"assignment was to 'dig up dirt' on various women and to induce them not to disclose their sexual relationships with Defendant Clinton."[279]

Feb.-Apr. 1998: **Ms. Jones's lawyers fail to persuade Judge Wright to reconsider the exclusion of evidence about Ms. Lewinsky; Judge Wright grants summary judgment for the defendants**

On Tuesday, February 10, 1998, attorneys for Ms. Jones moved for reconsideration of Judge Wright's January 29, 1998, Order excluding testimony about Monica Lewinsky. Counsel for Ms. Jones argued that Judge Wright had erred in excluding the Monica Lewinsky testimony at this stage of the proceedings because, among other reasons, Rule 403 determinations should not be made before trial, Ms. Lewinsky's testimony was relevant to show a pattern and practice of behavior, and Ms. Lewinsky's testimony was relevant to demonstrate a pattern of suppressing evidence in the Jones case.[280]

A week later, on Tuesday, February 17, 1998, the President's attorneys filed a motion for summary judgment, with supporting

---

Camera Inspection).

[279] 1414-DC-00001239 (Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Production of Documents or, in the Alternative, Motion for In Camera Inspection at 3).

[280] Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration or, in the Alternative, for Section 1292(b) Certification of Order Excluding Evidence Concerning Monica Lewinsky, Jones v. Clinton, No. LR-C-94-290 (Feb. 10, 1998); Memorandum in Support of Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration or, in the Alternative, for Section 1292(b) Certification of Order Excluding Evidence Concerning Monica Lewinsky at 7-11, Jones v. Clinton, No. LR-C-94-290 (Feb. 10, 1998).