because he was involved in the appeal from Mr. Weinstein's conviction, which meant that Mr. Aidala had the trial transcript including the cross examination testimony of my client and therefore he knew or should have known that as the DA stated in the letter, "Ms. Haley did not perjure herself" as the DA indicated in footnote 3 to the letter, when asked if she intended to sue the defendant, she stated, "there is always the possibility, but I have no plans at this time."

Mr. Aidala's false statements, name calling, and public bullying of my client in what appears to be an attempt to intimidate her are very serious.

The New York Rules of Professional Responsibility specifically prohibit attacks on the reputation of a witness or expected testimony of a witness (Rule 3.6b(1)) New York Rules of Professional Conduct.

Mimi has been very courageous throughout this unwarranted, vicious, and false attack on her.

She still has not made her decision as to whether or not to testify again, but she is very grateful to the District Attorney who brought these attacks to the attention of this Court.

Prohibiting such attacks by the defense will not only benefit Mimi, but also it will help to protect other witnesses in the upcoming trial and insure not only justice for Mimi if she testifies but for all other prosecution witnesses in this case as well.

I think it is long overdue for Mr. Aidala to retract his false statements concerning Mimi and apologize to her as well.

Gloria Allred
Attorney at Law
Representing Mimi Haley
May 29, 2024