FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D C 20463

THIS IS THE BEGINNING OF MUR # 4541

DATE FILMED 9-23-97 CAMERA NO. 4

CAMERAMAN JMN

9704353482 3

RECEIVED
FEDERAL ELECTION
COMMISSION
OFFICE OF GENERAL
COUNSEL
OCT 25 2 38 PM '96

October 23, 1996

MUR 4541

Edward I. Dyck
253 Heather Crest Drive
Chesterfield, MO 63017

Lawrence M. Noble
General Counsel
Office of General Counsel
The Federal Election Commission
999 E. Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20463

SUBJECT: Complaint against Ross Perot, Perot Reform Committee Inc., and Ms. Sandra McClure for possible Disbursement of Funds Coverup, which is in direct violation of CFR 11.

Dear Sir:

It has come to our attention in our lawsuit against Ross Perot for illegal investigations of Perot volunteers in 1992 that The Perot Group aka The Perot Petition committee, alais Perot 92, and now known as Perot Reform Committee, Inc. (Perot 96) is using and abusing the same old "COVERUP" techniques of 1992. Because it was reported to you, I ask that you query "Perot" Reform Committee Inc. and Sandy McClure as to the Purpose of Disbursement on Schedule B-P Itemized Disbursements page 23, dated 5-17-96 (see enclosed schedule).

On May 22, 1996 while under oath at Ms. McClure's deposition (see enclosure) Ms. McClure emphatically declared that she had received no compensation or consideration from Ross Perot or any affiliate since December 1995, and had been serving strictly as a volunteer of the Reform Party since its inception.

Because of Ross Perot's liability for Ms. McClure's actions in the 1992 lawsuit, the $8,223.26 was payment of Ms. McClure's legal bills at Kohn, Shands lawfirm.

Please verify this for me. If it was a deliberate coverup, than I suggest you correct your records to "legal fees".

Addresses for those involved are as follows;

9/04503824

Ross Perot
10444 Strait Lane
Dallas, TX 75229

Perot 96 Inc.
PO Box 96
Dallas, TX 75221
800-96-PARTY

Sandy McClure
417-881-2699 (Reform Party HQ for MO is in McClure's bedroom)
417-881-1593 fax

Yours very sincerely,

Edward Dyck

Subscribed and sworn before me on this 22nd day of October 1996.

ARTHUR E. HERDER, JR.
Notary Public - Notary Seal
STATE OF MISSOURI
Jefferson County
My Commission Expires: Sept. 17, 1999

9/0435348 25

SCHEDULE B-P ITEMIZED DISBURSEMENTS
Operating Expenditures FOR LINE NUMBER 23

NAME OF COMMITTEE(in Full)
Perot Reform Committee, Inc. C00315762

Any information copied from such Reports and Statements may not be sold or used by any person for the purposes of soliciting contributions or for commercial purposes, other than using the name and address of any political committee to solicit contributions from such committee.

Full Name Mailing Address	Purpose of Disbursement	Date MM/DD/YY	Amount
Easy Mail 1717 Apalachee Parkway Tallahassee, FL 32301-3039	Shipping Expense Disbursement for [X]Primary	05/10/96	$695.71
Easy Mail 1717 Apalachee Parkway Tallahassee, FL 32301-3039	Shipping Expense Disbursement for [X]Primary	05/20/96	$70.50
Easy Mail 1717 Apalachee Parkway Tallahassee, FL 32301-3039	Void Check Disbursement for [X]Primary	05/01/96	$-215.53
La Jolla Group 8304 Clairemont Mesa Blvd. San Diego, CA 92111-	Contract labor Disbursement for [X]Primary	05/02/96	$37637.50
La Jolla Group 8304 Clairemont Mesa Blvd. San Diego, CA 92111-	Contract labor Disbursement for [X]Primary	05/09/96	$64000.00
La Jolla Group 8304 Clairemont Mesa Blvd. San Diego, CA 92111-	Contract labor Disbursement for [X]Primary	05/16/96	$20000.00
La Jolla Group 8304 Clairemont Mesa Blvd. San Diego, CA 92111-	Contrct labor Disbursement for [X]Primary	05/16/96	$28650.00
Nations Bank 901 Main Street Dallas, TX 75202	Bank fees Disbursement for [X]Primary	05/30/96	$160.39
Nations Bank 901 Main Street Dallas, TX 75202	Bank fees Disbursement for [X]Primary	05/30/96	$34.01
State Industrial Ins 515 East Musser Street Carson City, NV 89714-	Workers Compensation Disbursement for [X]Primary	05/22/96	$232.49
Sandy McClure 3020 S. National, Suite 238 Springfield, MO 65804-	Consulting Fees Disbursement for [X]Primary	05/17/96	$8223.26

SUBTOTAL of Disbursements This Page.....> $160288.39

TOTAL This Period.....>

9/0403482 6

KOHN, SHANDS, ELBERT, GIANOULAKIS & GILJUM, LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
ONE MERCANTILE CENTER, 24TH FLOOR
ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI 63101
(314) 241-0963
TELECOPIER (314) 241-2509

ALAN G. KOHN
COURTNEY SHANDS, JR.
HAROLD I. ELBERT
JOHN GIANOULAKIS
JOSEPH P. GILJUM
JOHN A. KLOBASA
MARK J. BREMER
CHARLES S. ELBERT
ROBERT T. HAAR
ROBERT A. USETED
PETE WOODS
LISA A. PAKE
LORI J. BASKINS

ROBERT F. MURRAY
SUSAN E. BINDLER
JOHN W. LEMKEMEIER

August 21, 1996

Mr. Mark Dotzler
2222 Menard St.
St. Louis, MO 63104

Mr. Edward Dyck
253 Heather Crest Drive
Chesterfield, Missouri 63017

Mr. Kevin Laughlin
12384 Shoreridge Drive, Apt. E
Maryland Heights, Missouri 63043

Kim Askew, Esq.
Hughes & Luce, L.L.P.
1717 Main Street, Suite 2800
Dallas, Texas 75201

Carol A. Platt, Esq.
Armstrong, Teasdale, Schlafly & Davis
One Metropolitan Square, Suite 2600
St. Louis, Missouri 63102

G. Carroll Stribling, Jr., Esq.
Ziercher & Hocker, P.C.
231 S. Bemiston, 8th Floor
Clayton, Missouri 63105

Dear Mr. Dotzler, Mr. Dyck, Mr. Laughlin and Counsel:

I have enclosed copies of Ms. McClure's certifications and correction sheets for the transcripts of her deposition taken May 22-23, 1996.

Sincerely,

John W. Lemkemeier

JWL:na
Enclosures

9/04/03 4 8 2 7

STATE OF Missouri)
COUNTY OF GREEN)

I, **SANDRA MCCLURE**, do hereby certify:

That I have read the foregoing deposition;

That I have made such changes in form and/or substance to the within deposition as might be necessary to render the same true and correct;

That having made such changes thereon, I hereby subscribe my name to the deposition.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed this 20th day of August, 19 96, at SPRINGFIELD, MO.

Sandra McClure
SANDRA MCCLURE

DAWN M. RENWICK
NOTARY PUBLIC, STATE OF MISSOURI
MY COMMISSION EXPIRES 2/28/97
JEFFERSON COUNTY

My Commission Expires:

Notary Public: Dawn M. Renwick

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
Washington, DC 20463

November 1, 1996

Edward I. Dyck
253 Heather Crest Drive
Chesterfield, MO 63017

RE: MUR 4541

Dear Mr. Dyck:

This letter acknowledges receipt on October 25, 1996, of the complaint you filed alleging possible violations of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended ("the Act"). The respondent(s) will be notified of this complaint within five days.

You will be notified as soon as the Federal Election Commission takes final action on your complaint. Should you receive any additional information in this matter, please forward it to the Office of the General Counsel. Such information must be sworn to in the same manner as the original complaint. We have numbered this matter MUR 4541. Please refer to this number in all future communications. For your information, we have attached a brief description of the Commission's procedures for handling complaints.

Sincerely,

Colleen T. Sealander, Attorney
Central Enforcement Docket

Enclosure
Procedures

97 0434 3 4 8 2 9

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
Washington, DC 20463

November 1, 1996

H. Ross Perot
1700 Lakeside Square
Dallas, TX 75251

RE: MUR 4541

Dear Mr. Perot:

The Federal Election Commission received a complaint which indicates that you may have violated the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended ("the Act"). A copy of the complaint is enclosed. We have numbered this matter MUR 4541. Please refer to this number in all future correspondence.

Under the Act, you have the opportunity to demonstrate in writing that no action should be taken against you in this matter. Please submit any factual or legal materials which you believe are relevant to the Commission's analysis of this matter. Where appropriate, statements should be submitted under oath. Your response, which should be addressed to the General Counsel's Office, must be submitted within 15 days of receipt of this letter. If no response is received within 15 days, the Commission may take further action based on the available information.

This matter will remain confidential in accordance with 2 U.S.C. § 437g(a)(4)(B) and § 437g(a)(12)(A) unless you notify the Commission in writing that you wish the matter to be made public. If you intend to be represented by counsel in this matter, please advise the Commission by completing the enclosed form stating the name, address and telephone number of such counsel, and authorizing such counsel to receive any notifications and other communications from the Commission.

97044034830

If you have any questions, please contact Erik Morrison at (202) 219-3400. For your information, we have enclosed a brief description of the Commission's procedures for handling complaints.

Sincerely,

Colleen T. Sealander, Attorney
Central Enforcement Docket

Enclosures
1. Complaint
2. Procedures
3. Designation of Counsel Statement

97043534831

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
Washington, DC 20463

November 1, 1996

J. Michael Poss, Treasurer
Perot '96 Inc.
7616 LBJ Freeway
Suite 727
Dallas, TX 75251

RE: MUR 4541

Dear Mr. Poss:

The Federal Election Commission received a complaint which indicates that Perot '96 Inc. ("Committee") and you, as treasurer, may have violated the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended ("the Act"). A copy of the complaint is enclosed. We have numbered this matter MUR 4541. Please refer to this number in all future correspondence.

Under the Act, you have the opportunity to demonstrate in writing that no action should be taken against the Committee and you, as treasurer, in this matter. Please submit any factual or legal materials which you believe are relevant to the Commission's analysis of this matter. Where appropriate, statements should be submitted under oath. Your response, which should be addressed to the General Counsel's Office, must be submitted within 15 days of receipt of this letter. If no response is received within 15 days, the Commission may take further action based on the available information.

This matter will remain confidential in accordance with 2 U.S.C. § 437g(a)(4)(B) and § 437g(a)(12)(A) unless you notify the Commission in writing that you wish the matter to be made public. If you intend to be represented by counsel in this matter, please advise the Commission by completing the enclosed form stating the name, address and telephone number of such counsel, and authorizing such counsel to receive any notifications and other communications from the Commission.

9 / 0 4 3 5 3 4 8 3 2

If you have any questions, please contact Erik Morrison at (202) 219-3400. For your information, we have enclosed a brief description of the Commission's procedures for handling complaints.

Sincerely,

Colleen T. Sealander, Attorney
Central Enforcement Docket

Enclosures
1. Complaint
2. Procedures
3. Designation of Counsel Statement

97043034833

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
Washington, DC 20463

November 1, 1996

Mike Poss, Treasurer
Perot Reform Committee
7616 LBJ Freeway
Suite 727
Dallas, TX 75251

RE: MUR 4541

Dear Mr. Poss:

The Federal Election Commission received a complaint which indicates that the Perot Reform Committee ("Committee") and you, as treasurer, may have violated the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended ("the Act"). A copy of the complaint is enclosed. We have numbered this matter MUR 4541. Please refer to this number in all future correspondence.

Under the Act, you have the opportunity to demonstrate in writing that no action should be taken against the Committee and you, as treasurer, in this matter. Please submit any factual or legal materials which you believe are relevant to the Commission's analysis of this matter. Where appropriate, statements should be submitted under oath. Your response, which should be addressed to the General Counsel's Office, must be submitted within 15 days of receipt of this letter. If no response is received within 15 days, the Commission may take further action based on the available information.

This matter will remain confidential in accordance with 2 U.S.C. § 437g(a)(4)(B) and § 437g(a)(12)(A) unless you notify the Commission in writing that you wish the matter to be made public. If you intend to be represented by counsel in this matter, please advise the Commission by completing the enclosed form stating the name, address and telephone number of such counsel, and authorizing such counsel to receive any notifications and other communications from the Commission.

9704530483 4

If you have any questions, please contact Erik Morrison at (202) 219-3400. For your information, we have enclosed a brief description of the Commission's procedures for handling complaints.

Sincerely,

Colleen T. Sealander, Attorney
Central Enforcement Docket

Enclosures
1. Complaint
2. Procedures
3. Designation of Counsel Statement

9 7 0 4 3 5 3 4 8 3 5

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
Washington, DC 20463

November 1, 1996

Sandy McClure
3020 S. National
Suite 238
Springfield, MO 65804

RE: MUR 4541

Dear Ms. McClure:

The Federal Election Commission received a complaint which indicates that you may have violated the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended ("the Act"). A copy of the complaint is enclosed. We have numbered this matter MUR 4541. Please refer to this number in all future correspondence.

Under the Act, you have the opportunity to demonstrate in writing that no action should be taken against you in this matter. Please submit any factual or legal materials which you believe are relevant to the Commission's analysis of this matter. Where appropriate, statements should be submitted under oath. Your response, which should be addressed to the General Counsel's Office, must be submitted within 15 days of receipt of this letter. If no response is received within 15 days, the Commission may take further action based on the available information.

This matter will remain confidential in accordance with 2 U.S.C. § 437g(a)(4)(B) and § 437g(a)(12)(A) unless you notify the Commission in writing that you wish the matter to be made public. If you intend to be represented by counsel in this matter, please advise the Commission by completing the enclosed form stating the name, address and telephone number of such counsel, and authorizing such counsel to receive any notifications and other communications from the Commission.

97U4583483 6

If you have any questions, please contact Erik Morrison at (202) 219-3400. For your information, we have enclosed a brief description of the Commission's procedures for handling complaints.

Sincerely,

Colleen T. Sealander, Attorney
Central Enforcement Docket

Enclosures
1. Complaint
2. Procedures
3. Designation of Counsel Statement

97043034837

HUGHES & LUCE, L.L.P.

1717 Main Street
Suite 2800
Dallas, Texas 75201
214/939-5500
214/939-6100 (fax)

Attorneys and Counselors

November 11, 996

Writers Direct Dial Number

214/939-5416

Other Offices

Austin
Houston

RECEIVED
FEDERAL ELECTION
COMMISSION
OFFICE OF GENERAL
COUNSEL

Nov 12 10 09 AM '96

VIA FAX

Colleen T. Sealander, Esq.
Office of General Counsel
Federal Election Commission
999 E Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20463

Attn: Erik Morrison

Re: MUR 4541: Ross Perot
Perot Reform Committee, Inc., Mike Poss, Treasurer
Perot '96, Inc., Mike Poss, Treasurer

Dear Ms. Sealander:

Attached please find designations of counsel executed by the three respondents referenced above. This letter requests an extension of time of thirty (30) days to respond to your inquiry dated November 1, 1996, which was received November 5, 1996 by the referenced respondents. Because counsel was only recently appointed to this matter additional time is required to review the matter and surrounding facts. Based on the date of receipt, the original response date would be November 20, 1996. If the requested extension is granted, the response will be due December 20, 1996.

Thank you for your consideration. If you have any questions, you may reach me at the above referenced number.

Sincerely,

R. Clayton Mulford

RCM:rm
Enclosures

9/0450348350

RECEIVED
FEDERAL ELECTION
COMMISSION
OFFICE OF GENERAL
COUNSEL
Nov 12 10 09 AM '96

STATEMENT OF DESIGNATION OF COUNSEL

MUR 4541

NAME OF COUNSEL: R. Clayton Mulford, Kim J. Askew

FIRM: Hughes & Luce, L.L.P.

ADDRESS: 1717 Main Street, Suite 2800
Dallas, Texas 75201

TELEPHONE: (214) 939-5416

FAX: (214) 939-6100

The above-named individual is hereby designated as my counsel and is authorized to receive any notifications and other communications from the Commission and to act on my behalf before the Commission.

11/11/96
Date

Signature

RESPONDENT'S NAME: Ross Perot

ADDRESS: 1700 Lakeside Square
12377 Merit Drive
Dallas, Texas 75251

TELEPHONE: HOME( )

BUSINESS (214) 788-3000

9/0043034839

RECEIVED
FEDERAL ELECTION
COMMISSION
OFFICE OF GENERAL
COUNSEL
Nov 12 10 09 AM '96

STATEMENT OF DESIGNATION OF COUNSEL

MUR 4541

NAME OF COUNSEL: R. Clayton Mulford, Kim J. Askew

FIRM: Hughes & Luce, L.L.P.

ADDRESS: 1717 Main Street, Suite 2800
Dallas, Texas 75201

TELEPHONE: (214) 939-5416

FAX: (214) 939-6100

The above-named individual is hereby designated as my counsel and is authorized to receive any notifications and other communications from the Commission and to act on my behalf before the Commission.

11/11/96
Date

Signature

J Michael Poss

RESPONDENT'S NAME: Perot '96, Inc.

ADDRESS: Mike Poss, Treasurer
1700 Lakeside Square
12377 Merit Drive
Dallas, Texas 75251

TELEPHONE: HOME( )

BUSINESS(214) 788-3030

9 7 0 4 3 0 3 4 8 4 C

RECEIVED
FEDERAL ELECTION
COMMISSION
OFFICE OF GENERAL
COUNSEL

STATEMENT OF DESIGNATION OF COUNSEL

Nov 12 10 10 AM '96

MUR 4541

NAME OF COUNSEL: R. Clayton Mulford, Kim J. Askew

FIRM: Hughes & Luce, L.L.P.

ADDRESS: 1717 Main Street, Suite 2800

Dallas, Texas 75201

TELEPHONE: (214) 939-5416

FAX: (214) 939-6100

The above-named individual is hereby designated as my counsel and is authorized to receive any notifications and other communications from the Commission and to act on my behalf before the Commission.

11/11/96
Date

Signature

J Michael Poss

RESPONDENT'S NAME: Perot Reform Committee, Inc.
Mike Poss, Treasurer

ADDRESS: 1700 Lakeside Square

12377 Merit Drive

Dallas, Texas 75251

TELEPHONE: HOME( )

BUSINESS(214) 788-3030

9704353484 1

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20463

November 14, 1996

R. Clayton Mulford, Esq.
Hughes & Luce
1717 Main Street
Suite 2800
Dallas, TX 75201

RE: MUR 4541
Ross Perot, Perot Reform Committee, Inc.,
Mike Poss, Treasurer, Perot '96, Inc., Mike Poss
Treasurer

Dear Mr. Mulford:

This is in response to your letter dated November 11, 1996 which we received on November 12, 1996 requesting an extension to respond to the complaint filed in the above-noted matter. After considering the circumstances presented in your letter, the Office of the General Counsel has granted the requested extension. Accordingly, your response is due by the close of business on December 20, 1996.

If you have any questions, please contact the Central Enforcement Docket at (202) 219-3400.

Sincerely,

Erik Morrison

Erik Morrison, Paralegal
Central Enforcement Docket

9704353842

HUGHES & LUCE, L.L.P.

1717 Main Street
Suite 2800
Dallas, Texas 75201
214/939-5500
214/939-6100 (fax)

RECEIVED
FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL
DEC 13 10 35 AM '96

Attorneys and Counselors

December 12, 1996

Writer's Direct Dial Number
214/939-5416

Other Offices
Austin
Houston

Federal Election Commission
999 E. Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20463

VIA FACSIMILE and FEDERAL EXPRESS

Attn: Colleen T. Sealander
Erik Morrison

Re: MUR 4541: Ross Perot
Perot Reform Committee, Inc., Mike Poss, Treasurer ("PRC")
Perot '96, Inc., Mike Poss, Treasurer ("Perot '96")

Dear Ms. Sealander:

This letter is filed in response to your letter dated November 1, 1996, notifying Ross Perot, PRC and Perot '96 of a complaint filed against them by Edward Dyck. Mr. Dyck alleges in his complaint that the report by PRC of an expenditure of $8,223.26 on May 17, 1995 for consulting services of Sandra McClure is inaccurate, false or misleading, because such payments were for Ms. McClure's personal legal fees. Mr. Dyck's allegations are simply false.

Over the last three years Mr. Dyck has filed several baseless lawsuits against Ross Perot. He has lost at each turn but continues to assert claims. After losing in one federal court on summary judgment, he simply refiled the claims again in another jurisdiction. His attorney recently withdrew from representing him following a motion for sanctions, highlighting the bad faith nature of the claims and the complete lack of evidentiary support.

I understand Mr. Dyck has also filed suits against Ms. McClure during this period, alleging bad deeds of all kind, including defamation, liable, slander etc.

Ms. McClure was a volunteer petition gatherer for Ross Perot in Missouri in 1992, an activity Mr. Dyck also briefly pursued. Mr. Dyck apparently had disagreements with Ms. McClure, her large volunteer organization and the media attention it received. In 1992, Ms. McClure's organization submitted petitions in sufficient quantity to obtain ballot access in Missouri, a state which requires that electors be named on circulated petitions. Mr. Dyck was named as an elector on the petitions circulated by Mr. Dyck, but not on those circulated and submitted by Ms. McClure.

9704353843

As with Mr. Dyck's lawsuits and prior FEC complaints, this complaint is simply a frivolous accusation without support. PRC did not pay Ms. McClure's legal fees. The report as filed by PRC correctly and accurately reflects the purpose of the disbursement to Ms. McClure. Ms. McClure was engaged by PRC as a consultant in 1996 in connection with a ballot access petition drive in Missouri, because of her knowledge and experience in conducting a petition drive, and because of her access to a network of volunteers. On May 17, 1996, Ms. McClure was paid by PRC check for a total of 128 hours at the agreed amount of $25.00 per hour and for $223.26 in documented expenses, pursuant to her engagement as a consultant. (Affidavit of Russell Verney attached as Attachment 1.)

We respectfully request that the Commission not permit use of its facilities and resources for the pursuit of Mr. Dyck's personal agenda.

If you have any questions regarding the foregoing, please contact me at 214/939-5416.

Sincerely,

R. Clayton Mulford

Enclosures

Attachment 1

AFFIDAVIT OF

RUSSELL VERNEY

1. My name is Russell Verney. I am a resident of Dallas County, Texas.

2. I served as the National Coordinator for the Perot Reform Committee, Inc. ("PRC").

3. PRC engaged Sandra S. McClure to provide consulting services in connection with a ballot access petition drive in Missouri. Ms. McClure was recommended to provide such services because of her knowledge and background attained through her volunteer work in coordinating ballot access in Missouri on behalf of Ross Perot in 1992 election.

4. PRC engaged additional individuals with petition experience in other states as consultants to assist in the petition process. By using such persons, PRC could ensure that certain tasks would be accomplished by certain times and would be performed at a cost less than that charged by professional signature gatherers.

5. Ms. McClure was paid an agreed $25.00/hour fee and expenses for her consulting services.

6. With respect to the payment at issue in MUR 4541, Ms. McClure was paid for 128 hours at $25.00 an hour and $223.26 for documented expenses. A PRC check for a total of $8,223.26 was issued to Sandra McClure in May, 1996. A copy of the check is attached to this affidavit.

7. PRC has never paid legal expenses of Sandra McClure.

Russell Verney

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO BEFORE ME, the undersigned Notary Public, by Russell Verney on December 12, 1996.

RENEE MARIE JORDAN
NOTARY PUBLIC
State of Texas
Comm. Exp 04-18-2000

Notary Public In and For the State of Texas

Renee Marie Jordan
Printed Name of Notary

My Commission Expires:

April 18, 2000

PEROT REFORM COMMITTEE
P O BOX 516087
DALLAS, TEXAS 75251
(214) 450-8881

NationsBank
NationsBank of Texas
DALLAS, TEXAS

2266

CK 2266

VOID AFTER 90 DAYS

32-2/1110

PAY **EIGHT THOUSAND, TWO HUNDRED, TWENTY THREE AND 26/100** DOLLARS

DATE 5/17/96

AMOUNT **$8223.26**

TO THE ORDER OF
SANDY MCCLURE
3020 S. NATIONAL, STE 238
SPRINGFIELD, MO 65804

J Michael Lane

THE REVERSE SIDE OF THIS DOCUMENT INCLUDES AN ARTIFICIAL WATERMARK - HOLD AT AN ANGLE TO VIEW

PEROT REFORM COMMITTEE
P.O. BOX 516087 DALLAS TEXAS 75251

2266

DATE	INVOICE NO	COMMENT	AMOUNT	DISCOUNT	NET AMOUNT
		CONSULTING FEES -1099MISC.			
		506026			
				TOTAL	

PEROT REFORM COMMITTEE
P.O. BOX 516087 DALLAS TEXAS 75251

2266

DATE	INVOICE NO	COMMENT	AMOUNT	DISCOUNT	NET AMOUNT
				TOTAL	

REORDER FROM YOUR LOCAL SAFEGUARD DISTRIBUTOR IF UNKNOWN CALL 800-572-2422

Safeguard

KOHN, SHANDS, ELBERT, GIANOULAKIS & GILJUM, LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
ONE MERCANTILE CENTER, 24TH FLOOR
ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI 63101
(314) 241-0960
TELECOPIER (314) 241-2509

ALAN C. KOHN
COURTNEY SHANDS, JR.
HAROLD I. ELBERT
JOHN GIANOULAKIS
JOSEPH P. GILJUM
JOHN A. KLOBASA
MARK J. BREMER
CHARLES S. ELBERT
ROBERT T. HAAR
ROBERT A. USETED
PETE WOODS
LISA A. PAKE
LORI J. BASKINS

ROBERT F. MURRAY
SUSAN E. BINDLER
DAVID A. CASTLEMAN
BECKY L. HUINKER

RECEIVED
FEDERAL ELECTION
COMMISSION
OFFICE OF GENERAL
COUNSEL
DEC 20 2 24 PM '96

December 15, 1996

Colleen T. Sealander, Esq.
Office of General Counsel
Federal Election Commission
999 E. Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20463

Re: Sandra S. McClure Response
MUR 4541

Dear Ms. Sealander:

I submit this response on behalf of Sandra S. McClure in the above referenced complaint filed by Edward Dyck. Mr. Dyck has already sued Ms. McClure in federal court in St. Louis in connection with the Perot petition efforts. This appears to be a continuing effort by Mr. Dyck to try to harass and intimidate Ms. McClure for exercising her right of free speech in connection with the ultimate First Amendment right, the right to participate in the political process. We request that the complaint be dismissed because there is no basis for a finding of a violation by the Federal Election Commission Act.

Mr. Dyck claims that a schedule filed by Perot Reform Committee, Inc., with the F.E.C. dated May 17, 1996 showing the payment of consulting fees to Ms. McClure in the amount of $8,223.26 is inaccurate because he alleges this was actually a payment for Ms. McClure's "legal fees." The short answer to this contention, as far Ms. McClure is concerned, is that she did not file the schedule with the F.E.C. It is my understanding that the Perot Reform Committee, which filed the schedule, is addressing the allegations made by Mr. Dyck in a communication to you. This is entirely proper since it is the Committee, and not Ms. McClure, that may have filing responsibilities with the F.E.C.

97044530847

Because there is no basis by Mr. Dyck to make a complaint to F.E.C. about Ms. McClure, we respectfully ask that the complaint be dismissed.

KOHN, SHANDS, ELBERT,
GIANOULAKIS & GILJUM, LLP

Alan C. Kohn
One Mercantile Center, 24th Floor
St. Louis, MO 63101
(314) 241-3963
(314) 241-2509 (telecopier)

Attorneys for Respondent,
Sandra S. McClure

RECEIVED
FEDERAL ELECTION
COMMISSION
OFFICE OF GENERAL
COUNSEL

JAN 16 9 55 AM '97

January 8, 1997

Edward I. Dyck
253 Heather Crest Drive
Chesterfield, MO 63017

MUR 4541

Lawrence M. Noble
General Counsel
Office of General Counsel
The Federal Election Commission
999 E. Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20463

SUBJECT: Supplement to my FEC complaint dated October 23, 1996 (exhibit A) against Ross Perot, the Perot Reform Committee, Inc., and Sandra McClure.

Dear Sir:

I hereby supplement my October 23, 1996 FEC complaint (exhibit A) against Ross Perot, the Perot Reform Committee, Inc., and Sandra McClure for wilfully misrepresenting the reporting of the TRUE purpose for the disbursements of political funds as they were presented to The Federal Election Commission and for ~~for~~ knowingly falsifying official government reports. This is in direct violation of CFR 11. In addition, Ross Perot and his employees and agents show a pattern of deception that has continued from the 1992 Presidential Election through the 1996 Presidential Election, (exhibit D) in Missouri and other states.

The following individuals and entities may have knowledge of this deception and did not report said unlawful acts to the Federal Election Commission:

Clayton Ross Mulford--Perot employee and son in law
General Counsel
Perot '96 Inc. and the Perot Reform Committee, Inc., The Perot Petition Committee, Perot '92
PO Box 96
Dallas, TX 75221
800-96-PARTY

James Michael Poss--Perot employee
Treasurer
Perot '96 Inc. and the Perot Reform Committee, Inc.,,The Perot Petition Committee, Perot '92
PO Box 96
Dallas, TX 75221
800-96-PARTY

Perot '96 Inc.--Funded by Ross Perot
PO Box 96
Dallas, TX 75221
800-96-PARTY

Kim Juanita Askew--Perot lawyer
Hughes & Luce, L.L.P.
1717 Main Street, Ste 2800
Dallas, TX 75201
214-939-5500

Tom Luce--Perot lawyer, co-chair The Perot Petition Committee
Partner
Hughes & Luce, L.L.P.
1717 Main Street, Ste 2800
Dallas, TX 75201
214-939-5500

Alan C. Kohn--McClure (Perot) lawyer
Kohn, Shands, Elbert, Gianoulakis & Giljum
One Mercantile Center
St. Louis, MO 63101
314-241-3963

John W. Lemkemeier--McClure (Perot) lawyer
Bryan Cave
1 Metropolitan Square
St. Louis, MO 63101
314-259-2000

Carol A. Platt--Perot lawyer
Armstrong, Teasdale, Schlafly & Davis
One Metropolitan Square, Ste 2600
St. Louis, MO 63102
314-621-5070

G. Carroll Stribling, Jr., Esq.--Equifax Credit Information Services Inc. lawyer
Ziercher & Hocker, P.C.
231 S. Bemiston, 8th Floor
Clayton, MO 63105
314-727-5822

The above named should explain to The Federal Election Commisssion their knowledge of the following:

*Describe in detail everything you know about the filing of page 23, schedule B-P, "Itemized Disbursements", FEC Form, by the Perot Reform Committee, Inc. (exhibit B).

*Describe in detail everything you know about Ross Perot--the Perot Reform Committee's payment of $8,223.26 to Sandy McClure on 5-17-96 for "consulting fees." (exhibit B).

2

*Describe in detail all payments by Ross Perot, the Reform Committee Inc., Perot '96 Inc. The Perot Petition Committee or any entity thereof to Sandra McClure from April 1992 to the present. Please state amount, date, and purpose of payment.

*Describe in detail everything you know about who is paying Sandra McClure's legal bills to Alan Kohn and John Lemkemeier from May 1994 to the present. (May 1994 being the date the lawsuit was filed in Missouri against Sandra McClure for slander and libel in the 1992 Presidential Election).

*If you had knowledge of this deception to The Federal Election Commission, why did you not report it?

Ross Perot --U.S. Presidential Candidate in 1996 and 1992
10444 Strait Lane
Dallas, TX 75229
800-96-PARTY

In addition to explaining to The Federal Election Commission the above questions, Ross Perot should explain the following:

*Explain the relationship between you and Sandra McClure (employee or agency?) that caused you to pay her legal bills.

*What other payments (state amount, date, and purpose) did you give to Sandra McClure from April 1992 to the present.

Sandra S. McClure--Perot Missouri State Coordinator
7439 East Farm Road, 1-70
Rogersville, MO 65742

In addition to explaining to The Federal Election Commission the above questions, Sandra McClure should explain the following:

*Explain in detail the relationship (employee or agency?) you had to Ross Perot or any entity thereof from April 1992 to the present.

*Explain in detail (state amount, date received, and purpose) of all payments you received from Ross Perot or any entity thereof, from April 1992 to the present.

Exhibit B is The Federal Election Commission schedule B-P, "Itemized Disbursements", page 23, for the Perot Reform Committee, Inc. (fully funded by Ross Perot), showing the $8,223.26 disbursement to Sandy McClure on 5-17-96 for "consulting fees."

9704353485 1

Exhibit C is the text of the video deposition of Sandra McClure taken on May 22-23, 1996. Under PENALTY OF PERJURY, McClure SWEARS that, "I am volunteering with no reimbursement for trying to put a new political party on the ballot in Missouri."..."I don't have any money, so I run it out of my house." p 18. "I have no access to money at all." p 19. It is evident that Kim Askew and Alan Kohn had knowledge that Ross Perot was paying McClure's legal bills in the deposition. This is the reason that ~~that~~ they ordered McClure not ~~to~~ answer the question. p 158.

Exhibit D is Schedule B, "Itemized Disbursements", p 204, filed by The Perot Petition Committee for the 1992 Presidential Election. Note: "legal Fees" were listed as "Purpose of Disbursement" to deceive the FEC of their TRUE usage of political funds which was "investigation of volunteers" and "security."

Exhibit E is "Invoice no. 044" from Callahan & Gibbons Group, Inc. to Mr. Mark Blahnik of the Perot Petition Committee. Note: "Re: Confidential inquiries and physical security services State of Maryland." This occurred in more than one state.

Exhibit F is the deposition of Perot employee, Mark Blahnik, taken on May 16, 1996. On page 73-74 Blahnik states that Callahan & Gibbons Group is a private investigative firm...(that) would handle security and investigative matters that The Perot Petition Committee would need." On page 84-22 Blahnik admits he reviewed the C&G bills. Blahnik states that he did not question them. Page 91-2 indicates the possibility of "doctored bills." Page 95-8 he admits that he was an employee for The Perot Group at the time.

Exhibit G is a signed affidavit by Mark Blahnik on June 20, 1994, taken for Federal Election Complaint MUR 3963, stating that he was an employee of Ross Perot from March, 1992 through November, 1992.

Exhibit H is the deposition of Perot son-in-law and employee, Clay Mulford taken on May 30, 1996. On page 142 Ms. Askew states that Mulford is Mr. Perot's "personal counsel." Page 144 states that he was also an employee of Hughes & Luce lawfirm. On page 207 Mulford states that he reviewed the C&G bills with Mr. Blahnik. On pages 209 and 212 Mulford admits that C&G services were also used in Georgia and Illinois.

Exhibit I is the deposition of Perot employee J. Michael Poss taken on May 29, 1996. On page 12 Mr. Poss states that he has worked for The Perot Group since 1986. On page 27-8 he says that his responsibility as treasurer of The Perot Petition Committee was to ensure compliance with FEC reporting guidelines. On page 56 Mr. Poss states that he and assistant treasurer, Russ Monroe, had the authority from Ross Perot to "sign checks." Page 72-13 Poss admits that he signed the checks to Callahan & Gibbons. On page 82 Mr. Poss admits that he "reviewed and signed off on that report when it went to the Federal Election Commission?" On page 83 Poss states that Ross Perot furnished 95% of the funds himself, as he also did in 1996. On page 136 Poss Implicates Clay Mulford as the one at The Perot Petition Committee giving FEC advice.

9704363852

Exhibit J is a signed affidavit by Mike Poss on June 21, 1994, taken for Federal Election Complaint MUR 3963, stating that he was an employee of Ross Perot from March, 1992 through November, 1992.

Exhibit K is the deposition of H. Ross Perot, the sole proprietor of the unincorporated Perot Group, taken on May 31, 1996. On page 60-24 Mr. Perot states that Mr. Poss "handled the FEC reporting during that period."

Yours very sincerely,

Edward Dyck

Edward Dyck

Subscribed and sworn before me on this 10th day of January, 1997.

GAIL KLEISLY
Notary Public - Notary Seal
STATE OF MISSOURI
St. Louis County
My Commission Expires: Aug. 22, 2000

Gail Kleisly

9 7 0 4 3 0 3 4 8 5 3

October 23, 1996

Edward I. Dyck
253 Heather Crest Drive
Chesterfield, MO 63017

Lawrence M. Noble
General Counsel
Office of General Counsel
The Federal Election Commission
999 E. Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20463

SUBJECT: Complaint against Ross Perot, Perot Reform Committee Inc., and Ms. Sandra McClure for possible Disbursement of Funds Coverup, which is in direct violation of CFR 11.

Dear Sir:

It has come to our attention in our lawsuit against Ross Perot for illegal investigations of Perot volunteers in 1992 that The Perot Group aka The Perot Petition committee, alais Perot 92, and now known as Perot Reform Committee, Inc. (Perot 92) is using and abusing the same old "COVERUP" techniques of 1992. Because it was reported to you, I ask that you query "Perot" Reform Committee Inc. and Sandy McClure as to the Purpose of Disbursement on Schedule B-P Itemized Disbursements page 23, dated 5-17-96 (see enclosed schedule).

On May 22, 1996 while under oath at Ms. McClure's deposition (see enclosure) Ms. McClure emphatically declared that she had received no compensation or consideration from Ross Perot or any affiliate since December 1995, and had been serving strictly as a volunteer of the Reform Party since its inception.

Because of Ross Perot's liability for Ms. McClure's actions in the 1992 lawsuit, the $8,223.26 was payment of Ms. McClure's legal bills at Kohn, Shands lawfirm.

Please verify this for me. If it was a deliberate coverup, than I suggest you correct your records to "legal fees".

Addresses for those involved are as follows;

EXHIBIT
A

6

9704353854

Ross Perot
10444 Strait Lane
Dallas, TX 75229

[redacted]t 96 Inc.
PO Box 96
Dallas, TX 75221
800-96-PARTY

Sandy McC[redacted]
417-881-2699 (Reform Party HQ for MO is in McClure's bedroom)
417-881-1593 fax

Yours very sincerely,

Edward Dyck

Subscribed and sworn before me on this 22nd day of October 1996.

ARTHUR E. HERDER, JR.
Notary Public - Notary Seal
STATE OF MISSOURI
Jefferson County
My Commission Expires: Sept. 17, 1999

9/0433485 5

SCHEDULE B-P ITEMIZED DISBURSEMENTS
Operating Expenditures FOR LINE NUMBER 23

NAME OF COMMITTEE(in Full)
Perot Reform Committee, Inc. C00315762

Any information copied from such Reports and Statements may not be sold or used by any person for the purposes of soliciting contributions or for commercial purposes, other than using the name and address of any political committee to solicit contributions from such committee.

Full Name Mailing Address	Purpose of Disbursement	Date MM/DD/YY	Amount
Easy Mail 1717 Apalachee Parkway Tallahassee, FL 32301-3039	Shipping Expense Disbursement for [X]Primary	05/10/96	$695.71
Easy Mail 1717 Apalachee Parkway Tallahassee, FL 32301-3039	Shipping Expense Disbursement for [X]Primary	05/20/96	$70.50
Easy Mail 1717 Apalachee Parkway Tallahassee, FL 32301-3039	Void Check Disbursement for [X]Primary	05/01/96	$-215.53
La Jolla Group 8304 Clairemont Mesa Blvd. San Diego, CA 92111-	Contract labor Disbursement for [X]Primary	05/02/96	$37637.50
La Jolla Group 8304 Clairemont Mesa Blvd. San Diego, CA 92111-	Contract labor Disbursement for [X]Primary	05/09/96	$64800.00
La Jolla Group 8304 Clairemont Mesa Blvd. San Diego, CA 92111-	Contract labor Disbursement for [X]Primary	05/16/96	$20000.00
La Jolla Group 8304 Clairemont Mesa Blvd. San Diego, CA 92111-	Contrct labor Disbursement for [X]Primary	05/16/96	$28650.00
Nations Bank 901 Main Street Dallas, TX 75202	Bank fees Disbursement for [X]Primary	05/30/96	$160.39
Nations Bank 901 Main Street Dallas, TX 75202	Bank fees Disbursement for [X]Primary	05/30/96	$34.01
State Industrial Ins 515 East Musser Street Carson City, NV 89714-	Workers Compensation Disbursement for [X]Primary	05/22/96	$232.49
Sandy McClure 3020 S. National, Suite 238 Springfield, MO 65804-	Consulting Fees Disbursement for [X]Primary	05/17/96	$8223.26

SUBTOTAL of Disbursements This Page.....> $160288.33

TOTAL This Period.....>

EXHIBIT
B

9/0403 4856

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION

KEVIN LAUGHLIN, EDWARD DYCK and CARRIE ALSPAW Plaintiff, vs. ROSS PEROT, MARK ALAN BLAHNICK and THE CALLAHAN & GIBBONS GROUP, Defendants.	CONSOLIDATED Civil Action No 3-95-CV-2577-R

* * * * *

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
EASTERN DIVISION

MARK DOTZLER, Plaintiff, vs. ROSS PEROT, et al., Defendants.	CIVIL ACTION NO 4:94CV00887CFG
and	
KEVIN LAUGHLIN, EDWARD DYCK and CARRIE ALSPAW, Plaintiffs, vs. H. ROSS PEROT, THE PEROT PETITION COMMITTEE, MARK ALAN BLAHNIK, THE CALLAHAN & GIBBONS GROUP, U.S. DATALINK, INCORPORATED, EQUIFAX CREDIT INFORMATION SERVICES, TRW, INC., RUSS MELBYE, and SANDRA STONE McCLURE, Defendants.	CIVIL ACTION NO 4:94CV00888CFG VIDEO DEPOSITION OF SANDRA MCCLURE MAY 22, 1996

Taylor & Associates Reporting, Inc.
COURT REPORTERS
SUITE 920
906 OLIVE STREET
ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI 63101
PHONE: (314) 621-3777
1-800-280-DEPO
DEPONET

EXHIBIT
C

1

2 VIDEO DEPOSITION OF DEFENDANT, SANDRA
3 STONE McCLURE, VOLUME I, produced, sworn and examined
4 on the 22nd day of May, 1996, between the hours of
5 eight o'clock in the forenoon and six o'clock in the
6 afternoon of that day, at the offices of KOHN,
7 SHANDS, ELBERT, GIANOULAKIS & GILJUM, One Mercantile
8 Center, Suite 2400, St. Louis, Missouri 63101, before
9 DEBORAH C. WEAVER, a Notary Public and Registered
10 Professional Reporter within and for the State of
11 Missouri, in a certain cause now pending in the
12 United States District Court, of the Eastern District
13 of Missouri, Eastern Division, and wherein MARK
14 DOTZLER is Plaintiff and ROSS PEROT, et al are
15 Defendants; and KEVIN LAUGHLIN, EDWARD DYCK and
16 CARRIE ALSPAW are Plaintiffs and H. ROSS PEROT, THE
17 PEROT PETITION COMMITTEE, MARK ALAN BLAHNIK, THE
18 CALLAHAN & GIBBONS GROUP, U.S. DATALINK,
19 INCORPORATED, EQUIFAX CREDIT INFORMATION SERVICES,
20 TRW, INC., RUSS MELBYE, AND SANDRA STONE McCLURE are
21 Defendants; and also in a certain cause now pending
22 in the United States District Court, of the Northern
23 District of Texas, Dallas Division, and wherein KEVIN
24 LAUGHLIN, EDWARD DYCK and CARRIE ALSPAW are
25 Plaintiffs and ROSS PEROT, MARK ALAN BLAHNIK, and THE

TAYLOR & ASSOCIATES
(314) 621-3777 * TOLL FREE (800) 280-DEPO

9/0435348 58

1 CALLAHAN & GIBBONS GROUP, are Defendants.

2

A P P E A R A N C E S

3

For the Plaintiffs, Laughlin, Dyck
4 & Alspaw:

5 BODENHEIMER, JONES, KLOTZ & SIMMONS
509 Milam
6 Shreveport, Louisiana 71101
by: Mr. F. John Reeks, Jr.

7

Mark J. Dotzler
8 Pro Se
2222 Menard
9 St. Louis, MO 63101

10

For the Defendant ROSS PEROT and MARK ALAN
11 BLAHNIK, and PEROT PETITION COMMITTEE
RUSS MELBYE:

12

HUGHES & LUCE, L.L.P.
13 1717 Main Street
Suite 2800
14 Dallas, Texas 75201
by: Ms. Kim J. Askew

15

For the Defendant Equifax:

16

ZIERCHER & HOCKER
17 231 South Bemiston
8th Floor
18 Clayton, Missouri 63105
by: Mr. G. Carroll Stribling, Jr.

19

For the Defendant, McClure:

20

KOHN, SHANDS, ELBERT, GIANOULAKIS
21 & GILJUM
One Mercantile Center
22 24th Floor
St. Louis, MO 63101
23 by: Mr. Alan Kohn

24 Also present:

25 Kevin Laughlin
Edward I. Dyck

TAYLOR & ASSOCIATES
(314) 621-3777 * TOLL FREE (800) 280-DEPO

9/U4363 4859

1 IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED, by
2 and between counsel for the Plaintiffs and counsel
3 for the Defendants, that this deposition may be taken
4 in shorthand by Deborah C. Weaver, a Notary Public
5 and Shorthand Reporter, and afterwards transcribed
6 into typewriting; and the signature of the witness is
7 expressly reserved.
8 SANDRA STONE McCLURE,
9 of lawful age, produced, sworn and examined on behalf
10 of the Plaintiffs, deposes and says:
11 DIRECT-EXAMINATION
12 QUESTIONS BY MR. REEKS:
13 Q. Miss McClure, as I stated earlier, my
14 name is John Reeks and I represent the Plaintiffs in
15 actions that have been brought in the Eastern
16 District of Missouri which involves you as a
17 Defendant, and also there's an action pending in the
18 Northern District of Texas, which you are not a
19 Defendant in, but the Defendants being Ross
20 Perot, Mark Alan Blahnick and the Callahan and
21 Gibbons Group.
22 We're going to be asking you some
23 questions today concerning your knowledge of events
24 that transpired in 1992 concerning the Perot Petition
25 effort in the State of Missouri.

9/04383486C

1 you know of?
2 A. No.
3 Q. Are you -- after you were terminated
4 with United We Stand America, did you have any other
5 employment?
6 A. No. I am just -- I am volunteering
7 with no reimbursement for trying to put a new
8 political party on the ballot in Missouri. We call
9 it Reform Party. The organization is Citizen To
10 Establish A Reformed Party. It's not really an
11 organization. It's a working name we gave it. We
12 didn't know what to call ourselves.
13 Q. When did you begin working with that
14 organization?
15 A. There's not a stop/start date on that,
16 because the interest just mills into another one, and
17 then it blends. There's not a real stop and start,
18 John. I am sorry.
19 Q. Is that organization, the Citizens, and
20 I forget what you called it?
21 A. I am the organization. Citizens To
22 Establish A Reformed Party, CERP. I run it out of my
23 house. It's -- you know, there's no -- I don't have
24 any money, so I run it out of my house.
25 Q. Okay.

9/04303486 1

A. Back in like 1992 when you first start volunteering to do Perot on the ballot, same thing.

Q. And is that the movement we've heard about in the press that is backed by Ross Perot?

A. He's funding a lot of things trying to help people, yes.

Q. Is he funding any of the activities you have in the State of Missouri?

A. I have no access to money at all. Let me see. Let me think. Oh, I asked for some -- for them to pay a bill so we could have one meeting at one hotel, because now that we're partisan, we're not nonpartisan. We are, but it doesn't make any difference to them, to the people who own the libraries and everything. They say, oh, no, you're partisan.

So we've lost every free location that we had. So we paid -- I don't know that he did, but the organization paid for a hotel bill.

Q. Okay.

A. For one meeting.

Q. And are you the State Coordinator?

A. I coordinate it, yes.

Q. For that?

A. And that's all I can call myself.

9704353862

1 Q. And you indicated that you run that out
2 of your house?
3 A. Yes.
4 Q. Are you seeking to obtain a position
5 for the Reform Party on the Presidential ballot in
6 the State of Missouri?
7 MS. ASKEW: I am going to object to
8 this continuing line of question here. This lawsuit
9 relates to events that took place in March, April,
10 May and June of 1992.
11 We're now in the election of 1996. I
12 don't know mind you asking background information
13 about what she's doing, but what is taking place in
14 this poetical year is not the issue in this
15 deposition, and I object to this line of questions on
16 the basis of relevance.
17 MR. REEKS: Okay. Your objection is
18 noted.
19 MR. KOHN: Well, I would like to join
20 in that objection, and perhaps I have been derelict
21 in not objecting before. But as Kim said, I think
22 it's okay to get her background, what her current
23 employment is, but talk about all these details about
24 the Reform Party and 1996, when the events that are
25 the subject of your lawsuit cover about a three month

1 Ms. Pat Owens?
2 A. We got along well and she called and
3 said she was no longer employed and I don't remember
4 anything else.
5 Q. (By Mr. Reeks) Who was paying your
6 legal fees for the defense of this lawsuit?
7 MR. KOHN: I'm going to object to that
8 and instruct her not to answer.
9 MS. ASKEW: I object on the basis of
10 relevance.
11 THE WITNESS: Nobody is paying me a
12 salary.
13 MR. KOHN: I object to that and
14 instruct you not to answer. Now you just --
15 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry.
16 MR. KOHN: (continuing) -- pay
17 attention to your lawyer when he tells you to do it.
18 Q. (By Mr. Reeks) Are you refusing to
19 answer based on the instruction from your counsel?
20 MR. KOHN: I'm instructing her not to
21 answer.
22 THE WITNESS: Yeah.
23 MR. REEKS: That's all the questions I
24 have, thank you.
25

9 7 0 4 3 3 3 4 8 6 4

KOHN, SHANDS, ELBERT, GIANOULAKIS & GILJUM, LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
ONE MERCANTILE CENTER, 24TH FLOOR
ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI 63101

(314) 241-3960
TELECOPIER (314) 241-2509

ALAN G. KOHN
COURTNEY SHANDS, JR.
HAROLD I. ELBERT
JOHN GIANOULAKIS
JOSEPH P. GILJUM
JOHN A. KLOBASA
MARK J. BREMER
CHARLES S. ELBERT
ROBERT T. HAAR
ROBERT A. USETED
PETE WOODS
LISA A. PAKE
LORI J. BASKINS

ROBERT F. MURRAY
SUSAN E. BINDLER
JOHN W. LEMKEMEIER

August 21, 1996

Mr. Mark Dotzler
2222 Menard St.
St. Louis, MO 63104

Mr. Edward Dyck
253 Heather Crest Drive
Chesterfield, Missouri 63017

Mr. Kevin Laughlin
12384 Shoreridge Drive, Apt. E
Maryland Heights, Missouri 63043

Kim Askew, Esq.
Hughes & Luce, L.L.P.
1717 Main Street, Suite 2800
Dallas, Texas 75201

Carol A. Platt, Esq.
Armstrong, Teasdale, Schlafly & Davis
One Metropolitan Square, Suite 2600
St. Louis, Missouri 63102

G. Carroll Stribling, Jr., Esq.
Ziercher & Hocker, P.C.
231 S. Bemiston, 8th Floor
Clayton, Missouri 63105

Dear Mr. Dotzler, Mr. Dyck, Mr. Laughlin and Counsel:

I have enclosed copies of Ms. McClure's certifications and correction sheets for the transcripts of her deposition taken May 22-23, 1996.

Sincerely,

John W. Lemkemeier

JWL:na
Enclosures

STATE OF Missouri)
COUNTY OF GREEN)

I, **SANDRA MCCLURE**, do hereby certify:

That I have read the foregoing deposition;

That I have made such changes in form and/or substance to the within deposition as might be necessary to render the same true and correct;

That having made such changes thereon, I hereby subscribe my name to the deposition.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed this 20th day of August, 19 96, at SPRINGFIELD, MO.

Sandra McClure
SANDRA MCCLURE

DAWN M. RENWICK
NOTARY PUBLIC, STATE OF MISSOURI
MY COMMISSION EXPIRES 2/26/97
JEFFERSON COUNTY

My Commission Expires: _____

Notary Public: Dawn M. Renwick

9704503486 6

DEPOSITION CORRECTION SHEET

NAME OF WITNESS SANDRA S. McCLURE

RE: VIDEO DEPOSITION TAKEN MAY 22, 1996

Upon reading the deposition and before subscribing thereto, the deponent indicated the following changes should be made:

Page 99 Line 23 Should read "confronted he and Laughlin in the office and then"
Reason assigned for change: typographical error

Page 100 Line 24 Should read "Four volunteers told me specifically they"
Reason assigned for change: typographical error

Page 103 Line 4 Should read "He said oh, no. And he said, not exactly these words"
Reason assigned for change: typographical error

Page 165 Line 2 Should read "trying to get back Declarations of Candidacy signed from"
Reason assigned for change: typographical error

Page 205 Line 19 Should read "Petition Committee or Perot '92 because I wasn't"
Reason assigned for change: typographical error

Page_____ Line_____ Should read
Reason assigned for change:

Page_____ Line_____ Shoud read
Reason assigned for change:

Page_____ Line_____ Should read
Reason assigned for change:

Page_____ Line_____ Should read
Reason assigned for change:

Page_____ Line_____ Should read
Reason assigned for change:

Page_____ Line_____ Should read
Reason assigned for change:

SIGNATURE OF DEPONENT: Sandra S. McClure

97043034867

DEPOSITION CORRECTION SHEET

NAME OF WITNESS SANDRA S. McCLURE

RE: VIDEO DEPOSITION TAKEN MAY 23, 1996

Upon reading the deposition and before subscribing thereto, the deponent indicated the following changes should be made:

Page 137 Line 19 Should read "No, not there are --- there really are."
Reason assigned for change:
typographical error

Page 137 Line 20 Should read "There really are mentally unstable, not"
Reason assigned for change:
typographical error

Page _____ Line _____ Should read
Reason assigned for change:

Page _____ Line _____ Should read
Reason assigned for change:

Page _____ Line _____ Should read
Reason assigned for change:

Page _____ Line _____ Should read
Reason assigned for change:

Page _____ Line _____ Shoud read
Reason assigned for change:

Page _____ Line _____ Should read
Reason assigned for change:

Page _____ Line _____ Should read
Reason assigned for change:

Page _____ Line _____ Should read
Reason assigned for change:

Page _____ Line _____ Should read
Reason assigned for change:

SIGNATURE OF DEPONENT: Sandra S. McClure

97U4303486C

NAME OF COMMITTEE(in Full)
Perot Petition Committee C00263145

Any information copied from such Reports and Statements may not be sold or used by any person for the purposes of soliciting contributions or for commercial purposes, other than using the name and address of any political committee to solicit contributions from such committee.

Full Name Mailing Address	Purpose of Disbursement	Date MM/DD/YY	Amount
Glenda Potts Thacker 3135 Settles Rd. Owensboro, KY 42303	rent Disbursement for [X]General	08/27/92	$1800.00
The Callahan & Gibbons Group 333 California Street Ste 800 San Francisco, CA 98104-2012	Legal Fees Disbursement for [X]General	08/14/92	$3505.00
The Callahan & Gibbons Group 333 California Street Ste 800 San Francisco, CA 98104-2012	Legal Fees Disbursement for [X]General	08/14/92	$18000.00
The Callahan & Gibbons Group 333 California Street Ste 800 San Francisco, CA 98104-2012	Legal Fees Disbursement for [X]General	08/21/92	$5930.86
The Callahan & Gibbons Group 333 California Street Ste 800 San Francisco, CA 98104-2012	Legal Fees Disbursement for [X]General	08/21/92	$3127.15
The Callahan & Gibbons Group 333 California Street Ste 800 San Francisco, CA 98104-2012	Legal Fees Disbursement for [X]General	08/28/92	$6497.65
The Callahan & Gibbons Group 333 California Street Ste 800 San Francisco, CA 98104-2012	Legal Fees Disbursement for [X]General	08/28/92	$19166.25
The Courts at Preston Oaks 5400 Preston Oaks Rd Dallas, TX 75240	Rent Disbursement for [X]General	08/27/92	$1295.00
THE OFFICE HOUSE 640 W. MAXWELL ST. LEXINGTON, KY 40500	FURNITURE RENTAL Disbursement for [X]General	08/28/92	$292.00
SUBTOTAL of Disbursements This Page.....>			$59613.91
TOTAL This Period.....>			

92037810274

The Perot Petition Committee (PPC) finally admitted to the FEC that these weren't disbursements for "legal fees" and changed them to what the PPC now calls "security fees." Callahan & Gibbons are not lawyers, they are private investigators hired by Perot to investigate volunteers.

EXHIBIT
D

THE CALLAHAN & GIBBONS GROUP, INC.
THE INSURANCE EXCHANGE BUILDING
433 CALIFORNIA STREET, SUITE 906
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94104-2013
TELEPHONE: (415) 616-8822
FACSIMILE: (415) 362-4541

PRIVILEGED ATTORNEY/CLIENT WORK PRODUCT PREPARED AT THE DIRECTION AND UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF COUNSEL

June 18, 1992

Mr. Mark Blahnik
Perot Petition Committee
6606 LBJ Freeway
Dallas, TX 75240

Client no. 122
Invoice no. 044
Matter no. 001

CONFIDENTIAL

Re: Confidential inquiries and physical security services State of Maryland.

Fee for Professional Services and Out-of-Pocket Disbursements.

Senior Partner Hours	$ 1,600.00
Partner Hours	6,600.00
Associate Hours	8,550.00
Out-of-Pocket Disbursements	1,250.00
Total:	$18,000.00

EXHIBIT
E

22

1 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
2 EASTERN DIVISION

3 MARK DOTZLER, KEVIN)
LAUGHLIN, EDWARD DYCK,)
4 AND CARRIE ALSPAW,)
Plaintiffs,)
5 VS.) CONSOLIDATED
THE PEROT PETITION) CIVIL ACTION NO.
6 COMMITTEE, EQUIFAX) 4:94CV887 CFC
CREDIT INFORMATION)
7 SERVICES, INC., RUSS)
MELBYE, AND SANDRA)
8 STONE McCLURE,)
Defendants.)
9
---

10 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
11 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION
12
KEVIN LAUGHLIN, EDWARD)
13 DYCK, CARRIE ALSPAW,)
AND MARK DOTZLER,)
14 Plaintiffs,) CONSOLIDATED
VS.) CIVIL ACTION NO.
15 ROSS PEROT, MARK ALAN) 3-95-CV-2577-R
BLAHNIK AND THE CALLAHAN)
16 & GIBBONS GROUP, INC.,)
Defendants.)
17
18
19 ---
20 ORAL DEPOSITION OF
MARK ALAN BLAHNIK
21 ---
22
23
24 ANSWERS AND DEPOSITION OF MARK ALAN BLAHNIK,
25 a witness produced on behalf of the Plaintiff,

COPY

1 taken in the above styled and numbered cause at
2 9:21 A.M. on the 16th day of May, 1996, before R.
3 Michael Buie, a Certified Shorthand Reporter in
4 and for the State of Texas, at the Law Office of
5 Hughes & Luce, L.L.P., 1717 Main Street, Suite
6 2800, located in the City of Dallas, County of
7 Dallas, State of Texas, pursuant to Notice of
8 Deposition and in accordance with the stipulation
9 hereinafter set forth.
10
11 . . . . .
12
13 APPEARANCES
14 MR. F. JOHN REEKS
Bodenheimer, Jones, Klotz & Simmons
15 309 Milam Street
Shreveport, Louisiana 71101
16 APPEARING FOR THE PLAINTIFFS, KEVIN
LAUGHLIN, EDWARD DYCK AND CARRIE ALSPAW
17
18 MR. MARK DOTZLER
2222 Menard
19 St. Louis, Missouri 63104
APPEARING AS PLAINTIFF PRO SE
20
21 MS. KIM JUANITA ASKEW and
22 MR. CRAIG N. BUDNER
Hughes & Luce, L.L.P.
23 1717 Main Street, Suite 2800
Dallas, Texas 75201
24 [illegible] THE DEFENDANTS, THE PEROT
[illegible]ITTEE, ROSS PEROT, RUSS
[illegible]ARK ALAN BLAHNIK

1 (APPEARANCES CONTINUED)
2 MR. G. CARROLL STRIBLING, JR.
Bierscher & Rocker, P.C.
3 231 South Bemiston, Eighth Floor
St. Louis, (Clayton), Missouri 63105
4 APPEARING FOR THE DEFENDANT, EQUIFAX
CREDIT INFORMATION SERVICES, INC.
5
6 ALSO PRESENT: Edward Dyck
7 Kevin Laughlin
8
. . . . .
9
10 EXAMINATION INDEX
11

EXAMINATION	PAGE
BY MR. REEKS	6
BY MR. STRIBLING	131
BY MS. ASKEW	152
FURTHER EXAMINATION	
BY MR. REEKS	165
BY MR. STRIBLING	167
BY MR. REEKS	170
BY MS. ASKEW	172

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19 EXHIBIT INDEX
20

DEPOSITION	PAGE
NO. 12 Invoice No. 045, The Callahan & Gibbons Group, Inc. to Perot Petition Committee, dated 6-18-92, Bates stamped CG 0021 and 0022	82
NO. 13 Invoice No. 044, The Callahan & Gibbons Group, Inc. to Perot Petition Committee, dated 6-18-92, Bates stamped CG 0023 to 0025	83

21
22
23
24
25

1 (EXHIBIT INDEX CONTINUED)

DEPOSITION	PAGE
NO. 14 Invoice No. 043, The Callahan & Gibbons Group, Inc. to Perot Petition Committee, dated 6-18-92, Bates stamped CG 0026 to 0028	85
NO. 15 Invoice No. 042, The Callahan & Gibbons Group, Inc. to Perot Petition Committee, dated 6-18-92, Bates stamped CG 0029 and 0030	87
NO. 16 Invoice No. 041, The Callahan & Gibbons Group, Inc. to Perot Petition Committee, dated 6-18-92, Bates stamped CG 0031 to 0033	87
NO. 17 Invoice No. 040, The Callahan & Gibbons Group, Inc. to Perot Petition Committee, dated 6-18-92, Bates stamped CG 0034 and 0035	88
NO. 18 Invoice No. 039, The Callahan & Gibbons Group, Inc. to Perot Petition Committee, dated 6-18-92, Bates stamped CG 0036 and 0037	88
NO. 19 Invoice No. 038, The Callahan & Gibbons Group, Inc. to Perot Petition Committee, dated 6-18-92, Bates stamped CG 0038 to 0040	88
NO. 20 Invoice No. 037, The Callahan & Gibbons Group, Inc. to Perot Petition Committee, dated 6-18-92, Bates stamped CG 0041 and 0042	89
NO. 21 Invoice No. 046, The Callahan & Gibbons Group, Inc. to Perot Petition Committee, dated 6-18-92, Bates stamped SP000032	90
NO. 22 Document labeled "Schedule B, Itemized Disbursements," Page 204 of 230	92
NO. 23 Affidavit of Mark Blahnik	94

2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

EXHIBIT
F

EXHIBITS IN SEPARATE FOLDER

23

9704536871

(EXHIBIT INDEX CONTINUED)

DEPOSITION PAGE

NO. 24 11-4-93 Letter, Edward Dyck to Mark Blahnik ---------- 95

NO. 25 1-10-94 Letter, Edward Dyck to Mark Blahnik ---------- 96

NO. 26 Document labeled "Case Opening Form," Bates stamped CG 0018 ---------- 97

NO. 27 5-30-92 Article from the "St. Louis Post-Dispatch" labeled Perot's "Missouri Effort Is Split" ---------- 129

CERTIFIED/UNANSWERED QUESTIONS

Page 30, Line 24
Page 124, Line 12
Page 125, Line 15
Page 126, Line 3
Page 127, Line 2
Page 128, Line 12

MARK ALAN BLAHNIK,

the witness hereinbefore named, being first duly cautioned and sworn to testify the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, testified on his oath as follows:

THE REPORTER: Do you have the same stipulation?

MR. REEKS: Yes.

MS. ASKEW: Yes. And, of course, the deposition is being taken in both the Dallas and Missouri litigation.

MR. REEKS: That's correct.

(The stipulation for taking the deposition was stated previously at the deposition of Russ Melbye on May 15, 1996, appearing in its entirety at Page 6 thereof, and states that the deposition is being taken pursuant to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.)

EXAMINATION

BY MR. REEKS:

Q. Mr. Blahnik, would you state your name and address for the record.

A. Yes. My name is Mark Alan Blahnik. I live at 11209 Jereme, J-E-R-E-M-E, Trail, Frisco, Texas, 75034.

Q. Mr. Blahnik, my name is John Reeks. And we're taking your deposition today in connection

with two lawsuits that are ongoing, one in the Northern District of Texas and the other in the Eastern District of Missouri, involving activities of various people in connection with Ross Perot's 1992 presidential campaign and petition effort.

I'm going to ask you some questions about your knowledge of various things in connection with the '92 presidential campaign and petition effort. If I ask you anything that you're not clear about or don't understand, please let me know; and I'll try to reask the question so that you do understand it. If you answer the question, we'll assume that you understood the question. Is that fair?

A. Fair.

Q. Okay. What is your current occupation?

A. I'm the operations manager at The Perot Group.

Q. Okay. And what does that job involve?

A. Probably a better job description is office manager. Involves the facilities, switchboards. Because of my background, I do interview and accept the resumes, which I then pass on to human resources. I staff the Security Department. Those are the primary duties.

Q. Okay. When you say you interview and accept resumes, are you in personnel?

A. I am not currently. But based on my background at EDS and Perot Systems, it just kind of fell on me to do interviews when we need them.

Q. Okay. Do you screen prospective job applicants for The Perot Group?

A. In specific nontechnical or nonfinancial areas, yes.

Q. And your current employer is who now?

A. The Perot Group.

Q. Perot Group, okay. And you indicated you're in charge of security. What does that involve?

A. We have staff people that sit in our corporate office spaces that are security oriented that man the front door, et cetera. And we have security people that pull security duty around different Perot private properties as well.

Q. What is the offices that you were referring to just a minute ago? The offices on Merit Drive?

A. Yes.

Q. And how many people do you have employed in security in that?

Page 73

1 offices in St. Louis on or about May 19th, 1992?
2 A. No.
3 Q. Did you, other than within the context
4 of this lawsuit, did you ever have any knowledge
5 of a press conference that was held by Sandy
6 McClure at the Adams Mark hotel on May 29th,
7 1992?
8 A. No.
9 Q. Prior to November 1992, did you ever
10 discuss the re-petition of the state of Missouri
11 with Mr. Perot?
12 A. No.
13 MR. REEKS: Kim, you want to take a
14 little break now?
15 MS. ASKEW: Sure.
16 (Recess at 11:04 to 11:11.)
17 MR. REEKS: Ready, Kim?
18 MS. ASKEW: Yes.
19 Q. Mr. Blahnik, back on the record. Are
20 you familiar with a firm called The Callahan &
21 Gibbons Group?
22 A. Yes.
23 Q. And how are you familiar with The
24 Callahan & Gibbons Group?
25 A. They are the -- a private investigative

Page 74

1 firm, security firm, out of San Francisco that Tom
2 Barr told me would handle security and
3 investigative matters that The Perot Petition
4 Committee would need.
5 Q. Okay. And prior to Mr. Barr mentioning
6 The Callahan & Gibbons Group, did you have any
7 knowledge of The Callahan & Gibbons Group?
8 A. No.
9 Q. Did you have any knowledge of any of the
10 principals in The Callahan & Gibbons Group?
11 A. No.
12 Q. When did Tom Barr mention The Callahan &
13 Gibbons Group to you?
14 A. It was at a meeting in late March or
15 early April at the Park Sheraton Central -- Park
16 Central Sheraton.
17 Q. Sheraton Park Central?
18 A. I don't know what they call it.
19 Q. Here in Dallas?
20 A. Yes.
21 Q. Okay. And who was in that meeting?
22 A. Tom Barr, Evan Chessler, another young
23 lawyer I did not know, Mort Meyerson, myself, Tom
24 Luce. And there may have been others.
25 Q. How did the subject of Callahan &

Page 75

1 Gibbons come up in that meeting?
2 A. The question came up, would Ross Perot
3 accept Secret Service for the campaign. And the
4 answer was, no, he was not going to do that.
5 Therefore, Mr. Barr brought up The Callahan &
6 Gibbons Group and said that we would use them.
7 Q. Who made the decision that Mr. Perot
8 would not use Secret Service for the campaign?
9 A. Mr. Perot.
10 Q. Was that option available to him?
11 A. Yes.
12 Q. Approximately when did this meeting take
13 place at the Park Central?
14 A. I believe it was a Saturday morning, and
15 it was probably in early April.
16 Q. What did Mr. Barr indicate to you that
17 Callahan & Gibbons would be able -- what services
18 would they be able to provide to The Perot
19 Petition Committee?
20 A. They would be able to provide physical
21 security if we needed it. They would also be able
22 to do background checks if we needed that too.
23 Q. Did Mr. Barr indicate to you how he came
24 to know about The Callahan & Gibbons Group?
25 A. Yes.

Page 76

1 Q. And how was that?
2 A. Dick Callahan and he were buddies, going
3 back to the Marine Corps in the 1950's.
4 Q. And did he indicate to you whether he
5 had used The Callahan & Gibbons Group for other
6 matters since then?
7 A. No, he didn't.
8 Q. Did you ever hire The Callahan & Gibbons
9 Group to do anything for The Perot Petition
10 Committee?
11 A. No.
12 Q. Did you ever recommend The Callahan &
13 Gibbons Group to any other people in The Perot
14 Petition Committee to employ them for various
15 services?
16 A. In a general sense, yes.
17 Q. Okay. Tell me about that.
18 A. In a staff meeting shortly after that
19 Sheraton Park Central meeting with the four
20 regional directors, managers, I told them what had
21 gone on; and I passed on the name of Callahan &
22 Gibbons. Told them Tom Barr said we could use
23 them for security reasons. And I gave them the
24 phone numbers.
25 Q. Did you have any other contact with The

1 Callahan & Gibbons Group after the meeting with
2 Mr. Barr?
3 A. Yes.
4 Q. And what contact did you have with
5 them?
6 A. I was to call Dick Callahan, which I
7 called him, about a situation in Maryland that we
8 needed some physical security at. And he referred
9 me to his son John who was back in the office.
10 Richard was -- or Dick was up in New York at the
11 time, I believe, doing something for IBM. He
12 referred me to John out in San Francisco. And I
13 asked John to deal with the situation in
14 Maryland.
15 Q. Okay. Did you tell him what the
16 situation in Maryland was?
17 A. Yes.
18 Q. Okay. And what did you tell him?
19 A. I told him that we had some volunteers
20 that felt threatened, as far as life threatened;
21 and we needed to -- he needed to assess that
22 situation. And if he felt that we needed to put
23 security at these people's houses, that we had to
24 do that to protect them.
25 Q. Other than the situation in Maryland,

1 did you ever have any other occasion to contact
2 Callahan & Gibbons?
3 A. No.
4 Q. When you met with your regional -- what
5 did you call them?
6 A. Managers.
7 Q. -- managers, and passed along the name
8 of Callahan & Gibbons, what did you tell them that
9 Callahan & Gibbons could do for them?
10 A. That they could handle physical
11 security, if we needed it, at any facilities. And
12 also if we needed to do a background check on
13 anyone for criminal records, that we could use
14 them as well.
15 Q. Your understanding after talking with
16 Mr. Barr, what would a background check by
17 Callahan & Gibbons involve?
18 A. All electors in all 50 states had to be
19 eligible voters. Anyone who is a convicted felon
20 obviously can't vote, obviously could not be an
21 elector. So we had to ensure that every possible
22 elector vote that we had in question -- because
23 everybody felt it would be a tight race -- if in
24 question, we had to ensure that the person was not
25 a convicted felon.

1 Q. Okay. Anything else involved in the
2 background check?
3 A. No.
4 Q. Did you instruct the four regional
5 managers to conduct background checks on all the
6 electors --
7 A. No.
8 Q. -- in their states?
9 A. (Shakes negatively.)
10 Q. Did you instruct any of the regional
11 managers to conduct background checks on the
12 electors in their states?
13 A. No.
14 Q. Did you advise them that that option was
15 available to them if they desired to do so?
16 A. Not specifically.
17 Q. Do you know of anyone who advised the
18 regional directors that they should conduct
19 background checks -- regional managers. I'm
20 sorry -- background checks on electors in the
21 various states?
22 A. No.
23 Q. Were the regional managers left to their
24 own discretion as to whether background checks on
25 electors would be conducted?

1 A. To their own discretion and good
2 judgment, yes.
3 Q. Did you or anyone else, to your
4 knowledge, pass along to the regional managers the
5 fact that it was necessary to ensure that the
6 electors were not convicted felons?
7 A. To my knowledge, I passed that on to
8 them.
9 Q. Okay. And did you indicate to them a
10 manner or way to ensure that they did not -- that
11 they didn't have convicted felons on their list of
12 electors in their various states?
13 A. That would have been to have had a
14 background criminal check done.
15 Q. But you didn't actually instruct them to
16 go ahead and do those background checks?
17 MS. ASKEW: Asked and answered. He
18 said "no" now two times.
19 THE WITNESS: No.
20 Q. Did you ever talk with Mr. Monroe about
21 background checks that he requested on certain
22 electors?
23 MS. ASKEW: Go ahead. You can
24 answer it.
25 THE WITNESS: No.

26

1 Q. To your knowledge, did Mr. Monroe or any
2 one of his state people hire Callahan & Gibbons to
3 perform background checks on electors?
4 A. Other than hearing Mr. Melbye yesterday
5 stating that he did, I did not have knowledge.
6 Q. Okay. Other than the contact that you
7 mentioned earlier with Callahan & Gibbons
8 concerning the Maryland situation, did you ever
9 have any other contact with Callahan & Gibbons
10 from March 1992 until November 1992?
11 A. Yes.
12 Q. Okay. What was that?
13 A. John Callahan called me when I was in
14 Hawaii and told me that somebody -- it would have
15 been on the East Coast -- had questioned a
16 background check that somebody -- he had worked --
17 O'Connell & Associates had done. He just wanted
18 to give me a heads-up.
19 Q. Who is O'Connell & Associates?
20 A. He told me it was somebody that he had
21 subcontracted work to.
22 Q. Okay. That Callahan had subcontracted
23 work to?
24 A. Yes.
25 Q. Did The Perot Petition Committee ever

1 contract directly with O'Connell & Associates, to
2 your knowledge?
3 A. No. No.
4 (DEPOSITION EXHIBIT NO. 12 IDENTIFIED.)
5 Q. Mr. Blahnik, I'm going to show you some
6 documents that we've marked as -- that I'm going
7 to be marking as exhibits. I'm marking Blahnik
8 No. 12 and ask if you recognize that document.
9 A. Yes.
10 Q. Okay. And that's a bill from Callahan &
11 Gibbons Group?
12 A. Yes.
13 Q. And when did you receive this document?
14 A. Probably had to be shortly after the
15 18th of June.
16 Q. And it indicates it's for preparation of
17 drug policy report.
18 A. Yes.
19 Q. Had you requested a drug policy report
20 from Callahan & Gibbons?
21 A. I did not.
22 Q. Do you have any understanding as to why
23 Callahan & Gibbons would have addressed the
24 statement for their services to you?
25 A. Tom Barr gave them my name as the

1 contact.
2 Q. Okay. Are you familiar with the drug
3 policy report?
4 A. Yes.
5 Q. Okay. Were you one of the people that
6 was given that report?
7 A. No.
8 Q. What was the drug policy report?
9 A. The Perot Petition Committee
10 subcontracted out issues research, and Callahan &
11 Gibbons Group did it on crime-related things.
12 What the drug status is in our country, what the
13 status of gun control is, what the status of
14 police on the streets is and issues like that.
15 Q. So this was kind of researched for
16 issues for the presidential campaign?
17 A. For the Issues Department, yes.
18 Q. And attached to that is a check
19 voucher. It shows that it's for legal fees for
20 $5,930.86. Is Callahan & Gibbons Group a law
21 firm?
22 A. I don't know if they have lawyers on
23 their staff or not that do this.
24 (DEPOSITION EXHIBIT NO. 13 IDENTIFIED.)
25 Q. Okay. I show you another document

1 that's been marked as Blahnik No. 13 and ask if
2 you recognize that document.
3 MS. ASKEW: Well, now, there are
4 three -- this is not a single document.
5 THE WITNESS: Okay, I don't
6 recognize the check or the check stub.
7 Q. Okay. Well, it's a three-page
8 document. Do you recognize the first page of that
9 document?
10 A. Yes.
11 MS. ASKEW: And I don't see an
12 exhibit sticker on this. Why don't we put an
13 exhibit sticker on it so it's absolutely clear
14 what he's talking about.
15 Q. Okay. You're familiar -- in Blahnik No.
16 13, you're familiar with the first page of this
17 document?
18 A. Yes.
19 Q. Okay. And did you receive this
20 statement from Callahan & Gibbons Group?
21 A. Yes.
22 Q. Okay. Who made the decision on whether
23 these statements got paid?
24 A. I was one level. And based on if it was
25 issues or whatever else probably, John White did

21

1 issues. That was his department. After this, it
2 went to Bob Daniel, who is the CFO.
3 Q. This bill says security services, and
4 it's for a total amount of $18,000. Do you know
5 what was represented by this bill, what services
6 were represented by this bill?
7 A. I believe I do.
8 Q. Okay.
9 A. I believe this was for services in
10 Maryland.
11 Q. Okay. What's your belief based upon?
12 A. That we had -- we had different levels
13 of people here. And we had some out-of-pocket
14 disbursements.
15 Q. Okay.
16 A. And that was the only time we had used
17 whatever -- we had to probably house people for
18 physical security reasons check.
19 (DEPOSITION EXHIBIT NO. 14 IDENTIFIED.)
20 Q. I show you another document that's been
21 marked as Exhibit 14. It's also a three-page
22 document. Do you recognize any part of that?
23 MS. ASKEW: And I just want the
24 record to reflect that these documents may be
25 contained together in the clip for the purposes of

1 these exhibits, but they are not one document.
2 Q. Okay. It's one exhibit. And it's three
3 pages.
4 A. I recognize the front because it's got
5 my name on it.
6 Q. Okay. And it's a bill from Callahan &
7 Gibbons for security services, and the total
8 amount is $3505. Do you know what these services
9 were?
10 A. I couldn't tell you which state this
11 was.
12 Q. Did you receive a separate billing for
13 each state that they did security services in?
14 A. I don't know.
15 Q. Did you ever discuss the billing with
16 Callahan & Gibbons?
17 A. No.
18 Q. Did you ever do any background or
19 checking to determine the validity of the bills?
20 A. Probably just in the Maryland case.
21 Q. But the other bills, if the bill came
22 in, you just passed it along and suggested that it
23 be paid?
24 A. Yes.
25 Q. You didn't inquire into what these

1 services were for?
2 A. No.
3 (DEPOSITION EXHIBIT NO. 15 IDENTIFIED.)
4 Q. I show you another exhibit, which has
5 been marked Blahnik No. 15. It's a two-page
6 exhibit. And ask if you can identify any part of
7 that exhibit.
8 A. Not state-specific.
9 Q. This is also a bill from Callahan &
10 Gibbons Group in there?
11 A. Yes.
12 Q. For security services?
13 A. (Nods affirmatively.)
14 Q. And it was for $4,890.
15 A. (Nods affirmatively.)
16 Q. And you do not know what services were
17 performed?
18 A. No.
19 (DEPOSITION EXHIBIT NO. 16 IDENTIFIED.)
20 Q. I show you another document which has
21 been marked as Exhibit No., Blahnik No. 16. It's
22 a three-page exhibit. And again I ask you if you
23 recognize this, the first page of that exhibit.
24 A. Yes. It has my name on it.
25 Q. Okay. And it's for -- it's a bill from

1 Callahan & Gibbons Group for $6,497.65?
2 A. Yes.
3 Q. And do you know what that bill
4 represents?
5 A. No, I don't.
6 (DEPOSITION EXHIBIT NO. 17 IDENTIFIED.)
7 Q. I show you an exhibit that's been marked
8 Blahnik No. 17 and ask if you recognize the front
9 page of that exhibit.
10 A. Yes.
11 Q. Okay. And it's a statement from
12 Callahan & Gibbons addressed to you at The Perot
13 Petition Committee for $11,552.40. Do you know
14 what services this statement represents?
15 A. No.
16 (DEPOSITION EXHIBIT NO. 18 IDENTIFIED.)
17 Q. I show you another exhibit that's been
18 marked as Blahnik No. 18. First page is a
19 statement from Callahan and Gibbons Group
20 addressed to you with The Perot Petition Committee
21 for $3,127.15. Do you know what that bill
22 represents?
23 A. No.
24 (DEPOSITION EXHIBIT NO. 19 IDENTIFIED.)
25 Q. I show you another exhibit that's been

1 marked as Blahnik No. 19 a[illegible]sk if you recognize
2 the front page of that bill or that exhibit.
3 A. Yes.
4 Q. And that's a bill addressed to you from
5 Callahan & Gibbons Group?
6 A. Yes.
7 Q. And it's for $19,166.25; is that
8 correct?
9 A. Yes.
10 Q. Do you know what this bill represents,
11 what services this bill represents?
12 A. No, I don't.
13 (DEPOSITION EXHIBIT NO. 20 IDENTIFIED.)
14 Q. I show you another statement or another
15 exhibit that's been marked as Exhibit No. Blahnik
16 20 and ask if you recognize the front page of that
17 exhibit.
18 A. Yes.
19 Q. And that's a bill addressed to you from
20 The Callahan & Gibbons Group?
21 A. Yes.
22 Q. And it's for $5,658.75?
23 A. Yes.
24 Q. And do you know what services that bill
25 represents?

1 A. No, I don't.
2 (DEPOSITION EXHIBIT NO. 21 IDENTIFIED.)
3 Q. I show you an exhibit that's been marked
4 as Blahnik No. 21 and ask if you can recognize
5 that exhibit.
6 A. Yes.
7 Q. And what is that?
8 A. It's the bill for the services in
9 Maryland.
10 Q. Okay. And I call your attention to that
11 bill and the reference on that bill. What does
12 that read?
13 MS. ASKEW: When you say
14 "reference," what are you referring to?
15 MR. REEKS: Reference, R-E, colon.
16 THE WITNESS: Confidential
17 inquiries and physical security services, state of
18 Maryland.
19 Q. I ask that you compare Exhibit 20 (sic)
20 with Exhibit 13 and tell me whether those are the
21 same services that are represented.
22 A. Yes.
23 Q. Do you have any idea why the reference
24 on Exhibit 13 is for security services and for the
25 same services there was -- there's a different

1 reference on [illegible]hibit No. 21?
2 A. The only difference is this one didn't
3 get paid (indicating).
4 Q. And why didn't that one get paid?
5 A. I don't know if it was lost or what.
6 Q. Do you have any idea --
7 MR. STRIBLING: Excuse me, sir.
8 When you said that the only difference was this
9 one didn't get paid, which exhibit were you
10 referring to?
11 THE WITNESS: Twenty-one has no
12 paid acknowledgment on it or a canceled check with
13 it.
14 MR. STRIBLING: Twenty-one or 20?
15 THE WITNESS: Exhibit 21.
16 Q. That's for $18,000?
17 A. Yes.
18 Q. And do you know that that bill did not
19 get paid?
20 A. I -- I don't know for sure.
21 Q. There's no mark on it that says paid.
22 A. That says paid or -- all the others have
23 check numbers on them.
24 Q. Okay. And both of those bills, Exhibit
25 No. 13 and Exhibit No. 21, were dated on the same

1 date; is that right?
2 A. Yes.
3 MS. ASKEW: I think all of them
4 have been.
5 Q. And they've got the same client number,
6 invoice number and matter number?
7 A. I'd have to go back and look at the
8 others and see if they do.
9 Q. I'm just talking about those two.
10 A. Yes.
11 Q. Do you have any idea why the reference
12 on the bill is different for those two billing
13 statements?
14 A. No.
15 (DEPOSITION EXHIBIT NO. 22 IDENTIFIED.)
16 Q. I'm going to show you a document that's
17 been marked as Blahnik No. 22 and ask if you're
18 familiar with that document. It's a portion of a
19 larger document that was filed with the FEC by The
20 Perot Petition Committee. Are you familiar with
21 that?
22 A. No.
23 Q. I call your attention to the entries on
24 that document.
25 MS. ASKEW: I am not going to let

1 this witness answer any questions about a document
2 that he has never seen and has no familiarity
3 with.
4 Q. Okay. Well, I'm going to call your
5 attention to the entries on the document where it
6 says Callahan & Gibbons Group. And there is an
7 amount out there, $3,505. And it says, legal
8 fees. Are you familiar with any legal fees that
9 have been paid to Callahan & Gibbons?
10 MS. ASKEW: And I object to the
11 extent the testimony that you are soliciting is in
12 any way based on this document, Exhibit 22, which
13 the witness has said he has never seen prior to
14 your putting it before him.
15 MR. REEKS: Okay.
16 MS. ASKEW: If You can answer it,
17 go ahead.
18 THE WITNESS: No.
19 Q. Okay. Any of the other entries for
20 Callahan & Gibbons that are reflected on this
21 document, are you aware of any legal fees that
22 have been paid to The Callahan & Gibbons Group?
23 MS. ASKEW: I have the same
24 objection. Lack of foundation. The witness has
25 said he has no familiarity with this document and

1 the entries contained in the document.
2 Q. Okay. Subject to the objection --
3 A. No.
4 (DEPOSITION EXHIBIT NO. 23 IDENTIFIED.)
5 Q. I show you a document that's been marked
6 as Blahnik No. 23 and ask if you recognize that
7 document.
8 A. Yes.
9 Q. And what is that?
10 A. It's a statement of where I worked at a
11 certain period, time period.
12 MS. ASKEW: And I object because
13 this document is not complete. This is a portion
14 of a much larger document, and a portion of this
15 document has been pulled from the overall
16 document.
17 Q. Okay. Is that an affidavit that you
18 signed?
19 A. Yes.
20 Q. And is that your signature on the
21 document?
22 A. Yes.
23 Q. And do you recall the circumstances in
24 which you signed that document?
25 A. Yes.

1 Q. And what were they?
2 A. This was in response to an FEC inquiry.
3 Q. Okay. And what was the nature of the
4 inquiry?
5 A. The inquiry was to who my employer was.
6 Was my salary correctly recorded or attributed to
7 The Perot Petition Committee?
8 Q. And during the time frame that's listed
9 there, you were employed by The Perot Group?
10 A. Yes.
11 (DEPOSITION EXHIBIT NO. 24 IDENTIFIED.)
12 Q. I'm going to show you a document that's
13 been marked as Blahnik No. 24 and ask if you
14 recognize that document.
15 A. Yes, I do.
16 Q. And what is that?
17 A. This is a letter I received from Mr.
18 Dyck.
19 Q. Okay. And there's a certified mail
20 card, Xerox copy of a mail card, certified mail
21 card, that's at the bottom of that exhibit. Whose
22 signature is that on there?
23 A. Ladena Wassell (sic).
24 Q. Did she work in your office?
25 A. She does the mail. She did the mail at

1 that time.
2 Q. And that would have been her
3 acknowledgment of receipt?
4 A. Yes.
5 Q. Did you actually see that letter?
6 A. Yes.
7 Q. Did you ever respond to that letter?
8 A. No.
9 Q. Can you tell me why you didn't respond
10 to the letter?
11 A. Number one, that was the first time I
12 had ever seen Mr. Dyck's name or heard of him. I
13 didn't know who he was.
14 Q. Okay. Did you receive a subsequent
15 letter from Mr. Dyck?
16 A. Yes.
17 (DEPOSITION EXHIBIT NO. 25 IDENTIFIED.)
18 Q. Let me show you another document I've
19 marked as Exhibit No. 25 and ask you if that's the
20 subsequent letter that you received.
21 A. Yes.
22 Q. And did you respond to that letter?
23 A. No.
24 Q. And why did you not respond to that
25 letter?

30

AFFIDAVIT OF MARK BLAHNIK

Re: MUR 3963 - Perot '92 and Mike Poss, as Treasurer

I, MARK BLAHNIK, being duly sworn, depose and say:

1. During the period between March, 1992 and November, 1992, I provided services to Perot '92.

2. During the time period described above, I was exclusively employed by the Perot Group and did not receive compensation from any other source. The Perot Group is an unincorporated sole proprietorship owned by Ross Perot created for the purpose of managing Ross Perot's personal affairs.

Mark Blahnik
MARK BLAHNIK

Sworn to before me this 20th day of June, 1994

Bobbie Van Pelt
Notary Public

BOBBIE VAN PELT
MY COMMISSION EXPIRES
October 5, 1996

EXHIBIT
G

1 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT
2 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
EASTERN DIVISION

3 MARK DOTZLER, KEVIN)
LAUGHLIN, EDWARD DYCK,)
4 AND CARRIE ALSPAN,)
Plaintiffs,)
5 VS.) CONSOLIDATED
THE PEROT PETITION) CIVIL ACTION NO.
6 COMMITTEE, EQUIFAX) 4:94CV887 GFG
CREDIT INFORMATION)
7 SERVICES, INC., RUSS)
MELBYE, AND SANDRA)
8 STONE McCLURE,)
Defendants.)
9
10 ----------
11 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
12 DALLAS DIVISION

13 KEVIN LAUGHLIN, EDWARD)
DYCK, CARRIE ALSPAN,)
14 AND MARK DOTZLER,)
Plaintiffs,) CONSOLIDATED
VS.) CIVIL ACTION NO.
15 ROSS PEROT, MARK ALAN) 3-95-CV-2577-R
BLAHNIK AND THE CALLAHAN)
16 & GIBBONS GROUP, INC.,)
Defendants.)
17
18
19 ----------
20 VIDEOTAPED
ORAL DEPOSITION OF
21 CLAY MULFORD
22 ----------
23
24 ANSWERS AND DEPOSITION OF CLAY MULFORD, a
25 witness produced on behalf of the Plaintiff, taken

1 in the above styled and numbered cause at 9:43
2 A.M. on the 30th day of May, 1996, before R.
3 Michael Buie, a Certified Shorthand Reporter in
4 and for the State of Texas, at the Law Office of
5 Hughes & Luce, L.L.P., 1717 Main Street, Suite
6 2800, located in the City of Dallas, County of
7 Dallas, State of Texas, pursuant to Amended Notice
8 to Take Videotaped Deposition and in accordance
9 with the stipulation hereinafter set forth.
10
11 • • • • •
12
13 APPEARANCES
14 MR. F. JOHN REEKS
Bodenheimer, Jones, Klotz & Simmons
15 509 Milam Street
Shreveport, Louisiana 71101
16 APPEARING FOR THE PLAINTIFFS, KEVIN
LAUGHLIN, EDWARD DYCK AND CARRIE ALSPAN
17
18
MR. MARK DOTZLER
19 2222 Menard
St. Louis, Missouri 73104
20 APPEARING AS PLAINTIFF PRO SE
21
22 MS. KIM JUANITA ASKEW and
MR. CRAIG W. BUDWER
23 Hughes & Luce, L.L.P.
1717 Main Street, Suite 2800
24 Dallas, Texas 75201
APPEARING FOR THE DEFENDANTS, THE PEROT
25 PETITION COMMITTEE, ROSS PEROT, RUSS

1 (APPEARANCES CONTINUED)
2 MR. JOHN W. LEMKEMEIER
Kohn, Shands, Elbert, Gianoulakis, Giljum,
3 L.L.P.
One Mercantile Center
4 St. Louis, Missouri 63101
APPEARING FOR THE DEFENDANT,
5 SANDRA STONE McCLURE
6
7 MR. G. CARROLL STRIBLING, JR.
Ziercher & Hocker, P.C.
8 231 South Bemiston, Eighth Floor
St. Louis, (Clayton), Missouri 63105
9 APPEARING FOR THE DEFENDANT, EQUIFAX
CREDIT INFORMATION SERVICES, INC.
10
11
ALSO PRESENT: Edward Dyck
12 Kevin Laughlin
13
14 • • • • •
15
16 EXAMINATION INDEX
17 EXAMINATION PAGE
18 BY MR. REEKS ---------- 9
BY MR. STRIBLING ---------- 204
19 BY MR. DOTZLER ---------- 217
BY MR. BUDWER ---------- 253
20 BY MR. LEMKEMEIER ---------- 281
21
FURTHER EXAMINATION
22
BY MR. DOTZLER ---------- 280
23 BY MR. REEKS ---------- 287
BY MR. STRIBLING ---------- 296
24 BY MR. BUDWER ---------- 308
25

1 EXHIBIT INDEX
2 DEPOSITION PAGE
3 NO. 74 Affidavit of Ross Clayton Mulford ---- 16
4 NO. 75 10-1-92 Article in "The Washington
Post" entitled "Perot Unit Hired
5 Private Eyes to Probe Volunteers" ------ 78
6 NO. 76 10-1-92 Article in "The New York
Times" entitled "Perot Hired Private
7 Investigators to Check Campaign
Volunteers" ---------- 89
8
NO. 77 11-12-93 Cover letter, Edward Dyck
9 to Hughes & Luce (Mulford) with three
additional letters ---------- 101
10
NO. 78 Document labeled "'Missouri for
11 Perot Petition Drive,' For Immediate
Release" ---------- 172
12
NO. 79 Document labeled "Withdrawal of
13 Presidential Elector" ---------- 194
14 NO. 80 10-28-92 Article in "The Wall Street
Journal" entitled "Perot Could Face
15 Hurdle of Reversals in Electoral
College" ---------- 196
16
NO. 81 Document labeled "Oath and
17 Certificate of Presidential Elector" --- 201
18 NO. 82 Pages 5 and 6 of document of "The
Dallas Morning News," dated Saturday,
19 10-3-92 re "Credit Checks Defended,
Perot Campaign Lawyer Says Probes Were
20 Legal" ---------- 227
21 NO. 83 12-22-93 Letter, Mark Dotzler to
Hughes & Luce (Mulford) ---------- 238
22
NO. 84 12-28-93 Letter, Hughes & Luce
23 (Mulford) to Mark Dotzler ---------- 238
24 NO. 85 Document labeled "Official Missouri
Perot Petition Pak" ---------- 261
25

EXHIBIT
H

COPY

EXHIBITS IN
SEPARATE BINDER

32

Page 5

1 PROCEEDINGS:
2 (Opening colloquy does not appear on videotape.)
3 MS. ASKEW: Why don't we make sure
4 this is a part of the written record. This is a
5 notice of deposition that we have received on Mr.
6 Mulford for videotape deposition. The parties
7 have entered into an agreed temporary protective
8 order covering the use of the videotaped
9 deposition.
10 I will ask that the Court Reporter make the
11 protective orders that were previously provided to
12 him for both the litigation pending in the Dallas
13 District Court and in Missouri, we would like to
14 make sure that's a part of the record.
15 Under the terms of that Protective Order, the
16 videotaped deposition, the video portion of it, is
17 to be maintained in the custody of the Court
18 Reporter. It is not to be provided to any of the
19 parties to the litigation until such time as there
20 has been a ruling by the Court on that issue or
21 until there has been some final agreement of the
22 parties on that issue.
23 Of course, the lawyers and those working
24 under their control may obtain the videotape for
25 purposes of the litigation. And the only purpose

Page 6

1 for which the videotaped deposition is to be used,
2 under the terms of this Order, is for the purposes
3 of the litigation. I would ask that you make that
4 a copy of the record -- a part of the record.
5 MR. REEKS: And just for the
6 record, the parties are entitled to view the
7 videotape in conjunction with preparation for
8 trial. I think that's reflected in the --
9 MS. ASKEW: Yeah. The terms that
10 the parties have agreed to is reflected in the
11 videotape. I just want it to be clear that the
12 Court Reporter is to maintain possession of this
13 until we get to the point where the videotape is
14 being edited for trial or for any purpose as set
15 forth in that Order.
16 MR. REEKS: All right. Further, I
17 had a question just a minute ago Mr. Dotzler had
18 asked me. Since he is pro se, I presume that he
19 would be entitled --
20 MS. ASKEW: He would be entitled,
21 exactly, to treatment as counsel.
22 MR. REEKS: -- awarded the same
23 access to the videotape as counsel. Anything
24 else?
25 MS. ASKEW: Otherwise, we're taking

Page 7

1 the depositions pursuant to the Federal Rules of
2 Civil Procedure. The witness would like the
3 opportunity to review and sign the deposition.
4 And we're certainly agreeable to signature before
5 any notary.
6 MR. REEKS: And this deposition is
7 being taken for use in both the litigation pending
8 in the Northern District of Texas and in the
9 Eastern District of Missouri.
10 MS. ASKEW: That's correct.
11 THE REPORTER: Would you like the
12 transcript to come to you for signature?
13 MS. ASKEW: Yes.
14 (Videotape begins.)
15 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are now on
16 the videotape record. This is the videotaped
17 deposition of Clay Mulford. Today's date is May
18 30th, 1996. The time is 9:43 A.M., as indicated
19 on the videotape.
20 We are in the law offices of Hughes & Luce,
21 1717 Main Street, Suite 2800 in Dallas, Texas.
22 Civil Action No. 4-94CV887 GFG, Mark Dotzler, Et
23 al., versus The Perot Petition Committee, Et al.,
24 as well as Civil Action No. 3-95-CV-2577-R, Kevin
25 Laughlin, Et al., versus Ross Perot, Et al.

Page 8

1 Would counsel state their appearances for the
2 record, please.
3 MR. REEKS: My name is John Reeks.
4 I represent Plaintiffs Kevin Laughlin, Edward Dyck
5 and Carrie Alspaw.
6 MR. DOTZLER: I'm Mark Dotzler.
7 I'm a Plaintiff pro se in this action.
8 MR. STRIBLING: I'm Carroll
9 Stribling. I represent Equifax Credit Information
10 Services, Inc., a Defendant in the Eastern
11 District of Missouri litigation.
12 MS. ASKEW: I'm Kim Askew, and with
13 me is Craig Budner. We represent Ross Perot and
14 Mark Alan Blahnik in the litigation pending in the
15 United States District Court for the Northern
16 District of Texas.
17 We represent The Perot Petition Committee and
18 Russ Melbye in the litigation pending in the
19 United States District Court for the Eastern
20 District of Missouri.
21 MR. LEMKEMEIER: I'm John
22 Lemkemeier. I represent Sandy McClure in the
23 litigation pending in the Eastern District of
24 Missouri.
25 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Will the Court

1 back by the Court Reporter, please?
2 (Question read back.)
3 THE WITNESS: Yes. I believe so.
4 MS. ASKEW: Yes. And stop it right
5 there because any questions thereafter would
6 relate to legal advice that Mr. Mulford might have
7 given to persons --
8 THE WITNESS: That's true.
9 MS. ASKEW: – at The Perot Petition
10 Committee. And I will object to the extent that
11 answering any of these questions would require
12 that he get into the conversations that he had
13 with his client.
14 You can certainly ask the question, but I
15 think it's privileged. I will instruct him not to
16 answer it.
17 Q. Okay. Well, let me -- who would you
18 have had any discussions with concerning that
19 issue?
20 MS. ASKEW: You can answer that.
21 THE WITNESS: The staff that I had
22 in the Legal Department.
23 Q. Okay. Anyone at The Perot Petition
24 Committee?
25 A. They were employees of The Perot

1 Petition Committee.
2 Q. Okay. And what are the names of those
3 people?
4 A. Dan Routman, who was a lawyer that
5 worked under me; the accounting people; possibly
6 Tom Luce.
7 Q. Okay. And did you discuss that matter
8 with anyone outside The Perot Petition Committee?
9 A. No.
10 Q. Did you discuss it with Mr. Perot?
11 A. I may have.
12 Q. All right.
13 A. Because it would have been a legal
14 requirement that he would -- that I would have
15 brought to his attention and given him advice on.
16 Q. And what did you tell Mr. Perot?
17 MS. ASKEW: I'm going to have the
18 same objection because Mr. Mulford was also, in
19 many respects, Mr. Perot's personal counsel; so I
20 would have the same objection.
21 Now, if you had those conversations in some
22 other context outside of providing legal advice to
23 Mr. Perot, you can certainly testify to those.
24 Q. Did you have any conversations with Mr.
25 Perot concerning this issue in terms of campaign

1 strategy or tactics?
2 A. Hmm. I see. No.
3 Q. Did you ever have any conversations with
4 Mr. Perot about this issue, other than advising
5 him what the legal implications were of his
6 withdrawal and the need to sign these documents?
7 A. No.
8 MR. REEKS: Let's take a break
9 while the Court Reporter is changing his paper.
10 (Brief interruption.)
11 Q. Back on the record. Mr. Mulford, when
12 did you first have contact with Sandy McClure in
13 the state of Missouri?
14 MS. ASKEW: Well, I object to the
15 extent you assume that he had such contact in the
16 state of Missouri, if you're asking about Sandy
17 McClure being from the state of Missouri.
18 Q. I'm sorry if there was any –
19 MS. ASKEW: That was unclear.
20 Q. – unclear implication about the
21 question. But Ms. McClure was from the state of
22 Missouri. And I'm not intimating that you were
23 present in the state of Missouri –
24 MS. ASKEW: That's fine. I just
25 wanted to clarify.

1 Q. -- but when did you first have contact
2 with Ms. McClure?
3 A. I believe it was around the same time
4 period as, that I talked to Kevin Laughlin.
5 Q. Okay. And that would have been toward
6 the end of April of 1992?
7 A. I believe so, yeah.
8 Q. And where were you when you had those
9 contacts?
10 A. I was here, Hughes & Luce.
11 Q. And was it a telephone contact with Ms.
12 McClure?
13 A. I can't -- well, it certainly wasn't in
14 person.
15 Q. Okay.
16 A. So it must have been by telephone. And
17 I don't recall whether she had called me or I had
18 called her. It would have been one of the many
19 literally thousands of people that were calling me
20 in that time frame.
21 MS. ASKEW: You've answered the
22 question.
23 THE WITNESS: So it must have been
24 at the request of Russ or someone.
25 Q. When you first talked to Ms. McClure,

Q. Did you have any part in preparing or requiring electors to sign loyalty oaths?
A. Not that I recall. But I may have made up a form like that, just in the context of this issue that I was looking into on the faithless-elector problem.
Q. What about resignation letters for electors?
A. Don't recall. If someone had called and said, we need -- you know, an elector is going to resign and under the state law we need to submit something to the state to do it, I would have prepared a document like that or had someone to prepare it.
But this is in the context, you know, where we're doing a thousand different things. It would be considered a very minor procedural, ministerial task.
(DEPOSITION EXHIBIT NO. 81 IDENTIFIED.)
Q. I'm going to show you a document. It may have been previously introduced. Exhibit No. 81. And it purports to be an Oath and Certificate of Presidential Elector. Did you prepare that form document?
A. I don't remember.

Q. I call your attention to the --
A. This document is not a form document. It has a particular name in it.
Q. Okay.
A. I know I did not prepare that. I know I did not go through and type the names in.
Q. This document has a coding in the lower right-hand corner.
A. Uh-huh.
Q. Does that coding look familiar to you?
A. Uh-huh. Yes.
Q. Does that indicate that it was produced by Hughes & Luce?
MR. BUDNER: Objection. We've been into this. Mr. Mulford would have to speculate. I believe he's testified that that would be a Hughes & Luce code. But you can answer subject to that objection.
THE WITNESS: The same answer as the last document.
Q. Okay. To your knowledge, did yourself or anyone at the Hughes & Luce law firm prepare loyalty oaths for the various electors in the various states?
A. We may have. You know, it would be an

appropriate thing to do to try to make sure the people felt that they were obligated to vote for the candidate you vote for.
You need to remember the valid access. These are all volunteer people. They are putting their names on the ballot as electors. Often it's Joe, Joe's sister, Joe's neighbor. We had no idea who they were. They could have been Republicans. They could have been Democrats. It was a precaution, I think, to be sure that those people that were going to be electors actually supported Perot.
MR. REEKS: Thank you, Mr. Mulford. That's all I have.
THE WITNESS: Thank you.
MR. DOTZLER: Want to go?
MR. REEKS: You want to go off the record?
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We're off the record. The time is 3:39.
(Discussion off the record.)
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the record. The time is 3:41.
(no omissions)

EXAMINATION
BY MR. STRIBLING:
Q. Mr. Mulford, my name is Carroll Stribling. I represent Equifax Credit Information Services, Inc., which is one of the Defendants in the litigation pending in the Eastern District of Missouri. I just have a few questions for you.
You testified earlier about -- well, let me open up with one thing. Equifax is a nationwide credit-reporting company. Are you aware of that?
A. I am now.
Q. Okay. Are you aware, sir, or have you ever seen a credit report with respect to any one of the Plaintiffs that have been prepared from or received from Equifax?
A. No.
Q. Have you ever spoken to anyone at The Perot Petition Committee or the campaign who indicated to you that they saw that they had had one, sir?
A. No.
Q. You indicated that you reviewed the statements of Callahan & Gibbons in a period of time during the period from about the middle of September until the beginning of October of 1992.

Page 205

A. Sometime during that period.
Q. Yeah. And who was it who called to your attention, or how was it that you came by doing an investigation as to what had happened with respect to Callahan & Gibbons? Why did that happen?
A. I think, as I mentioned, I got a call from someone in the media regarding the FEC reports that said that legal fees were paid to an entity called Callahan & Gibbons, and was I aware that that was not a law firm.
Q. Okay. So that was the first you had heard of it?
A. That was the first I heard of it.
Q. Was that Mike Isikoff who called you; do you know?
A. I don't recall.
Q. Had you dealt with Mike Isikoff before at "The Washington Post"?
A. I believe so.
Q. Was he a person who you had met and spoken to face to face? Do you know what he looks like?
A. I don't remember what he looks like. But I think I did during the '92 campaign. In the September phase, I did not become well acquainted

Page 206

with the media people until really October during the campaign. The September phase, it would have been introductory, other than people that had covered the campaign in the spring.
Q. Okay. During the spring, you would also have spoken to the press at one time or another too --
A. Very rarely.
Q. Okay. During May and June?
A. Very rarely. We had people much more capable than I am at that -- available at that period.
Q. And when you went -- when you set about to investigate Callahan & Gibbons, my understanding was that you got together a group of the statements which you said were the pink documents, a stack of them.
A. Yes, I think they were pink.
Q. And they have been marked. And you've -- I think you've been shown them. They are 13 through 20 in the Plaintiff's deposition exhibits. And I'll go ahead and hand those to you.
A. Okay.
Q. Did you review those with anyone,

Page 207

Callahan & Gibbons or anybody else, to determine what it was they were for?
A. With -- yes, with Mark Blahnik and his staff, two or three people on his staff. This is while I was looking into the report that our FEC reports included inaccurate information.
Q. Now, the bills from Callahan & Gibbons, those Exhibits 13 through 20 of the Plaintiffs deposition exhibits in this combined litigation or combined discovery, don't say, except for two of them, one which talks about the state of Maryland and one which talks about some research into drug programs or drugs as an issue -- outside of that, they don't say a lot except for security services or something to that effect.
A. Right.
Q. Okay. Did you ask anything more about what it was that was $78,000 worth of money, what it was that that money had been spent on, what services had been received?
A. Yes. That's why I had the meeting with Mark Blahnik.
Q. Did you go over the bills one by one?
A. No. We went over them as a group.
Q. Okay.

Page 208

A. I said I wanted to know everything that Callahan & Gibbons was engaged to do.
Q. Did you ask to see any documents or correspondence or anything of that sort outside of just the bills that might have transpired between Callahan & Gibbons and The Perot Petition Committee?
A. No.
Q. Just the bills.
A. Just the bills.
Q. And who, other than Mr. Blahnik, was it that you talked to about these bills?
A. Russ Monroe and maybe one or two other people that had knowledge about what was done. I don't remember who they were.
Q. Did you speak with Mr. Melbye about it?
A. Probably. I think he covered the state of Ohio, and some of the activities occurred in Ohio.
Q. Okay. Did you, after you were through with that investigation, did you feel that you had an understanding of the services that Callahan & Gibbons had provided for the some $78,000 that you had paid?
A. Yes.

1 Q. Okay. What was the -- [illegible]e of the
2 services were for security gu[illegible], weren't they?
3 A. That's what I understand.
4 Q. Yeah. What was the extent of the use of
5 security guards? I think there's been some
6 testimony in earlier depositions that perhaps two
7 guards were used in Maryland for a period of
8 time.
9 A. You know, I don't know. I think the
10 guards were also used in Georgia, your hometown,
11 in Atlanta.
12 Q. My client's hometown.
13 A. Your client's hometown. Sorry.
14 Q. Okay. So you think that there may have
15 been some security guards used in Atlanta. And I
16 think you testified that that was the first that
17 you understood that Callahan & Gibbons had been
18 used.
19 A. That's my recollection, what I was told.
20 Q. Okay. Do you know how much money was
21 spent on security guards in Atlanta?
22 A. No.
23 Q. Okay. Then there were some security
24 guards in Maryland. Are you aware of that?
25 A. That's my understanding.

1 Q. Okay. [illegible] you know how many guards or
2 how much ti[illegible]or how much money was spent on
3 security guards in --
4 A. No.
5 Q. -- Maryland?
6 A. No.
7 Q. Now, you have a bill for the research
8 with respect to drug policy, don't you, so you
9 know how much was spent on that?
10 A. I suppose so, yeah.
11 Q. Okay. With respect to the remainder, do
12 you know what comprised those services?
13 A. No.
14 Q. And did you make any attempt to find out
15 what comprised those services?
16 A. No. There would be no need to. It's
17 $60,000 that was spent to do what? They told me
18 what. They told me it was all appropriate and
19 legal. I called Callahan & Gibbons. They told me
20 the same thing. I opened it all up to the press.
21 Q. Okay. Well, I want to get to what the
22 "what" was. Okay. You said $60,000 to do what.
23 They told me what. What's the "what"?
24 A. They told me that they were used to see
25 if electors in states had had requirements on the

1 qualifications of the electors, whether those
2 people would be qualified.
3 Q. As I understood your earlier testimony,
4 sir, you said that background checks had been done
5 in certain cases. And one of the examples you
6 used was a question of whether or not a person was
7 a convicted felon and, therefore, whether they
8 could legally qualify to be an elector in a
9 state.
10 Were there any other cases that you're aware
11 of, outside of whether a person was a convicted
12 felon or not, for which background checks were
13 made?
14 A. I'm not sure I understand the question.
15 Q. Okay. You've indicated in your
16 testimony that an issue you might be looking at to
17 determine whether to do a background check of an
18 elector would be to determine whether he was a
19 convicted felon or not, because in some states, if
20 you're a convicted felon, you can't be an elector
21 because you're not a voter, right?
22 A. What I said, I believe, is that not that
23 I did that or that I knew about it, but that I
24 would use as an example one of the reasons I was
25 told or one of the results I was told about that

1 came up from Illinois about whether or not the
2 person could be an elector. But it's in the
3 news --
4 Q. Do you know whether a background check
5 was done in Illinois by Callahan & Gibbons?
6 A. I believe one was. I don't know. I
7 have not seen it.
8 Q. Okay. Were you ever given by Mr.
9 Blahnik or Mr. Monroe or Mr. Melbye or anyone else
10 you spoke to at The Perot Petition Committee any
11 other reason for asking for a background check
12 with respect to an elector or state coordinator or
13 volunteer or anybody, other than a suspicion that
14 they might be a convicted felon?
15 A. No.
16 Q. So that, I take it though, outside of
17 the bill that talks about the report on drug
18 policy and the bill which specifically talks about
19 the state of Maryland, security services to the
20 state of Maryland, if I were to go through those
21 exhibits and say, well, did you find out what this
22 particular invoice is for, you wouldn't be able to
23 tell me.
24 A. Absolutely not.
25 Q. You testified also about an interview

Page 213

that you had with Callahan & Gibbons. What exactly, as best you can recall, did whoever you spoke to at Callahan & Gibbons tell you they had done?

A. They had told me -- they told me they had looked into the public records to see whether people had moved frequently, to see if they had conviction records, that they used the phrase which I mentioned earlier that everything they did was information that could be purchased from public record companies that collect this sort of data on people.

They used an example, if I remember right, of subscription lists to magazines and things of that nature. But they were adamant that nothing was done that was improper. I told them if something was done improper, that we would take action against them, that it would be incumbent upon us to do so.

Q. I understand that part of your testimony, that they assured you that they felt that they had done nothing improper; and you assured them that you were concerned about that.

But what I'm asking is: What exactly did they tell you that they did?

Page 214

A. I can't recall the specific conversation.

Q. Okay.

A. Or the details of it.

Q. Did they indicate to you that they had received any information with respect to volunteers or electors or coordinators or whoever, that they had not turned over to The Perot Petition Committee?

A. No.

Q. Did you go over their bills with them and ask them what it was they had done?

A. No.

Q. Did they talk to you at all about any other services they had used, subcontractors, other individuals, other portions of searches which had been done, by people other than themselves?

A. No.

Q. They did not. Did you ask them whether they had -- whether they had control of their entire investigation or whether some portions had been subcontracted out to other people who were not necessarily under their control?

A. No. I probably should have, but I just

Page 215

didn't know how these entities operate.

Q. Did they talk to you at all about a firm by the name of North American Advisory, Inc.?

A. No.

Q. In Chicago, Illinois or the Chicago metropolitan area?

A. No.

Q. Did they talk to you at all about O'Connell & Associates, a private investigating firm in the northeast, in New England?

A. No. I've subsequently become aware of them because of the litigation.

Q. Right. Did they speak to you at all about a firm in Ohio by the name of Research Associates?

A. No.

Q. Did they indicate to you -- well, when you were talking to Blahnik and Monroe and perhaps Melbye about what was done, did you inquire as to who had actually ordered background investigations from Callahan & Gibbons?

A. Yes. I asked how this happened, how Callahan & Gibbons became a customer or a service provider to the campaign. And they told me what I testified to earlier, that in my absence, they

Page 216

called Tom Barr as an attorney because they wanted legal advice on whether or not they could get a restraining order on some -- one volunteer versus another.

Q. I don't mean to interrupt you but --

A. That's fine.

Q. -- I understand that testimony. I thought I was asking something different. What I'm asking is: In each individual instance in which background checks were ordered, did you make any attempt to find out who had ordered the background check with respect to any particular individual?

MR. BUDNER: And when you say "you," you mean Clay personally.

MR. STRIBLING: I mean Clay personally in his investigation, yes.

THE WITNESS: Yes. In a general sense, in the sense that you're meeting with a group of people and you -- I asked, why was this done? And they would say, because we had this problem here or this issue there. And the person that would have been involved with that state ensuring that what needed to be done legally to get on the ballot was there. And I assumed that

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
EASTERN DIVISION

MARK DOTZLER, KEVIN LAUGHLIN, EDWARD DYCK, AND CARRIE ALSPAW, Plaintiffs,
vs.
THE PEROT PETITION COMMITTEE, EQUIFAX CREDIT INFORMATION SERVICES, INC., RUSS MELBYE, AND SANDRA STONE McCLURE, Defendants.

CONSOLIDATED CIVIL ACTION NO. 4:94CV887 GFG

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION

KEVIN LAUGHLIN, EDWARD DYCK, CARRIE ALSPAW, AND MARK DOTZLER, Plaintiffs,
vs.
ROSS PEROT, MARK ALAN BLAMMIK AND THE CALLAHAN & GIBBONS GROUP, INC., Defendants.

CONSOLIDATED CIVIL ACTION NO. 3-95-CV-2577-R

ORAL DEPOSITION OF
J. MICHAEL POSS

ANSWERS AND DEPOSITION OF J. MICHAEL POSS, a witness produced on behalf of the Plaintiff, taken in the above styled and numbered cause at 9:46

A.M. on the 29th of May, 1996, before R. Michael Buie, a Certified Shorthand Reporter in and for the State of Texas, at the Law Office of Hughes & Luce, L.L.P., 1717 Main Street, Suite 2800, located in the City of Dallas, County of Dallas, State of Texas, pursuant to Amended Notice of Deposition and in accordance with the stipulation hereinafter set forth.

• • • • •

APPEARANCES

MR. F. JOHN REEKS
Bodenheimer, Jones, Klotz & Simmons
509 Milam Street
Shreveport, Louisiana 71101
APPEARING FOR THE PLAINTIFFS, KEVIN LAUGHLIN, EDWARD DYCK AND CARRIE ALSPAW

MR. MARK DOTZLER
2222 Menard
St. Louis, Missouri 73104
APPEARING AS PLAINTIFF PRO SE

MS. KIM JUANITA ASKEW and
MR. CRAIG W. BUDNER
Hughes & Luce, L.L.P.
1717 Main Street, Suite 2800
Dallas, Texas 75201
APPEARING FOR THE DEFENDANTS, THE PEROT PETITION COMMITTEE, ROSS PEROT, RUSS MELBYE AND MARK ALAN BLAMMIK

(APPEARANCES CONTINUED)

MR. G. CARROLL STRIBLING, JR.
Biercher & Hocker, P.C.
231 South Bemiston, Eighth Floor
St. Louis, (Clayton), Missouri 63105
APPEARING FOR THE DEFENDANT, EQUIFAX CREDIT INFORMATION SERVICES, INC.

ALSO PRESENT: Edward Dyck
Kevin Laughlin

• • • • •

EXAMINATION INDEX

EXAMINATION	PAGE
BY MR. REEKS	5
BY MR. STRIBLING	115
BY MR. DOTZLER	124
BY MS. ASKEW	130
FURTHER EXAMINATION	
BY MR. STRIBLING	152
BY MR. DOTZLER	153
BY MR. REEKS	154
BY MS. ASKEW	157
BY MR. DOTZLER	158
BY MR. REEKS	160
BY MS. ASKEW	161

EXHIBIT INDEX

DEPOSITION	PAGE
NO. 60 Affidavit of Mike Poss	54
NO. 61 Document labeled "Statement of Organization"	54

(EXHIBIT INDEX CONTINUED)

DEPOSITION	PAGE
NO. 62 4-7-92 Memorandum, Perot Petition Committee to State Coordinators re Campaign Finance Procedures	58
NO. 63 Signature Authorization for Unincorporated Not for Profit Organizations	61
NO. 64 Marked but not unidentified nor provided for attachment	64
NO. 65 4-27-92 Memorandum, John Richards to All District Coordinators re Congressional District Treasurers and Bank Accounts	65
NO. 66 3-20-92 Letter, Ross Perot to Federal Election Commission	84
NO. 67 Declaration of Candidacy for President of the United States	85
NO. 68 Document labeled "Sworn Declaration"	85
NO. 69 Packet of documents labeled "Schedule B, Itemized Disbursements"	88
NO. 70 11-29-93 Letter, Edward Dyck to The Perot Group (Poss)	101
NO. 71 12-11-93 Letter, Perot '92 (Poss) to Edward Dyck	101
NO. 72 12-11-93 Letter, Mark Dotzler to The Perot Group (Poss)	128
NO. 73 12-20-93 Letter, Perot '92 (Poss) to Mark Dotzler	129

EXHIBIT
I

COPY

EXHIBITS IN SEPARATE BINDER

29

Page 5

1 J. MICHAEL POSS,
2 the witness hereinbefore named, being first duly
3 cautioned and sworn to testify the truth, the
4 whole truth and nothing but the truth, testified
5 on his oath as follows:
6 THE REPORTER: Would you state your
7 stipulation, please.
8 MR. REEKS: Okay. This deposition
9 is taken pursuant to the Federal Rules. Mr. Poss,
10 would you --
11 MS. ASKEW: And we're taking it in
12 both cases, the Missouri and the Dallas
13 litigation.
14 MR. REEKS: Right. In both cases.
15 EXAMINATION
16 BY MR. REEKS:
17 Q. Mr. Poss, would you please state your
18 full name and address.
19 A. James Michael Poss, 6405 Mercedes
20 Avenue, Dallas, Texas, 75214.
21 Q. Okay. And, Mr. Poss, you've had your
22 deposition taken before?
23 A. Yes, I have.
24 Q. Okay. And I'm going to be asking you
25 some questions today about your knowledge of

Page 6

1 events that occurred during the 1992 presidential
2 campaign and the petition effort for Mr. Perot.
3 If I ask you any questions that you're not
4 clear about or don't understand, please stop me
5 and ask me to go back and reask the question. Is
6 that agreeable?
7 A. Yes, it is.
8 Q. And if you answer a question, we'll
9 understand that you understood the question. Is
10 that agreeable?
11 A. Yes, it is.
12 Q. Prior to coming here today, did you
13 discuss your deposition with anyone?
14 A. Yes, I did.
15 Q. Okay. With whom?
16 A. With Ms. Askew and with Craig Budner.
17 Q. Okay. No one else?
18 A. No one else.
19 Q. Have you discussed the depositions of
20 any of the other parties or witnesses that have
21 been taken in this case?
22 A. No, I have not.
23 Q. Have you read any of the prior
24 depositions that have been taken in this case?
25 A. No, I have not.

Page 7

1 Q. The Court Reporter reminded me that
2 we've been forgetting to ask in these depositions
3 about reading and signing the deposition. And for
4 the record, would you like to read and sign the
5 deposition after it's been transcribed by the
6 Court Reporter?
7 MS. ASKEW: Yes.
8 THE WITNESS: Yes, I would.
9 MS. ASKEW: And I would agree to
10 signature before any notary.
11 MR. REEKS: Okay.
12 MS. ASKEW: And that will apply,
13 just so the record is clear, as to all witnesses
14 that you have deposed that we have presented for
15 deposition -- Russ Monroe, Russ Melbye, Joe Grant,
16 Mark Blahnik.
17 MR. REEKS: That's agreeable.
18 Thank you, Ms. Askew.
19 Q. Mr. Poss, just by way of background, let
20 me get some information about your education. Did
21 you go to college?
22 A. Yes, I did.
23 Q. Okay. And where did you go to college?
24 A. The University of Texas at Austin.
25 Q. Okay. And what course of study did you

Page 8

1 engage in at the University of Texas?
2 A. Accounting.
3 Q. And did you receive a degree in
4 accounting?
5 A. I did.
6 Q. And it was a B.A.?
7 A. B.B.A.
8 Q. B.B.A.? Okay. And when was that?
9 A. 1973.
10 Q. And did you do any postgraduate work?
11 A. I did.
12 Q. Okay. And where was that?
13 A. That was at the University of Texas at
14 Austin.
15 Q. And what was that in?
16 A. That was in law.
17 Q. Went to law school?
18 A. I did.
19 Q. And did you get a juris doctor?
20 A. I did.
21 Q. And when was your juris doctor awarded?
22 A. 1976.
23 Q. Have you been engaged in the practice of
24 law since getting out of law school?
25 A. No, I have not.

Page 9

1 Q. Any other college level or later work
2 that you've done?
3 A. No.
4 Q. Did you go -- directly from receiving
5 your accounting degree at U.T. did you go directly
6 into law school?
7 A. Yes, I did.
8 Q. And there wasn't a period of time when
9 you were in the work force as a full-time employee
10 of some -- other than like maybe a summer job?
11 A. There was just a summer job between
12 graduation and the beginning of law school.
13 Q. Okay. And where was that?
14 A. That was in Austin, Texas.
15 Q. And what were you doing?
16 A. I was working for a defense contractor.
17 Q. And after you finished law school in
18 1976, what did you do?
19 A. I went to work for Arthur Young &
20 Company here in Dallas, Texas.
21 Q. And that's a C.P.A. firm?
22 A. It is.
23 Q. And what was your position when you
24 started out with Arthur Young?
25 A. I was a tax accountant.

Page 1

1 Q. And how long were you with Arthur Young
2 & Company?
3 A. Three years.
4 Q. And would that have been through about
5 1979?
6 A. It would be.
7 Q. And what did you do after that?
8 A. I went to work for Ross Perot.
9 Q. In about 1979?
10 A. Yes.
11 Q. And what kind of work did you do when
12 you went to work for Mr. Perot?
13 A. Tax accounting.
14 Q. Had you come into contact with Mr. Perot
15 when you were with Arthur Young & Company?
16 A. Yes, I had.
17 Q. And how did you come into contact with
18 Mr. Perot?
19 A. I was assigned to work on the tax
20 returns for Mr. Perot, and I was working on the
21 tax returns for Electronic Data Systems.
22 Q. And after you left Arthur Young, were
23 you doing similar type work for Mr. Perot?
24 A. Primarily the same type of work for Mr.
25 Perot that I had been doing for Mr. Perot in the

Page 11

1 employment of Arthur Young.
2 Q. Okay. And were you the person that put
3 together the final tax returns after 1979 when you
4 went to work for Mr. Perot?
5 A. Yes, I was.
6 Q. And were those checked by Arthur Young &
7 Company?
8 A. Yes. They were reviewed by Arthur Young
9 & Company.
10 Q. And since 1979, have you been working
11 for Ross Perot during that entire period?
12 A. Yes, I have been.
13 Q. Have you been working for Ross Perot
14 individually or for one of his corporations or
15 other entities?
16 A. I was actually employed by Electronic
17 Data Systems, starting in 1979, and worked for
18 Electronic Data Systems until 1986.
19 Q. Okay. And when you were employed by
20 Electronic Data Systems or Data Systems, did you
21 do their tax returns as well?
22 A. No. I would like to add that I was
23 employed by Electronic Data Systems; but my salary
24 was reimbursed by Mr. Perot to the corporation,
25 Electronic Data Systems.

Page 1

1 Q. Okay. You did not perform functions for
2 Electronic Data Systems?
3 A. No, I did not.
4 Q. And you worked -- you were employed by
5 Electronic Data Systems until 1986?
6 A. That's correct.
7 Q. And who did you go to work for in 1986?
8 A. The Perot Group.
9 Q. And what is The Perot Group?
10 A. The Perot Group is an unincorporated
11 sole proprietorship of Ross Perot.
12 Q. And what functions does it perform?
13 A. Primarily it functions as a family
14 office organization for the Perot family.
15 Q. And how many employees does The Perot
16 Group have?
17 A. Approximately 50 to 60.
18 Q. And does The Perot Group manage the
19 various businesses and other entities that Mr.
20 Perot has an interest in?
21 A. It does.
22 Q. And you've been working for The Perot
23 Group since 1986?
24 A. Yes. However, there was a change of
25 name in approximately June of 1992.

41

do it.
Q. And he didn't give you any option for saying, no, thanks, I'd rather not?
A. No.
Q. Just basically instructed you to do that?
A. Yes.
Q. And you were his employee at the time?
A. Yes.
Q. And you worked for The Perot Group?
A. Yes.
Q. Was there ever any concern that your duties with The Perot Petition Committee would interfere with your job at The Perot Group?
A. No.
Q. Did you ever have any discussion like that with Mr. Perot?
A. No, none.
Q. What did your job as treasurer for The Perot Petition Committee involve?
A. It involved signing checks, setting up the accounting system for The Perot Petition Committee, hiring the accounting staff that would be needed for The Perot Petition Committee.
Q. When you say signing checks, did that

involve reviewing invoices for services or goods and things of that nature?
A. Only in a high-level review capacity.
Q. Explain that to me.
A. We developed a staff of accountants who would review the invoices that were submitted for payment, and they would make sure that we had proper authorization to pay those invoices.
Q. And when you say you had high-level review, would you review only larger bills; or would you review them after they had been previously reviewed by other accountants?
A. I reviewed them after they had been reviewed by other accountants.
Q. Did you have any training or instruction with regard to what you were going to be doing as treasurer of The Perot Petition Committee?
A. No, I did not.
Q. Did you basically learn on the job?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Did you have any instruction or training with regard to Federal Election Commission guidelines or rules?
A. No, I did not.
Q. Did you read any materials on Federal

Election Commission guidelines, rules?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. And what all did you review?
A. I don't recall the exact title of the brochures, but the Federal Election Commission publishes a number of documents, and I reviewed those.
Q. Okay. Was part of your responsibility as treasurer of The Perot Petition Committee to ensure compliance with FEC reporting guidelines?
A. Yes, it was.
Q. And did you also have any responsibility for ensuring compliance with FEC reporting guidelines by the various state petition organizations?
A. No, I did not have -- I did not have authority, or I did not have -- I had no reason to file -- or I had no reason at that time to worry about the state organizations.
Q. Okay. At some time did you become responsible for the filing of state organizations in compliance with FEC guidelines?
A. I was not responsible for the filing by the state organizations of their material.
Q. Did you ever at any time request that

the state petition organizations forward their filing information to you for filing under The Perot Petition Committee?
A. I suggested that they did.
Q. And when was that?
A. That was in early April, I believe.
Q. And did any of the states take advantage of your suggestion?
A. I believe some of them did, yes.
Q. Did the state of Missouri?
A. I do not recall.
Q. Were you also responsible for assisting the state organizations with setting up bank accounts and taking care of their financial, the financial part of their business?
MS. ASKEW: Object to the compound nature of the question.
Q. Okay. Let me -- do you understand the question?
A. No -- repeat it, please.
Q. Okay. I'll break it down. Were you responsible for assisting the states in setting up bank accounts?
A. No.
Q. Did you assist states in setting up bank

42

1 Rollins in June of 1992?
2 A. Mr. Rollins brought with him or brought
3 into the campaign a number of individuals who had
4 worked with him in prior campaigns. And one of
5 those people was named Charlie Leonard.
6 Q. Would anybody from The Perot Petition
7 Committee that we've discussed previously, such as
8 Mr. Blahnik or Mr. Monroe, have reported to Mr.
9 Rollins?
10 A. Not to my knowledge.
11 Q. Did Tom Luce ever meet with you to
12 discuss financial matters with The Perot Petition
13 Committee?
14 A. No.
15 Q. Did he ever ask you to keep him advised
16 of how much money was being spent?
17 A. No.
18 Q. Did you ever discuss any other matters
19 dealing with The Perot Petition Committee with Mr.
20 Luce?
21 A. No.
22 Q. Did you ever see Mr. Luce?
23 A. I would see him, yes.
24 Q. Okay. Did you do any -- did you have
25 any conversations with Mr. Luce other than, you

1 know, saying hi in the hallway?
2 A. No, I don't recall any.
3 MR. REEKS: You want to take a
4 short break?
5 MS. ASKEW: Sure.
6 (Recess at 10:52 to 11:01.)
7 (DEPOSITION EXHIBIT NO. 60 IDENTIFIED.)
8 Q. Mr. Poss, back after the short break.
9 I'm going to show you a document that I've marked
10 as Exhibit 60 and ask if you can identify that
11 document.
12 A. Yes, I can.
13 Q. Okay. And is that your signature?
14 A. Yes, it is.
15 Q. Is that a true and correct copy of an
16 affidavit that you signed on June 21st, 1994?
17 A. Yes, it is.
18 Q. A couple of things that I forgot to ask
19 you previously. Do you know who hired or selected
20 Mark Blahnik to work for The Perot Petition
21 Committee?
22 A. I believe Ross Perot did.
23 (DEPOSITION EXHIBIT NO. 61 IDENTIFIED.)
24 Q. Let me show you another document. It
25 may already be in evidence. I've marked this

1 document as Exhibit No. 61 and ask if you are
2 familiar with that document.
3 A. Yes, I am.
4 Q. And what is this?
5 A. This is an FEC document.
6 Q. Okay. And what is the purpose of this
7 FEC document?
8 A. It designates a treasurer of The Perot
9 Petition Committee and an assistant treasurer.
10 Q. Did you prepare -- I know you didn't
11 prepare the form. But did you fill out the form
12 and sign the form?
13 A. I signed the form. I don't recall who
14 actually prepared the form.
15 Q. Okay. Is the information in the form
16 true and correct, to the best of your knowledge
17 and belief?
18 A. Yes, it is.
19 Q. And is this a true and correct copy of
20 the statement of organization which you signed on
21 behalf of The Perot Petition Committee?
22 A. Yes, it is.
23 Q. It lists Russ Monroe as assistant
24 treasurer?
25 A. That is correct.

1 Q. Did Russ Monroe answer to you with The
2 Perot Petition Committee?
3 A. No, he did not.
4 Q. What was his function as assistant
5 treasurer with The Perot Petition Committee?
6 A. He would sign checks in my absence.
7 Q. Was there any limitation placed on his
8 authority to sign checks?
9 A. No, there was not.
10 Q. He had the same authority that you had?
11 A. Yes.
12 Q. What types of checks? Payment of any
13 vendors or anything of that nature?
14 MS. ASKEW: What's the question?
15 Q. Okay. What kind of checks would Mr.
16 Monroe sign?
17 A. Actually I'm not certain that Mr. Monroe
18 ever signed any checks at all.
19 Q. Okay. But he was there if needed?
20 A. Correct.
21 Q. Are you aware of any instances where you
22 were not available to sign checks and Mr. Monroe
23 signed checks?
24 A. No, I am not.
25 Q. Did Mr. Monroe have authority to

43

Page 69

1 Q. At some point did the various state
2 organizations become what you refer to as state-
3 affiliated committees?
4 A. At some point in time -- and I don't
5 recall at what point in time that was -- some of
6 the states did become affiliated, yes.
7 Q. And what was the significance of a state
8 organization becoming a state-affiliated
9 committee?
10 A. The only real significance had to do
11 with FEC reporting.
12 Q. And what was the -- how did FEC
13 reporting have any impact or any role in a state
14 becoming a state-affiliated committee?
15 A. Would you ask that question again?
16 Q. How did the FEC rules play a role in a
17 state becoming a state-affiliated committee?
18 MS. ASKEW: Object to the extent it
19 calls for a legal conclusion. But you may answer
20 the question.
21 THE WITNESS: The reporting to the
22 FEC for the activities that were occurring in the
23 states could then be reported on the FEC report
24 that was filed by The Perot Petition Committee
25 from Dallas.

Page 70

1 Q. And how would you get the information
2 from the various states to file with the FEC?
3 A. That was provided by the -- by a
4 volunteer from one of the state organizations.
5 Q. And what types of information would be
6 given by the state organization to The Perot
7 Petition Committee for filing?
8 A. They would provide the names, the
9 addresses and job descriptions of the donors or
10 the contributors to the campaign on the receipt
11 side. On the disbursement side they would provide
12 names of vendors, amounts paid and dates checks
13 were written.
14 Q. Would they also provide information such
15 as if a volunteer incurred an expense and sought
16 reimbursement? Would that kind of information be
17 provided?
18 A. I believe so.
19 Q. Were there any controls over how the
20 funds in the various, in the state-affiliated
21 committees could be used?
22 A. We exercised no control over those
23 funds.
24 Q. Do you know whether the state of
25 Missouri was a state-affiliated committee?

Page 71

1 A. I do not know.
2 Q. If a state had sent FEC forms to the PPC
3 in April for receipts and disbursements in March,
4 would that state be an affiliated committee as far
5 as The Perot Petition Committee was concerned?
6 A. I do not know what the criteria was for
7 becoming an affiliated committee.
8 Q. Who was responsible for setting up that
9 designation of state-affiliated committees?
10 A. Clay Mulford.
11 Q. Did you have any discussions with Mr.
12 Mulford about setting up the designation of
13 state-affiliated committees?
14 A. No.
15 Q. If states would send the FEC forms for
16 filing with The Perot Petition Committee's FEC
17 report, would you be responsible for reviewing
18 those forms?
19 A. No.
20 Q. Who would be responsible for reviewing
21 those forms?
22 A. Bob Daniel and the people from Ernst &
23 Young that we had employed to help us process the
24 FEC reports.
25 Q. Did you have any personal involvement in

Page 72

1 any of the FEC filings or reporting?
2 A. I reviewed the forms, and I signed the
3 forms.
4 Q. Are you familiar with a firm called The
5 Callahan & Gibbons Group?
6 A. I am.
7 Q. And how are you familiar with The
8 Callahan & Gibbons Group?
9 A. I became familiar with them when I
10 signed some checks to them.
11 Q. What checks did you sign to The Callahan
12 & Gibbons Group?
13 A. I don't remember the specific checks. I
14 just know that I had signed some checks to them.
15 Q. Were those for services rendered?
16 A. They were for services, yes.
17 Q. And do you know what type services The
18 Callahan & Gibbons Group performed for Perot
19 Petition Committee?
20 A. During what time?
21 Q. During April, May and June of 1992.
22 A. I was under the mistaken impression
23 during that time period that they were performing
24 legal services, what I now know to be a mistaken
25 impression.

44

Page 73

1 Q. Okay. How did you gain that impression
2 that they were performing legal services?
3 A. From our controller at The Perot
4 Petition Committee.
5 Q. And who was that?
6 A. Bob Daniel.
7 Q. And do you know how Bob Daniel came to
8 understand that Callahan & Gibbons was a law firm
9 or was performing legal services?
10 A. No, I do not.
11 Q. Have you discussed it with Mr. Daniel?
12 A. No, I have not.
13 Q. When did you learn that the work that
14 Callahan & Gibbons Group was doing was not legal
15 services?
16 A. I believe I learned that in September
17 of '92.
18 Q. And what are the circumstances of your
19 learning of that information?
20 A. I learned that, I believe, from Mark
21 Blahnik.
22 Q. And was that in a conversation you had
23 with Mr. Blahnik?
24 A. Yes.
25 Q. Okay. What did Mr. Blahnik tell you?

Page 74

1 A. I don't recall exactly what he told me.
2 Q. Who had initiated the conversation
3 concerning Callahan & Gibbons?
4 A. I don't recall that.
5 Q. Do you believe it occurred in September?
6 A. I believe so.
7 Q. Was it in The Perot Petition Committee
8 offices or Perot '92 offices?
9 A. Yes, it was.
10 Q. Or '96?
11 A. Yes, it was.
12 Q. Are you familiar with who retained
13 Callahan & Gibbons for The Perot Petition
14 Committee?
15 A. No, I'm not.
16 Q. Do you know how The Perot Petition
17 Committee became knowledgeable of the Callahan &
18 Gibbons Group?
19 A. I believe they were suggested or
20 referred to The Perot Petition Committee by an
21 attorney named Thomas Barr.
22 Q. And what was Mr. Barr's relation to the
23 Perot Petition Committee?
24 A. Mr. Barr was serving as an adviser to
25 The Perot Petition Committee.

Page 75

1 Q. Was that his only title or designation?
2 A. There were no titles. That's the best
3 description I can give to him.
4 Q. Was he paid by the Perot Petition
5 Committee?
6 A. No, he was not.
7 Q. And to your knowledge, what was Mr.
8 Barr's connection with The Callahan & Gibbons
9 Group?
10 A. I don't know his connection there.
11 Q. Had you ever heard of the Callahan &
12 Gibbons Group prior to them doing work for The
13 Perot Petition Committee?
14 A. Never.
15 Q. Had you ever heard of Richard Callahan?
16 A. No.
17 Q. Or John Callahan?
18 A. No.
19 Q. Or John Gibbons?
20 A. No.
21 Q. Do you know who requested that Callahan
22 & Gibbons Group perform background checks or
23 investigations upon electors and volunteers in the
24 various states?
25 A. I do not.

Page 76

1 Q. You received the bills from Callahan &
2 Gibbons; is that right?
3 A. They were received by The Perot Petition
4 Committee, yes.
5 Q. And did you review the bills?
6 A. No, I did not.
7 Q. I'm going to show you, starting with, I
8 believe it's Exhibit 12 through 20, and ask that
9 you look at those statements from The Callahan &
10 Gibbons Group. I believe they're addressed to
11 Mark Blahnik, each of them.
12 A. Uh-huh.
13 Q. And ask if you recall any of those bills
14 or statements.
15 A. All right.
16 Q. Okay. Are you familiar with any of the
17 statements that are shown in Exhibits 12 through
18 20?
19 A. Yes, I am.
20 Q. Okay. And when did you become familiar
21 with those exhibits?
22 A. I recall seeing some of the exhibits as
23 early as, say, August of '92.
24 Q. Did you have any role in approving
25 payment of the invoices represented by those

1 exhibits?
2 A. No, I did not.
3 Q. Who would have done that?
4 A. Probably Mark Blahnik.
5 Q. Okay. And there's a paid stamp up at
6 the top. Is that internal with The Perot Petition
7 Committee, or is that from The Callahan & Gibbons
8 Group, or do you know?
9 A. I do not know. I don't recall that
10 stamp from The Perot Petition Committee.
11 Q. Looking at Exhibit No. 12, which is a
12 statement -- is that what you have in front of
13 you?
14 A. Yes.
15 Q. -- which is a statement directed to Mr.
16 Blahnik from The Callahan & Gibbons Group -- and I
17 don't have my copy. But it's for $5,930.86.
18 A. Yes.
19 Q. Do you know what those services
20 represent?
21 A. I do not.
22 Q. Looking over at No. 13, Exhibit No. 13,
23 it's a statement for $18,000 even. Do you know
24 what those services represent?
25 A. No, I don't.

1 Q. Looking over at 14, there's a statement
2 for $3,505. Do you know what services that
3 invoice represents?
4 A. No, I do not.
5 Q. Did you ever perform any review of the
6 invoices that were submitted by Callahan & Gibbons
7 to determine what the nature of the services were
8 that were performed?
9 A. No, I did not.
10 Q. Looking over at Exhibit 21, that's a
11 statement from The Callahan & Gibbons Group and
12 previously identified. It's addressed to Mr.
13 Blahnik for $18,000. And under the reference it
14 says -- and if you would read it because I don't
15 have my copy. Would you read it for the record.
16 A. "Confidential inquiries and physical
17 security services, state of Maryland."
18 Q. Okay. And I ask you to look back at
19 Exhibit No. 13. And Exhibit 13 and Exhibit 21 are
20 for the same amount. And they've got the same
21 client number, invoice number and matter number.
22 Do you know why the reference that's contained in
23 those statements are different?
24 A. No, I do not.
25 Q. You never had any conversations with

1 Callahan & Gibbons concerning description of the
2 services in the invoices they were submitting?
3 A. I've never spoken to anybody at Callahan
4 & Gibbons.
5 Q. What is your understanding -- in various
6 of the invoices that are in Exhibits 13 through --
7 or 12 through 20 there are references to security
8 services. Do you know what that involved?
9 A. My understanding is that involved
10 security services provided with respect to the
11 state of Maryland.
12 Q. Okay. For all of those? For all of the
13 invoices?
14 A. That was my understanding at the time,
15 yes.
16 Q. Did you gain another understanding at
17 some subsequent point?
18 A. No, not really.
19 Q. When you say "not really," you appear to
20 be hedging a little bit. Have you heard any
21 information concerning what those invoices may
22 represent?
23 A. I have heard an allegation that has
24 something to do with background investigations.
25 Q. And who did you hear that from?

1 A. From my attorney.
2 Q. Okay. Have you heard anything about
3 background investigations in your conversations
4 with anyone in The Perot Petition Committee?
5 A. Not to my knowledge.
6 Q. Okay. With Mr. Mulford?
7 A. No.
8 Q. Mr. Blahnik?
9 A. No.
10 Q. Mr. Monroe?
11 A. No.
12 Q. Have you seen press accounts of
13 background investigations with regard to
14 volunteers?
15 A. I have seen none.
16 MR. STRIBLING: I beg your pardon,
17 sir. What was your answer?
18 THE WITNESS: Was the question,
19 have I seen press releases or press --
20 Q. Press reporting of background
21 investigations in --
22 A. No. I have seen no news clippings or
23 news articles.
24 Q. Okay. Have you ever had any discussions
25 with Mr. Perot concerning background

46

Page 81

1 investigations of electors or volunteers in the
2 states during the 1992 petition effort or
3 campaign?
4 A. No.
5 Q. I'll refer you over in the book to
6 Exhibit No. 26. And that's a document that has
7 written at the top of it Case Opening File. And
8 it was produced to us by Callahan & Gibbons. Are
9 you familiar with that document?
10 A. I have never seen this document.
11 Q. Okay. Do you have any knowledge
12 concerning why Callahan & Gibbons might have
13 listed the ultimate client to be H. Ross Perot?
14 A. No, I do not.
15 Q. Let me get that back from you real
16 quick.
17 A. (Hands to counsel)
18 Q. I'm going to show you a document that's
19 been previously identified as Exhibit No. 22,
20 Blahnik No. 22, and ask if you are familiar with
21 that document. For the record, I believe it's a
22 portion of a Federal Election Commission filing.
23 A. I am familiar with this document.
24 Q. Okay. And in that document there's a
25 listing of payments to The Callahan & Gibbons

Page 82

1 Group?
2 A. That is correct.
3 Q. And those payments are shown to be legal
4 fees?
5 A. That is correct.
6 Q. And that's for the reasons that -- did
7 you place the -- strike that last question. Did
8 you make the entries on that report that those
9 payments were for legal fees?
10 A. No, I did not make those entries.
11 Q. Okay. Would you have reviewed and
12 signed off on that report when it went to the
13 Federal Election Commission?
14 A. Yes, I would have.
15 Q. And was that done when you were under
16 the impression that those were legal fees?
17 A. Yes.
18 Q. Did you ever file any amended filing to
19 correct that error?
20 A. I believe we did, but I'm not exactly
21 certain that we did.
22 Q. During the time period of April, May and
23 June of 1992, where did the funding for The Perot
24 Petition Committee come from?
25 A. It came from contributions from various

Page 83

1 individuals, and it came from Mr. Perot.
2 Q. How much did Mr. Perot contribute to The
3 Perot Petition Committee during that period of
4 time?
5 A. I don't recall the exact amount.
6 Q. Would those be the funds that you
7 transferred from Mr. Perot's account into the
8 account of the Perot Petition Committee?
9 A. Yes.
10 Q. And you would have known at that time
11 how much was being transferred?
12 A. Yes.
13 Q. How much were you receiving from other
14 sources, other than Mr. Perot, during that time
15 period?
16 A. The amount was not significant in terms
17 of the total amount that Mr. Perot was
18 contributing.
19 Q. Okay. If you were to assign a
20 percentage, what percentage would you assign to
21 the amount that Mr. Perot was contributing as
22 opposed to other contributions?
23 A. 95 percent.
24 Q. I'm going to show you some other
25 documents. And these may have been already

Page 84

1 introduced, but I'm not sure. What number was the
2 last?
3 A. Here's 65.
4 Q. I believe 66.
5 (DEPOSITION EXHIBIT NO. 66 IDENTIFIED.)
6 MR. STRIBLING: This is 66?
7 MR. REEKS: Yes.
8 Q. I'm going to show you a document that's
9 been marked as Exhibit No. 66 and ask if you are
10 familiar with that document.
11 A. I am familiar with it.
12 Q. Okay. Did you have any role in the
13 preparation of that document?
14 A. I did not.
15 Q. What is the purpose of that document?
16 A. The purpose of the document, to the best
17 of my understanding, is to attempt to comply with
18 the FEC regulations.
19 Q. Are you familiar with Mr. Perot's
20 signature?
21 A. I am.
22 Q. Is that his signature at the bottom?
23 A. That appears to be his signature, yes.
24 it does.
25 Q. Is that a true and correct copy of the

Page 133

1 and Clay Mulford?
2 A. No, he did not.
3 Q. Did he supervise any other employees
4 with The Perot Petition Committee?
5 A. No.
6 Q. Did he have any official function
7 whatsoever with The Perot Petition Committee?
8 A. No.
9 Q. Now, you've talked about media, data
10 processing, field operations, the fact that you
11 hired staff, temporary staff, FEC reporting,
12 volunteers. Was Ross Perot, the candidate,
13 involved in any of those activities on behalf of
14 The Perot Petition Committee for the period, March
15 through June 1992?
16 A. No, he was not.
17 Q. Were you involved with The Perot
18 Petition Committee on a daily basis during this
19 period, March through June of 1992?
20 A. Yes, I was.
21 Q. Okay. If Ross Perot had been involved
22 in those types of activities on behalf of The
23 Perot Petition Committee during this period, is
24 this something you would have had knowledge of?
25 A. Yes.

Page 134

1 Q. Now, was The Perot Petition Committee
2 actually located in the offices of Ross Perot, The
3 Perot Group, Perot Services or any of the other
4 Perot-related entities that we've talked about
5 here today?
6 A. No.
7 Q. Where were those offices located?
8 A. At the outset, they were located on the
9 eleventh floor of the building that houses the
10 Perot Group offices. At a later point in time the
11 office was moved to 6606 Hillcrest Parkway.
12 Q. Was Mr. Perot, The Perot Group, Perot
13 Services or any of the other businesses in which
14 Mr. Perot might have been involved in, ever housed
15 on the eleventh floor or the second floor that you
16 have mentioned?
17 A. No.
18 Q. When The Perot Petition Committee
19 operations moved to Hillcrest, did Mr. Perot move
20 to that office?
21 A. No, he did not.
22 Q. Did he ever have an office in The Perot
23 Petition Committee offices?
24 A. No, he did not.
25 Q. Why were the activities of The Perot

Page 135

1 Petition Committee and their offices separate from
2 the office of Ross Perot and the other Perot-
3 related entities that you've mentioned?
4 A. In order to keep --
5 MR. REEKS: Object. Excuse me.
6 Object. Calls for legal conclusion. Calls for
7 speculation.
8 Q. Well, were you involved in the decision,
9 Mr. Poss, related to where offices would be
10 located and where the daily activities of The
11 Perot Petition Committee would be handled?
12 A. Yes, I was.
13 Q. Based on the knowledge that you have
14 from your personal involvement in those decisions,
15 would you tell the jury why the decision was made
16 to have those offices separate from the offices of
17 Ross Perot?
18 A. Because they really weren't the
19 activities of Ross Perot. We wanted to keep them
20 separate for that reason.
21 Q. Did Ross Perot participate in any way on
22 the decisions made on the office space for The
23 Perot Petition Committee and where it would be
24 located?
25 A. No.

Page 136

1 Q. Were those decisions that you were
2 personally involved in?
3 A. Yes.
4 Q. So if Mr. Perot had been involved in
5 those types of decisions, you would have knowledge
6 of that.
7 A. Yes.
8 Q. We talked about the petition drives. To
9 your knowledge, did Mr. Perot have any personal
10 involvement in any of these petition drives that
11 we've mentioned?
12 A. The only involvement that he had was to
13 appear at rallies at the end of the petition drive
14 to thank the volunteers for their efforts.
15 Q. Was that something arranged by The Perot
16 Petition Committee?
17 A. Yes.
18 Q. When there were issues related to FEC
19 compliance, is that something that you went to
20 Ross Perot for advice on?
21 A. No.
22 Q. Who would you go to for that type of
23 advice?
24 A. Clay Mulford.
25 Q. Now, during the period you were acting

48

AFFIDAVIT OF MIKE POSS

Re: MUR 3963 - Perot '92 and Mike Poss, as Treasurer

I, MIKE POSS, being duly sworn, depose and say:

1. During the period between March, 1992 and November, 1992, I was the Treasurer of Perot '92.

2. During the time period described above, I was exclusively employed by the Perot Group and did not receive compensation from any other source. The Perot Group is an unincorporated sole proprietorship owned by Ross Perot created for the purpose of managing Ross Perot's personal affairs.

Mike Poss
MIKE POSS

Sworn to before me this 21 day of June, 1994

Bobbie Van Pelt
Notary Public

BOBBIE VAN PELT
MY COMMISSION EXPIRES
October 5, 1996

9104583487

EXHIBIT
I
J

IN THE UNITED STATES DIST[illegible] COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT [illegible]SSOURI
EASTERN DIVISION

MARK DOTZLER, KEVIN LAUGHLIN, EDWARD DYCK, AND CARRIE ALSPAN, Plaintiffs, vs. THE PEROT PETITION COMMITTEE, EQUIFAX CREDIT INFORMATION SERVICES, INC., RUSS MELBYE, AND SANDRA STONE McCLURE, Defendants.) CONSOLIDATED CIVIL ACTION NO. 4:94CV887 GFG

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION

KEVIN LAUGHLIN, EDWARD DYCK, CARRIE ALSPAN, AND MARK DOTZLER, Plaintiffs, vs. ROSS PEROT, MARK ALAN BLANNIK AND THE CALLAHAN & GIBBONS GROUP, INC., Defendants.) CONSOLIDATED CIVIL ACTION NO. 3-95-CV-2577-R

VIDEOTAPED
ORAL DEPOSITION OF
H. ROSS PEROT

ANSWERS AND DEPOSITION OF H. ROSS PEROT, a witness produced on behalf of the Plaintiff, taken

in the above [illegible]d and numbered cause at 9:41 A.M. on the 31st day of May, 1996, before R. Michael Bule, a Certified Shorthand Reporter in and for the State of Texas, at the Law Office of Hughes & Luce, L.L.P., 1717 Main Street, Suite 2800, located in the City of Dallas, County of Dallas, State of Texas, pursuant to Notice of Deposition and in accordance with the stipulation hereinafter set forth.

* * * * *

APPEARANCES

MR. F. JOHN REEKS
Bodenheimer, Jones, Klotz & Simmons
509 Milam Street
Shreveport, Louisiana 71101
APPEARING FOR THE PLAINTIFFS, KEVIN LAUGHLIN, EDWARD DYCK AND CARRIE ALSPAN

MR. MARK DOTZLER
2222 Menard
St. Louis, Missouri 73104
APPEARING AS PLAINTIFF PRO SE

MS. KIM JUANITA ASKEW and
MR. CRAIG W. BUDNER
Hughes & Luce, L.L.P.
1717 Main Street, Suite 2800
Dallas, Texas 75201
APPEARING FOR THE DEFENDANTS, THE PEROT PETITION COMMITTEE, ROSS PEROT, RUSS MELBYE AND MARK ALAN BLANNIK

(APPEARANCES CONTINUED)

MR. G. CARROLL STRIBLING, JR.
Zierchar & Hocker, P.C.
231 South Bemiston, Eighth Floor
St. Louis, (Clayton), Missouri 63105
APPEARING FOR THE DEFENDANT, EQUIFAX CREDIT INFORMATION SERVICES, INC.

ALSO PRESENT: Edward Dyck
Kevin Laughlin

* * * * *

EXAMINATION INDEX

EXAMINATION	PAGE
BY MR. REEKS	6
BY MR. DOTZLER	74
BY MR. STRIBLING	75
BY MS. ASKEW	89
FURTHER EXAMINATION	
BY MR. DOTZLER	86
BY MR. REEKS	102
BY MS. ASKEW	107

EXHIBIT INDEX

DEPOSITION	PAGE
NO. 86 10-27-92 Article from "USA Today" entitled "Angry Perot Denends Charge of GOP"	44
NO. 87 10-20-92 Article from "The Washington Post" entitled "Campaign '92: Transcript of the Third Presidential Debate"	48

EXHIBIT INDEX

DEPOSITION	PAGE
NO. 88 12-13-93 Letter, Edward Dyck to The Perot Group (Perot)	65

CERTIFIED/UNANSWERED QUESTIONS:

Page 20, Line 5
Page 106, Line 1
Page 106, Line 19
Page 107, Line 9

EXHIBIT
K

COPY

50

1 PROCEEDINGS:
2 MS. ASKEW: With respect to the
3 videotaped portion of the deposition, it is
4 subject to the terms of the Protective Order which
5 has been agreed to by the parties. The videotape
6 portion of the deposition is to remain in the
7 custody of the Court Reporter until it is to be
8 used for some purpose in the litigation. And I
9 think all of those terms are set forth in that
10 order.
11 MR. REEKS: That's correct.
12 MR. STRIBLING: That's correct.
13 MS. ASKEW: And, of course, we are
14 taking the deposition pursuant to the Federal
15 Rules of Civil Procedure. Mr. Perot will want to
16 review and sign his deposition, and we will agree
17 to signature before any notary.
18 MR. REEKS: Okay. And this is for
19 use in both the Northern District of Texas and
20 Eastern District of Missouri litigations.
21 MS. ASKEW: That's correct.
22 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This is the
23 deposition of H. Ross Perot in the case of Mark
24 Dotzler, Et al. versus Perot Petition Committee,
25 Et al., Case No. 4:94CV887 CEG; and Kevin

1 Laughlin, et al. versus Ross Perot, Et al., Case
2 No. 3-95-CV-2577-R. The time is 9:41. We're on
3 the record.
4 * * * * *
5 H. ROSS PEROT,
6 the witness hereinbefore named, being first duly
7 cautioned and sworn to testify the truth, the
8 whole truth and nothing but the truth, testified
9 on his oath as follows:
10 EXAMINATION
11 BY MR. REEKS:
12 Q. Mr. Perot, would you please state your
13 name and address for the Court.
14 A. Henry Ross Perot, 12377 Merit Drive,
15 Dallas, Texas.
16 Q. And that's your business address?
17 A. Yes.
18 Q. Okay. My name is John Reeks, and I
19 represent the Plaintiffs or some of the Plaintiffs
20 in lawsuits that have been filed in the Northern
21 District of Texas and the Eastern District of
22 Missouri concerning certain activities that
23 occurred in the 1992 Perot petition drive and
24 election campaign.
25 I'm going to be asking you some questions

1 here today concerning your knowledge of events
2 that took place with regard to those events. If
3 you don't understand a question that I ask or it's
4 not clear to you, please ask me to go back --
5 A. Fine.
6 Q. -- and reask the question. Is that
7 agreeable?
8 A. Sure.
9 Q. And if you answer a question, we'll
10 assume that you understood the question. Is that
11 agreeable?
12 A. Fine.
13 Q. Okay. Prior to your deposition today,
14 did you have occasion to discuss your testimony or
15 the deposition with anyone else?
16 A. Just with the attorneys.
17 Q. Okay. And you've already discussed
18 reading and signing of the deposition, and I
19 understand you want to read and sign the
20 deposition after it's transcribed; is that
21 correct?
22 A. Yes.
23 MS. ASKEW: Yes. That's correct.
24 Q. Would you please tell me something about
25 your educational background.

1 A. Went -- grew up in Texas. Went to
2 public schools in Texas. Went to junior college
3 in Texas. Went to the Naval Academy.
4 Q. And when did you finish at the U.S.
5 Naval Academy?
6 A. 1953.
7 Q. And did you have a particular field of
8 study or concentration at the Naval Academy?
9 A. Everybody took the same courses. The
10 only choice you got was language.
11 Q. Okay. And what type of degree was
12 awarded to you by the Naval Academy?
13 A. Bachelor of Science in Electrical
14 Engineering.
15 Q. And after the Naval Academy, did you
16 serve in the military?
17 A. Served four years at sea.
18 Q. And that would have been through about
19 nineteen --
20 A. Fifty-seven.
21 Q. -- fifty-seven? And after your military
22 service, what did you do?
23 A. Worked for IBM for five years in data
24 processing, then started a company, Electronic
25 Data Systems.

51

1 the state of Missouri?
2 A. I don't recall any conversations about
3 Missouri.
4 Q. What about with Mr. Luce?
5 A. Same. I do not recall any conversations
6 about Missouri.
7 Q. Were you familiar with the fact that at
8 some point in time there was a decision made to
9 re-petition the state of Missouri?
10 A. No, not at that time. I've heard about
11 it in the last two or three days.
12 Q. During the months of March through June
13 of 1992, had you heard about the re-petitioning of
14 any states?
15 A. No.
16 Q. I'll show you another document. I think
17 it's in this one. I'll show you a document that's
18 dated May 19th, 1992.
19 MR. STRIBLING: Do you have an
20 exhibit number?
21 MR. REEKS: It's Exhibit No. 36.
22 MS. ASKEW: Thirty-seven.
23 MR. REEKS: I'm sorry. Thirty-
24 seven.
25 MS. ASKEW: Did you want him to

1 look at 37?
2 MR. REEKS: No. Let's look at 37
3 (sic). I'm sorry.
4 THE WITNESS: Okay.
5 MR. BUDNER: That's 37.
6 THE WITNESS: Okay.
7 Q. It appears to be a letter or memorandum
8 to Kevin Laughlin, Edward Dyck, Mark Dotzler from
9 Sandra S. McClure. Have you ever seen that
10 document before?
11 A. No.
12 Q. In the first paragraph of the document
13 it states, "For the reasons itemized
14 alphabetically below, the coordinators of the
15 Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, Eighth and
16 Ninth Congressional Districts of Missouri and The
17 Perot Petition Committee of Dallas, Texas are
18 unanimous in their decision that" -- and it goes
19 on to say that you be severed from any connection
20 or association with the Ross Perot petition drive
21 and several other statements.
22 Did you ever have any role on behalf of The
23 Perot Petition Committee in assenting or agreeing
24 to the positions taken in this letter?
25 A. No.

1 Q. Were you aware of a meeting that was
2 held in the state of Missouri on or about March
3 19th, 1992 at which time this letter was presented
4 to Mr. Dyck, Mr. Laughlin?
5 A. No.
6 Q. Were you aware that Mr. Melbye attended
7 the meeting on March 19th, 1992?
8 A. No.
9 Q. In connection with The Perot Petition
10 Committee, how often would you review the
11 disbursements and expenditures of the Perot
12 Petition Committee?
13 MS. ASKEW: Are we talking about
14 March through June of 1992?
15 MR. REEKS: During March through
16 June of 1992.
17 THE WITNESS: Again, I'm not sure
18 that I did. I think my recollection is that
19 periodically I would ask Mike how much we had
20 spent. He would tell me. You can get a much more
21 precise answer from Mike Poss.
22 Q. And did --
23 A. I was preoccupied with other things.
24 Q. Okay. During the March through June
25 time period, did you review FEC filings and things

1 of that nature?
2 A. Not that I recall. I don't know when we
3 had to start filing those. You would have to look
4 to see when we started filing those things. Do
5 you know?
6 Q. No, I don't.
7 A. Okay. I'm not even sure when we had to
8 start making those filings.
9 Q. Was there ever a time when you had to
10 start reviewing the FEC reporting forms that were
11 filed?
12 A. Did I have to sign them?
13 Q. I'm not sure.
14 A. Typically -- I mean if I had to sign
15 them, I might have flipped through them. But as
16 far as taking the time to review them, no,
17 because -- again, check with the people who know
18 all about this. But I think they are very thick,
19 detailed reports. And you're talking about hours
20 to review one. And I didn't have hours to review
21 one. So I had to let people that I trusted put
22 those things together and send them in.
23 Q. And Mr. Poss was responsible for that?
24 A. That's my understanding, yes. I believe
25 he -- he handled the FEC reporting during that

9/0435349OC

1 period.
2 Q. Did someone else handle it during other
3 periods?
4 A. I'm not sure, but you might want -- if
5 that's important to you, you might want to check
6 to see who was handling the FEC reporting later
7 on. I have a hazy recollection that we brought
8 someone in who was an expert on that who did it.
9 And I believe we had a person who came as a
10 consultant to do that.
11 Q. Were you aware of any allegations that
12 persons in the state of Missouri were subject to
13 libel, slander or defamation by people who were
14 working for the Perot petition effort?
15 A. No.
16 Q. Have you ever had any knowledge of those
17 accusations?
18 MS. ASKEW: You mean after the
19 lawsuit was filed?
20 THE WITNESS: Prior to the lawsuit,
21 no. None prior to the lawsuit.
22 Q. Okay, none prior to the lawsuit? Were
23 you aware that a press conference was held in the
24 state of Missouri on or about May 29th, 1992 by
25 Sandra McClure at which time the re-petition of

1 the state of Missouri was announced?
2 A. No.
3 Q. Are you aware of any allegations of
4 computer hacking with regard to The Perot Petition
5 Committee offices on Merit Drive?
6 A. No.
7 Q. Were you contacted by the FBI concerning
8 any allegations of computer hacking at Perot
9 Petition Committee offices?
10 A. I was not.
11 Q. You were not?
12 A. No. I'm confused. Computer hacking?
13 MS. ASKEW: You've answered it.
14 That's fine. I'll talk to you about it later.
15 Q. Mr. Perot, I note that you might have
16 been confused about the definition of computer
17 hacking. And do you -- have you ever heard the
18 term "computer hacking"?
19 A. Yes.
20 Q. Okay. In what context have you heard of
21 computer hacking?
22 A. Mainly with people on personal
23 computers. It has a wide definition. And I'm not
24 interested in trying to create definitions for
25 you. I would appreciate it if you would create a

1 definition for me.
2 Q. Well, all right. I was just asking what
3 your understanding of computer hacking was.
4 A. Well, what do you mean? What are you
5 referring to?
6 Q. Okay. Basically I'm referring to using
7 computers and using modems over phone lines to
8 make unauthorized accesses into databases.
9 MS. ASKEW: Are you talking about
10 his knowledge of computer hacking in general or
11 computer hacking as it relates to the PPC? Why
12 don't we relate this to your allegations related
13 to the PPC because we're not here to get lessons
14 on what he knows --
15 MR. REEKS: I will do that, Ms.
16 Askew. But I just wanted to be sure that me and
17 Mr. Perot were kind of talking on the same
18 definitional basis.
19 MS. ASKEW: I think if you relate
20 it to the PPC, he will tell you what he knows.
21 THE WITNESS: Be specific. I'll
22 try to answer.
23 Q. Okay. Specifically I was referring to
24 the utilization of computers and modems and phone
25 lines for unauthorized access into various

1 databases as a working definition of computer
2 hacking.
3 Are you aware of any allegations of computer
4 hacking by that definition with regard to The
5 Perot Petition Committee?
6 A. No. You're saying The Perot Petition
7 Committee. You're saying people who worked in the
8 committee using computers to get other
9 information, if I follow you correctly?
10 Q. That was my question, Mr. Perot.
11 A. No. I've never heard that story.
12 That's a new one.
13 Q. Okay. I think we had talked about Sandy
14 McClure and that you had met her during the July
15 to August time frame in 1992. And I may have
16 asked this question, but I'm not sure at this
17 time. Did you ever have any telephone
18 conversations or other communications with Ms.
19 McClure prior to June or July of 1992?
20 A. None that I recall, no. I have a hazy
21 recollection of meeting her in a huge group of
22 people but not meeting or visiting with her or
23 getting into any detailed conversations with her.
24 Just met her.
25 Q. Okay. What is your understanding of the

53

KOHN, SHANDS, ELBERT, GIANOULAKIS & GILJUM, LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
ONE MERCANTILE CENTER, 24TH FLOOR
ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI 63101
(314) 241-[illegible]
TELECOPIER (314) 241-[illegible]

ALAN G. KOHN
COURTNEY SHANDS, JR.
HAROLD L. ELBERT
JOHN GIANOULAKIS
JOSEPH P. GILJUM
JOHN A. ELORAGA
MARK J. BERNER
CHARLES S. ELBERT
ROBERT T. HAAS
ROBERT A. UNITER
PETE WOODS
LISA A. PAGE
LORI J. BARKING

RODNEY F. MURRAY
SUSAN E. BIEDERMAN
JOHN W. LEVERMANN

November 14, 1996

VIA FACSIMILE (202/219-3483)

Colleen T. Sealander, Esq.
Office of General Counsel
Federal Election Commission
999 E Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20463

Attn: Erik Morrison

RB: MUR 4541: Sandra McClure

Dear Ms. Sealander:

Attached please find a designation of counsel form executed by the respondent referenced above. This letter requests an extension of time of thirty (30) days to respond to your inquiry dated November 1, 1996 which was received November 4, 1996 by the referenced respondent. Because counsel was only recently appointed to this matter, additional time is required to review the matter and surrounding facts. Based on the date of receipt, the original response date would be November 19, 1996. If the requested extension is granted, the response will be due December 19, 1996.

Thank you for your consideration. If you have any questions, you may reach me at the above-referenced number.

Sincerely,

ACK:na
Enclosure

FEB 5 3 17 PM '97
RECEIVED
FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL

9704353902

STATEMENT OF DESIGNATION OF COUNSEL

MUR 4541

NAME OF COUNSEL: Alan C. Kohn

FIRM: KOHN, SEANDS, ELBERT, GIANOULAKIS & GILJUM, LLP

ADDRESS: One Mercantile Center

Suite 2410

St. Louis, Missouri 63101

TELEPHONE: (314) 241-3963

FAX: (314) 241-2509

RECEIVED
FEDERAL ELECTION
COMMISSION
OFFICE OF GENERAL
COUNSEL

FEB 5 3 17 PM '97

The above-named individual is hereby designated as my counsel and is authorized to receive any notifications and other communications from the Commission and to act on my behalf before the Commission.

Nov 13, 1996 — Sandra McClure

Date — Signature

RESPONDENT'S NAME: Sandra McClure

ADDRESS: 3020 S. National

Suite 238

Springfield, Missouri 65804

TELEPHONE: HOME

BUSINESS (417) 881-1593

9704353349 03

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20463

February 7, 1997

Alan C. Kohn, Esq.
Kohn, Shands, Elbert, Gianoulakis & Giljum, LLP
One Mercantile Center, 24th Floor
St. Louis, MO 63101

RE: MUR 4541
Sandra S. McClure

Dear Mr. Kohn:

On November 1, 1996, your client was notified that the Federal Election Commission received a complaint from Edward I. Dyck alleging violations of certain sections of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended. At that time she was given a copy of the complaint and informed that a response to the complaint should be submitted within 15 days of receipt of the notification.

On January 19, 1997, the Commission received additional information from the complainant pertaining to the allegations in the complaint. Enclosed is a copy of this additional information. As this new information is considered an amendment to the original complaint, you are hereby afforded an additional 15 days in which to respond to the allegations.

If you have any questions, please contact Jennifer Henry at (202) 219-3400.

Sincerely,

F. Andrew Turley
Supervisory Attorney
Central Enforcement Docket

Enclosures
1. Amendment to the Complaint

9704383490 4

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20463

February 7, 1997

Edward I. Dyck
253 Heather Crest Drive
Chesterfield, MO 63017

RE: MUR 4541

Dear Mr. Dyck:

This letter acknowledges receipt on January 19, 1997, of the amendment to the complaint you filed on October 25, 1996. The respondent(s) will be sent copies of the amendment. You will be notified as soon as the Federal Election Commission takes final action on your complaint.

Sincerely,

F. Andrew Turley
Supervisory Attorney
Central Enforcement Docket

97044339905

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20463

February 7, 1997

R. Clayton Mulford, Esq.
Hughes & Luce, L.L.P.
1717 Main Street, Suite 2800
Dallas, Texas 75201

RE: MUR 4541
Ross Perot, Perot Reform Committee, Inc.
James Michael Poss, Perot '96 Inc., Treasurer
Mike Poss, Perot Reform Committee, Inc. Treasurer

Dear Mr. Mulford:

On November 1, 1996, your clients were notified that the Federal Election Commission received a complaint from Edward I. Dyck alleging violations of certain sections of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended. At that time they were given a copy of the complaint and informed that a response to the complaint should be submitted within 15 days of receipt of the notification.

On January 19, 1997, the Commission received additional information from the complainant pertaining to the allegations in the complaint. Enclosed is a copy of this additional information. As this new information is considered an amendment to the original complaint, you are hereby afforded an additional 15 days in which to respond to the allegations.

If you have any questions, please contact Jennifer Henry at (202) 219-3400.

Sincerely,

F. Andrew Turley
Supervisory Attorney
Central Enforcement Docket

Enclosures
1. Amendment to the complaint

97044334906

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20463

February 7, 1997

John W. Lemkemeier, Esq.
Bryan Cave
1 Metropolitan Square
St. Louis, MO 63101

RE: MUR 4541

Dear Mr. Lemkemeier:

On or about January 19, 1997, the Federal Election Commission received a self-styled "supplement" to a complaint originally filed on October 25, 1996 by Mr. Edward Dyck alleging that Perot '96, J. Michael Poss as treasurer, Perot Reform Committee, Mike Poss as treasurer, Mr. Ross Perot, and Ms. Sandy McClure may have violated the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended ("the Act"). The original complaint was filed with the Commission on or about October 25, 1996. The allegations concerning you are primarily contained in the attached amendment. Copies of both these documents are enclosed. We have numbered this matter MUR 4541. Please refer to this number in all future correspondence.

Under the Act, you have the opportunity to demonstrate in writing that no action should be taken against you in this matter. Please submit any factual or legal materials which you believe are relevant to the Commission's analysis of this matter. Where appropriate, statements should be submitted under oath. Your response, which should be addressed to the General Counsel's Office, must be submitted within 15 days of receipt of this letter. If no response is received within 15 days, the Commission may take further action based on the available information.

This matter will remain confidential in accordance with 2 U.S.C. § 437g(a)(4)(B) and § 437g(a)(12)(A) unless you notify the Commission in writing that you wish the matter to be made public. If you intend to be represented by counsel in this matter, please advise the Commission by completing the enclosed form stating the name, address and telephone number of such counsel, and authorizing such counsel to receive any notifications and other communications from the Commission.

Celebrating the Commission's 20th Anniversary

YESTERDAY, TODAY AND TOMORROW
DEDICATED TO KEEPING THE PUBLIC INFORMED

9 7 0 4 3 3 4 9 0 7

If you have any questions, please contact Jennifer Henry at (202) 219-3400. For your information, we have enclosed a brief description of the Commission's procedures for handling complaints.

Sincerely,

F. Andrew Turley
Supervisory Attorney
Central Enforcement Docket

Enclosures
1. Complaint
2. Procedures
3. Designation of Counsel Statement
4. Amendment to the Complaint

97043034903

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20463

February 7, 1997

R. Clayton Mulford, Esq.
Hughes & Luce, L.L.P.
1717 Main Street, Suite 2800
Dallas, Texas 75201

RE: MUR 4541

Dear Mr. Mulford:

On or about January 19, 1997, the Federal Election Commission received a self-styled "supplement" to a complaint originally filed on October 25, 1996 by Mr. Edward Dyck alleging that Perot '96, J. Michael Poss as treasurer, Perot Reform Committee, Mike Poss as treasurer, Mr. Ross Perot, and Ms. Sandy McClure may have violated the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended ("the Act"). The original complaint was filed with the Commission on or about October 25, 1996. The allegations concerning you are primarily contained in the attached amendment. Copies of both these documents are enclosed. We have numbered this matter MUR 4541. Please refer to this number in all future correspondence.

Under the Act, you have the opportunity to demonstrate in writing that no action should be taken against you in this matter. Please submit any factual or legal materials which you believe are relevant to the Commission's analysis of this matter. Where appropriate, statements should be submitted under oath. Your response, which should be addressed to the General Counsel's Office, must be submitted within 15 days of receipt of this letter. If no response is received within 15 days, the Commission may take further action based on the available information.

This matter will remain confidential in accordance with 2 U.S.C. § 437g(a)(4)(B) and § 437g(a)(12)(A) unless you notify the Commission in writing that you wish the matter to be made public. If you intend to be represented by counsel in this matter, please advise the Commission by completing the enclosed form stating the name, address and telephone number of such counsel, and authorizing such counsel to receive any notifications and other communications from the Commission.

97043034909

If you have any questions, please contact Jennifer Henry at (202) 219-3400. For your information, we have enclosed a brief description of the Commission's procedures for handling complaints.

Sincerely,

F. Andrew Turley
Supervisory Attorney
Central Enforcement Docket

Enclosures
1. Complaint
2. Procedures
3. Designation of Counsel Statement
4. Amendment to the Complaint

97043034291C

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20463

February 7, 1997

G. Carroll Stribling, Jr., Esq.
Ziercher & Hocker, P.C.
231 S. Bemiston, 8th Floor
Clayton, MO 63105

RE: MUR 4541

Dear Mr. Stribling:

On or about January 19, 1997, the Federal Election Commission received a self-styled "supplement" to a complaint originally filed on October 25, 1996 by Mr. Edward Dyck alleging that Perot '96, J. Michael Poss as treasurer, Perot Reform Committee, Mike Poss as treasurer, Mr. Ross Perot, and Ms. Sandy McClure may have violated the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended ("the Act"). The original complaint was filed with the Commission on or about October 25, 1996. The allegations concerning you are primarily contained in the attached amendment. Copies of both these documents are enclosed. We have numbered this matter MUR 4541. Please refer to this number in all future correspondence.

Under the Act, you have the opportunity to demonstrate in writing that no action should be taken against you in this matter. Please submit any factual or legal materials which you believe are relevant to the Commission's analysis of this matter. Where appropriate, statements should be submitted under oath. Your response, which should be addressed to the General Counsel's Office, must be submitted within 15 days of receipt of this letter. If no response is received within 15 days, the Commission may take further action based on the available information.

This matter will remain confidential in accordance with 2 U.S.C. § 437g(a)(4)(B) and § 437g(a)(12)(A) unless you notify the Commission in writing that you wish the matter to be made public. If you intend to be represented by counsel in this matter, please advise the Commission by completing the enclosed form stating the name, address and telephone number of such counsel, and authorizing such counsel to receive any notifications and other communications from the Commission.

Celebrating the Commission's 20th Anniversary

YESTERDAY, TODAY AND TOMORROW
DEDICATED TO KEEPING THE PUBLIC INFORMED

97043039911

If you have any questions, please contact Jennifer Henry at (202) 219-3400. For your information, we have enclosed a brief description of the Commission's procedures for handling complaints.

Sincerely,

F. Andrew Turley
Supervisory Attorney
Central Enforcement Docket

Enclosures
1. Complaint
2. Procedures
3. Designation of Counsel Statement
4. Amendment to the Complaint

9 / 0 4 5 3 3 4 9 1 2

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20463

February 7, 1997

Tom Luce, Esq.
Hughes & Luce, L.L.P.
1717 Main Street, Suite 2800
Dallas, Texas 75201

RE: MUR 4541

Dear Mr. Luce:

On or about January 19, 1997, the Federal Election Commission received a self-styled "supplement" to a complaint originally filed on October 25, 1996 by Mr. Edward Dyck alleging that Perot '96, J. Michael Poss as treasurer, Perot Reform Committee, Mike Poss as treasurer, Mr. Ross Perot, and Ms. Sandy McClure may have violated the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended ("the Act"). The original complaint was filed with the Commission on or about October 25, 1996. The allegations concerning you are primarily contained in the attached amendment. Copies of both these documents are enclosed. We have numbered this matter MUR 4541. Please refer to this number in all future correspondence.

Under the Act, you have the opportunity to demonstrate in writing that no action should be taken against you in this matter. Please submit any factual or legal materials which you believe are relevant to the Commission's analysis of this matter. Where appropriate, statements should be submitted under oath. Your response, which should be addressed to the General Counsel's Office, must be submitted within 15 days of receipt of this letter. If no response is received within 15 days, the Commission may take further action based on the available information.

This matter will remain confidential in accordance with 2 U.S.C. § 437g(a)(4)(B) and § 437g(a)(12)(A) unless you notify the Commission in writing that you wish the matter to be made public. If you intend to be represented by counsel in this matter, please advise the Commission by completing the enclosed form stating the name, address and telephone number of such counsel, and authorizing such counsel to receive any notifications and other communications from the Commission.

Celebrating the Commission's 20th Anniversary
YESTERDAY, TODAY AND TOMORROW
DEDICATED TO KEEPING THE PUBLIC INFORMED

97U4383491 3

If you have any questions, please contact Jennifer Henry at (202) 219-3400. For your information, we have enclosed a brief description of the Commission's procedures for handling complaints.

Sincerely,

F. Andrew Turley
Supervisory Attorney
Central Enforcement Docket

Enclosures
1. Complaint
2. Procedures
3. Designation of Counsel Statement
4. Amendment to the Complaint

9/04353491 4

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20463

February 7, 1997

Kim Juanita Askew, Esq.
Hughes & Luce, L.L.P.
1717 Main Street, Suite 2800
Dallas, Texas 75201

RE: MUR 4541

Dear Ms. Askew:

On or about January 19, 1997, the Federal Election Commission received a self-styled "supplement" to a complaint originally filed on October 25, 1996 by Mr. Edward Dyck alleging that Perot '96, J. Michael Poss as treasurer, Perot Reform Committee, Mike Poss as treasurer, Mr. Ross Perot, and Ms. Sandy McClure may have violated the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended ("the Act"). The original complaint was filed with the Commission on or about October 25, 1996. The allegations concerning you are primarily contained in the attached amendment. Copies of both these documents are enclosed. We have numbered this matter MUR 4541. Please refer to this number in all future correspondence.

Under the Act, you have the opportunity to demonstrate in writing that no action should be taken against you in this matter. Please submit any factual or legal materials which you believe are relevant to the Commission's analysis of this matter. Where appropriate, statements should be submitted under oath. Your response, which should be addressed to the General Counsel's Office, must be submitted within 15 days of receipt of this letter. If no response is received within 15 days, the Commission may take further action based on the available information.

This matter will remain confidential in accordance with 2 U.S.C. § 437g(a)(4)(B) and § 437g(a)(12)(A) unless you notify the Commission in writing that you wish the matter to be made public. If you intend to be represented by counsel in this matter, please advise the Commission by completing the enclosed form stating the name, address and telephone number of such counsel, and authorizing such counsel to receive any notifications and other communications from the Commission.

9704383491 5

If you have any questions, please contact Jennifer Henry at (202) 219-3400. For your information, we have enclosed a brief description of the Commission's procedures for handling complaints.

Sincerely,

F. Andrew Turley
Supervisory Attorney
Central Enforcement Docket

Enclosures
1. Complaint
2. Procedures
3. Designation of Counsel Statement
4. Amendment to the Complaint

97043034916

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20463

February 7, 1997

Alan C. Kohn, Esq.
Kohn, Shands, Elbert, Gianoulakis & Giljum, LLP
One Mercantile Center, 24th Floor
St. Louis, MO 63101

RE: MUR 4541

Dear Mr. Kohn:

On or about January 19, 1997, the Federal Election Commission received a self-styled "supplement" to a complaint originally filed on October 25, 1996 by Mr. Edward Dyck alleging that Perot '96, J. Michael Poss as treasurer, Perot Reform Committee, Mike Poss as treasurer, Mr. Ross Perot, and Ms. Sandy McClure may have violated the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended ("the Act"). The original complaint was filed with the Commission on or about October 25, 1996. The allegations concerning you are primarily contained in the attached amendment. Copies of both these documents are enclosed. We have numbered this matter MUR 4541. Please refer to this number in all future correspondence.

Under the Act, you have the opportunity to demonstrate in writing that no action should be taken against you in this matter. Please submit any factual or legal materials which you believe are relevant to the Commission's analysis of this matter. Where appropriate, statements should be submitted under oath. Your response, which should be addressed to the General Counsel's Office, must be submitted within 15 days of receipt of this letter. If no response is received within 15 days, the Commission may take further action based on the available information.

This matter will remain confidential in accordance with 2 U.S.C. § 437g(a)(4)(B) and § 437g(a)(12)(A) unless you notify the Commission in writing that you wish the matter to be made public. If you intend to be represented by counsel in this matter, please advise the Commission by completing the enclosed form stating the name, address and telephone number of such counsel, and authorizing such counsel to receive any notifications and other communications from the Commission.

9704383429 17

If you have any questions, please contact Jennifer Henry at (202) 219-3400. For your information, we have enclosed a brief description of the Commission's procedures for handling complaints.

Sincerely,

F. Andrew Turley
Supervisory Attorney
Central Enforcement Docket

Enclosures
1. Complaint
2. Procedures
3. Designation of Counsel Statement
4. Amendment to Complaint

97043534916

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20463

February 7, 1997

Carol A. Platt, Esq.
Armstrong, Teasdale, Schlafly & Davis
One Metropolitan Square, Suite 2600
St. Louis, MO 63102

RE: MUR 4541

Dear Ms. Platt:

On or about January 19, 1997, the Federal Election Commission received a self-styled "supplement" to a complaint originally filed on October 25, 1996 by Mr. Edward Dyck alleging that Perot '96, J. Michael Poss as treasurer, Perot Reform Committee, Mike Poss as treasurer, Mr. Ross Perot, and Ms. Sandy McClure may have violated the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended ("the Act"). The original complaint was filed with the Commission on or about October 25, 1996. The allegations concerning you are primarily contained in the attached amendment. Copies of both these documents are enclosed. We have numbered this matter MUR 4541. Please refer to this number in all future correspondence.

Under the Act, you have the opportunity to demonstrate in writing that no action should be taken against you in this matter. Please submit any factual or legal materials which you believe are relevant to the Commission's analysis of this matter. Where appropriate, statements should be submitted under oath. Your response, which should be addressed to the General Counsel's Office, must be submitted within 15 days of receipt of this letter. If no response is received within 15 days, the Commission may take further action based on the available information.

This matter will remain confidential in accordance with 2 U.S.C. § 437g(a)(4)(B) and § 437g(a)(12)(A) unless you notify the Commission in writing that you wish the matter to be made public. If you intend to be represented by counsel in this matter, please advise the Commission by completing the enclosed form stating the name, address and telephone number of such counsel, and authorizing such counsel to receive any notifications and other communications from the Commission.

Celebrating the Commission's 20th Anniversary

YESTERDAY, TODAY AND TOMORROW
DEDICATED TO KEEPING THE PUBLIC INFORMED

If you have any questions, please contact Jennifer Henry at (202) 219-3400. For your information, we have enclosed a brief description of the Commission's procedures for handling complaints.

Sincerely,

F. Andrew Turley
Supervisory Attorney
Central Enforcement Docket

Enclosures
1. Complaint
2. Procedures
3. Designation of Counsel Statement
4. Amendment to the Complaint

9/04/03 9:92 C

HUGHES & LUCE, L.L.P.

1717 Main Street
Suite 2800
Dallas, Texas 75201
214 939-5500
214 939-6100 (fax)

Attorneys and Counselors

December 12, 1996

Writers Direct Dial Number
214/939-5416

Other Offices
Austin
Houston

Federal Election Commission
999 E. Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20463

VIA FACSIMILE and FEDERAL EXPRESS

Attn: Colleen T. Sealander
Erik Morrison

Re: MUR 4541: Ross Perot
Perot Reform Committee, Inc., Mike Poss, Treasurer ("PRC")
Perot '96, Inc., Mike Poss, Treasurer ("Perot '96")

Dear Ms. Sealander:

This letter is filed in response to your letter dated November 1, 1996, notifying Ross Perot, PRC and Perot '96 of a complaint filed against them by Edward Dyck. Mr. Dyck alleges in his complaint that the report by PRC of an expenditure of $8,223.26 on May 17, 1995 for consulting services of Sandra McClure is inaccurate, false or misleading, because such payments were for Ms. McClure's personal legal fees. Mr. Dyck's allegations are simply false.

Over the last three years Mr. Dyck has filed several baseless lawsuits against Ross Perot. He has lost at each turn but continues to assert claims. After losing in one federal court on summary judgment, he simply refiled the claims again in another jurisdiction. His attorney recently withdrew from representing him following a motion for sanctions, highlighting the bad faith nature of the claims and the complete lack of evidentiary support. Mr. Dyck has also filed several complaints against Ross Perot with the FEC, including MUR 4316 and MUR 3963.

I understand Mr. Dyck has also filed suits against Ms. McClure during this period, alleging bad deeds of all kind, including defamation, liable, slander etc.

Ms. McClure was a volunteer petition gatherer for Ross Perot in Missouri in 1992, an activity Mr. Dyck also briefly pursued. Mr. Dyck apparently had disagreements with Ms. McClure, her large volunteer organization and the media attention it received. In 1992, Ms. McClure's organization submitted petitions in sufficient quantity to obtain ballot access in Missouri, a state which requires that electors be named on circulated petitions. Mr. Dyck was named as an elector on the petitions circulated by Mr. Dyck, but not on those circulated and submitted by Ms. McClure.

9 7 0 4 3 3 4 9 2 1

As with Mr. Dyck's lawsuits and prior FEC complaints, this complaint is simply a frivolous accusation without support. PRC did not pay Ms. McClure's legal fees. The report as filed by PRC correctly and accurately reflects the purpose of the disbursement to Ms. McClure. Ms. McClure was engaged by PRC as a consultant in 1996 in connection with a ballot access petition drive in Missouri, because of her knowledge and experience in conducting a petition drive, and because of her access to a network of volunteers. On May 17, 1996, Ms. McClure was paid by PRC check for a total of 128 hours at the agreed amount of $25.00 per hour and for $223.26 in documented expenses, pursuant to her engagement as a consultant. (Affidavit of Russell Verney attached as Attachment 1.)

We respectfully request that the Commission not permit use of its facilities and resources for the pursuit of Mr. Dyck's personal agenda.

If you have any questions regarding the foregoing, please contact me at 214/939-5416.

Sincerely,

R. Clayton Mulford

Enclosures

9 / 0 4 3 3 3 4 9 2 2

Attachment 1

AFFIDAVIT OF

RUSSELL VERNEY

1. My name is Russell Verney. I am a resident of Dallas County, Texas.

2. I served as the National Coordinator for the Perot Reform Committee, Inc. ("PRC").

3. PRC engaged Sandra S. McClure to provide consulting services in connection with a ballot access petition drive in Missouri. Ms. McClure was recommended to provide such services because of her knowledge and background attained through her volunteer work in coordinating ballot access in Missouri on behalf of Ross Perot in 1992 election.

4. PRC engaged additional individuals with petition experience in other states as consultants to assist in the petition process. By using such persons, PRC could ensure that certain tasks would be accomplished by certain times and would be performed at a cost less than that charged by professional signature gatherers.

5. Ms. McClure was paid an agreed $25.00/hour fee and expenses for her consulting services.

6. With respect to the payment at issue in MUR 4541, Ms. McClure was paid for 128 hours at $25.00 an hour and $223.26 for documented expenses. A PRC check for a total of $8,223.26 was issued to Sandra McClure in May, 1996. A copy of the check is attached to this affidavit.

7. PRC has never paid legal expenses of Sandra McClure.

Russell Verney

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO BEFORE ME, the undersigned Notary Public, by Russell Verney on December 12, 1996.

RENEE MARIE JORDAN
NOTARY PUBLIC
State of Texas
Comm. Exp. 04-18-2000

Notary Public In and For the State of Texas

Renee Marie Jordan
Printed Name of Notary

My Commission Expires:

April 18, 2000

9/0433349923

PEROT REFORM COMMI
P O BOX 516087
DALLAS, TEXAS 75251
(214) 450-8881

NationsBank DALLAS, TEXAS
NationsBank of Texas, N.A.

2266

CK 2266

VOID AFTER
90 DAYS

32-2/1110

PAY **EIGHT THOUSAND, TWO HUNDRED, TWENTY THREE AND 26/100** DOLLARS

DATE	AMOUNT
5/17/96	**$8223.26**

TO THE ORDER OF
SANDY MCCLURE
3020 S. NATIONAL, STE 238
SPRINGFIELD, MO 65804

J Michael Lane

PEROT REFORM COMMITTEE
P O BOX 516087 DALLAS TEXAS 75251

2266

DATE	INVOICE NO	COMMENT	AMOUNT	DISCOUNT	NET AMOUNT
		CONSULTING FEES -1099MISC. 506026			
				TOTAL	

PEROT REFORM COMMITTEE
P O BOX 516087 DALLAS TEXAS 75251

2266

DATE	INVOICE NO	COMMENT	AMOUNT	DISCOUNT	NET AMOUNT
				TOTAL	

REORDER FROM YOUR LOCAL SAFEGUARD DISTRIBUTOR IF UNKNOWN CALL

KOHN, SHANDS, ELBERT, GIANOULAKIS & GILJUM, LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
ONE MERCANTILE CENTER, 24TH FLOOR
ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI 63101
(314) 241-8960
TELECOPIER (314) 241-8509

ALAN C. KOHN
COURTNEY SHANDS, JR.
HAROLD I. ELBERT
JOHN GIANOULAKIS
JOSEPH P. GILJUM
JOHN A. KLOBASA
MARK J. BREMER
CHARLES S. ELBERT
ROBERT T. HAAR
ROBERT A. USERED
PETE WOODS
LISA A. PAKE
LORI J. BASKINS

ROBERT F. MURRAY
SUSAN E. BINDLER
DAVID A. CASTLEMAN
BECKY L. HUINKER

February 20, 1997

RECEIVED
FEDERAL ELECTION
COMMISSION
OFFICE OF GENERAL
COUNSEL
FEB 21 10 35 AM '97

VIA FAX AND FEDERAL EXPRESS

Mr. F. Andrew Turley
Supervisory Attorney
Central Enforcement Docket
Federal Election Commission
999 E. Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20463

RE: Sandra S. McClure Response to Amended Complaint
MUR 4541

Dear Mr. Turley:

On behalf of Sandra S. McClure and myself, I submit this response to the amended complaint sent by Mr. Dyck on January 19, 1997.

The Amended Complaint with attached additional materials adds nothing to Mr. Dyck's meritless claim. The information is completely irrelevant and serves only to cause delay and continual harassment of Ms. McClure, and now, to her lawyer.

In accordance with my letter of December 15, 1996 (a copy of which is enclosed) and for the reasons there stated, there is no basis for Mr. Dyck to make a complaint to the F.E.C. about me or about my client, Sandy McClure. Furthermore, the merits of Mr. Dyck's complaint have been addressed in detail by Mr. Mulford in his letter to you of December 12, 1996 (a copy of which is also enclosed). Please note that Mr. Mulford in that letter states that Mr. Dyck has filed a number of meritless lawsuits, one of which is against Ms. McClure and is pending on a motion filed by her for summary judgment.

This latest "amended complaint" appears to be just another attempt to intimidate Ms. McClure and, now, to intimidate her lawyers as well. I therefore respectfully request that the complaint and amended complaint against Ms. McClure and me be dismissed because there is no basis for a finding of a violation of the Federal Election Commission Act. I must add that I deeply resent the fact that Mr. Dyck has attempted, not only to harass, embarrass and impugn the character of Ms. McClure, but her lawyers as well. This type of conduct is reprehensible and unfair.

KOHN, SHANDS, ELBERT,
GIANOULAKIS & GILJUM, LLP

Alan C. Kohn
One Mercantile Center
24th Floor
St. Louis, MO 63101
(314) 241-3963
(314) 241-2509 (telecopier)

ACK:smr
Encs.

KOHN, SHANDS, ELBERT, GIANOULAKIS & GILJUM, LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
ONE MERCANTILE CENTER, 24TH FLOOR
ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI 63101

(314) 241-3960
TELECOPIER (314) 241-2509

ALAN C. KOHN
COURTNEY SHANDS, JR.
HAROLD I. ELBERT
JOHN GIANOULAKIS
JOSEPH P. GILJUM
JOHN A. KLOBASA
MARK J. BREMER
CHARLES S. ELBERT
ROBERT T. HAAR
ROBERT A. USETED
PETE WOODS
LISA A. PAKE
LORI J. BASKINS

ROBERT F. MURRAY
SUSAN E. BINDLER
DAVID A. GASTLEMAN
BECKY L. HUINKER

December 15, 1996

Colleen T. Sealander, Esq.
Office of General Counsel
Federal Election Commission
999 E. Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20463

Re: Sandra S. McClure Response
MUR 4541

Dear Ms. Sealander:

I submit this response on behalf of Sandra S. McClure in the above referenced complaint filed by Edward Dyck. Mr. Dyck has already sued Ms. McClure in federal court in St. Louis in connection with the Perot petition efforts. This appears to be a continuing effort by Mr. Dyck to try to harass and intimidate Ms. McClure for exercising her right of free speech in connection with the ultimate First Amendment right, the right to participate in the political process. We request that the complaint be dismissed because there is no basis for a finding of a violation by the Federal Election Commission Act.

Mr. Dyck claims that a schedule filed by Perot Reform Committee, Inc., with the F.E.C. dated May 17, 1996 showing the payment of consulting fees to Ms. McClure in the amount of $8,223.26 is inaccurate because he alleges this was actually a payment for Ms. McClure's "legal fees." The short answer to this contention, as far Ms. McClure is concerned, is that she did not file the schedule with the F.E.C. It is my understanding that the Perot Reform Committee, which filed the schedule, is addressing the allegations made by Mr. Dyck in a communication to you. This is entirely proper since it is the Committee, and not Ms. McClure, that may have filing responsibilities with the F.E.C.

9704353927

Because there is no basis by Mr. Dyck to make a complaint to F.E.C. about Ms. McClure, we respectfully ask that the complaint be dismissed.

KOHN, SHANDS, ELBERT,
GIANOULAKIS & GILJUM, LLP

_____

Alan C. Kohn
One Mercantile Center, 24th Floor
St. Louis, MO 63101
(314) 241-3963
(314) 241-2509 (telecopier)

Attorneys for Respondent,
Sandra S. McClure

97044353492 8

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20463

February 21, 1997

John Lemkemeier, Esq.
Bryan Cave LLP
One Metropolitan Square, Suite 3600
211 N. Broadway
St. Louis, MO 63102

MUR 4541

Dear Mr. Lemkemeier:

Per your request on February 21, 1997, I am sending you a new copy of the complaint and amendment to the complaint. Should you have any further questions, please contact me at (202)219-3400.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Henry

Jennifer Henry
Paralegal Specialist

Enclosures
1. Copy of Letter to Respondent
2. Complaint
3. Procedures
4. Designation of Counsel Statement
5. Amendment to the Complaint

97044353929

ZIERCHER HOCKER, P.C.
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

THE BEMISTON TOWER
231 SOUTH BEMISTON, 8TH FLOOR
ST. LOUIS, (CLAYTON) MO 63105-1914
TELEPHONE (314) 727-5822
FACSIMILE (314) 727-2824

RECEIVED
FEDERAL ELECTION
COMMISSION
OFFICE OF GENERAL
COUNSEL

FEB 24 10 44 AM '97

F. WILLIAM HUMAN, JR.
ALBERT A. MICHENFELDER, JR.
EDGAR G. BOEDEKER
EDGAR T. FARMER
EDWARD K. FEHLIG
GEORGE J. BUDE
RICHARD A. ROTH
G. CARROLL STRIBLING, JR.
GARY H. FEDER
GARY L. VINCENT
DANIEL L. HUMAN
STEVEN W. KOSLOVSKY
DAVID D. CRANE*
RICHARD J. EISEN*
CHRISTOPHER KARLEN
RICHARD A. YAWITZ
HOWARD J. SMITH
WILLIAM J. BRUIN, JR.
DAVID R. HUMAN*
M. ERIK P. (THOR) HEARNE, II**
THOMAS E. TONEY, III

MARY WEBSTER MURPHY
JOHN J. DIEHL, JR.
JEFFREY D. SIGMUND*
ROBERT W. PASTER*
M. DeANN OUTLAW*
JILL M. FARMER*
P. TABOR DYKE*
JAMES L. CHARPENTIER*
S. DIANE TURPIN
S. CHRISTIAN MULLGARDT, II

OF COUNSEL
LON HOCKER
JAMES L. NOURSE

HERBERT W. ZIERCHER
1902-1988
ERWIN TZINBERG
1912-1974

*ALSO ADMITTED IN ILLINOIS
**ALSO ADMITTED IN MICHIGAN

February 19, 1997

Mr. F. Andrew Turley
Supervisory Attorney
Central Enforcement Docket
Federal Election Commission
Washington, D.C. 20463

RE: MUR 4541

Dear Mr. Turley:

I have received your letter of February 7, 1997, concerning the self-styled amendment to the Complaint originally filed by Mr. Edward Dyck. I am not sure that any complaint has been made about me; however, to the extent that a request for information is made, other than communications between me and my client which are privileged, I have the following to say:

1. I have acted as counsel for Equifax Credit Information Services, Inc. ("ECIS") in litigation brought against it and others by Mr. Dyck and others concerning certain events surrounding Mr. Dyck and the other Plaintiffs becoming volunteers in H. Ross Perot's effort to have his name placed upon the ballot as a presidential candidate in Missouri for the 1992 election, (the "Litigation") I have no relationship to Mr. Perot, the events of his Missouri candidacy in 1992 or 1996 or any of the parties other than my representation of ECIS as its chief trial counsel.

2. With respect to the specific questions asked by Mr. Dyck on page 2 of his letter of January 8, 1997 as concerns me:

   (a) I know nothing about the filing of page 23 Schedule B-P "Itemized Disbursements" FEC Form, by the Perot Reform Committee other than what is disclosed on the document itself. I believe that the first time I saw this document was when I received it on January 21, 1997 as a part of documents submitted by Plaintiffs other than Mr. Dyck in opposition to ECIS's Motion for Summary Judgment in the Litigation.

(b) I know nothing about the Perot Reform Committee's payment of $8,223.26 to Sandra McClure on 05/17/96 for "consulting fees" other than the information which is contained upon Exhibit B-P to Mr. Dyck's letter.

(c) I know nothing about any payments by Ross Perot, the Reform Committee, Inc., Perot 1996, Inc., the Perot Petition Committee or any entity thereof to Sandra McClure from April 1992 to the present other than information which has been disclosed in formal discovery or in documents in support of briefs filed by Plaintiffs in the Litigation. Any information which I know was disclosed equally to Mr. Dyck at the same time as formal discovery or documents filed in the Litigation.

(d) I know nothing about who is paying Sandra Stone McClure's legal bills to Alan Kohn and John Lemkemeier from May 1994 to the present.

(e) I am unaware of any deception to the Federal Election Commission.

If you desire anything further from me, please contact me at your convenience. If Mr. Dyck actually makes any complaint against me other than his comments in his letter of January 8, 1997 to Mr. Noble, would you please tell me so that I might employ counsel or otherwise takes steps to respond appropriately.

Yours very truly,

ZIERCHER & HOCKER, P.C.

G. Carroll Stribling, Jr.

GCS/kds

9/0045534931

HUGHES & LUCE, L.L.P.

1717 Main Street
Suite 2800
Dallas, Texas 75201
214 / 939-5500
214 / 939-6100 (fax)

RECEIVED
FEDERAL ELECTION
COMMISSION
OFFICE OF GENERAL
COUNSEL

FEB 24 10 35 AM '97

Attorneys and Counselors

February 21, 1997

Writer's Direct Dial Number
214/939-5412

Other Offices
Austin
Houston

Federal Election Commission
999 E Street, NW
Washington, DC 20463

Attention: F. Andrew Turley

Re: MUR 4541

Dear Mr. Turley:

On February 12, 1997 I received your letter dated February 7, 1997 concerning the above referenced MUR. I have never heard of the complainant, have no knowledge of facts related to his allegations, and am completely unfamiliar with and have no knowledge with respect to the alleged violations he asserts.

Very truly yours,

Thomas W. Luce III

Thomas W. Luce, III

TWL/rm

9704503934

HUGHES & LUCE, L.L.P

1717 Main Street
Suite 2800
Dallas, Texas 75201
214/939-5500
214/939-6100 (fax)

RECEIVED
FEDERAL ELECTION
COMMISSION
OFFICE OF GENERAL
COUNSEL

FEB 24 10 34 AM '97

Attorneys and Counselors

February 21, 1997

Writer's Direct Dial Number
214/939-5416

Other Offices
Austin
Houston

Federal Election Commission
999 E Street, NW
Washington, DC 20463

Attention: F. Andrew Turley

Re: MUR 4541

Dear Mr. Turley:

On February 12, 1997 I received your February 7, 1997 letter concerning the additional information you received from Mr. Edward Dyke, the complainant in the above-referenced matter.

As noted in my response dated December 12, 1996, Mr. Dyke has filed numerous unsuccessful lawsuits against Mr. Perot and others over the past several years. He has also filed several complaints with the FEC concerning these matters. His complaint in this instance is simply part of a ploy to manufacture an agency relationship between Ross Perot and Sandra McClure, in an effort to pursue Mr. Perot for allegedly defamatory statements made by Ms. McClure in May 1992. Those alleged statements are the subject of one of Mr. Dyke's currently pending lawsuits, which was filed in 1994. In this manner, Mr. Dyke hopes to obtain large sums from Mr. Perot where his assorted other actions have failed.

In his amendment Mr. Dyke simply continues to accuse Mr. Perot and the Perot Reform Committee of willfully misrepresenting the purpose for disbursements in reports filed with the Commission. He also submits a list of attorneys (including me) involved in his litigation and suggests they be deposed by the FEC to determine their knowledge of unspecified "patterns of deception."

His specific accusations are two. Without substantiation or support he reiterates his claim that payments made to Sandra McClure by the Perot Reform Committee for consulting fees in 1996 were actually payments made for or to her attorneys in connection with Mr. Dyke's 1994 defamation action against her. He also claims that the characterization of disbursements reported by the Perot Petition Committee ("PPC") in 1992 to The Callahan & Gibbons Group ("C&G") was intentionally misleading.

As set forth in the previous response and affidavit, the Perot Reform Committee paid Ms. McClure for consultant services at an agreed hourly rate. The Perot Reform Committee has never paid Ms. McClure's legal fees.

There is also nothing misleading or inaccurate about the reporting by the PPC of payments to C&G, which was retained by PPC in 1992 through New York counsel. PPC contacted counsel to obtain a restraining order with respect to threatening activities around some volunteer offices, and that counsel utilized the services of C&G. Invoices were evidently sent directly to PPC. Because of their wording and approval by counsel they were apparently coded as "legal" in the PPC reporting system. A review of the C&G statement included in Mr. Dyke's amendment suggests why this occurred: it is labeled as a privileged attorney-client communication and reflects hourly billings by partners and associates.

When the PPC learned that the category into which the payments had been placed may not be descriptive, the purpose for the disbursements were re-characterized by amendment filed with the Commission, as Mr. Dyke himself notes in his addendum to his Exhibit "D."

We again respectfully request that Commission resources not be devoted to Mr. Dyke's unsubstantiated and false, but never ending, accusations.

Very truly yours,

R. Clayton Mulford

RCM:rmm

HUGHES & LUCE, L.L.P.

1717 Main Street
Suite 2800
Dallas, Texas 75201
214 / 939-5500
214 / 939-6100 (fax)

RECEIVED
FEDERAL ELECTION
COMMISSION
OFFICE OF GENERAL
COUNSEL

FEB 24 10 40 AM '97

Attorneys and Counselors

February 21, 1997

Writer's Direct Dial Number
214/939-5412

Other Offices
Austin
Houston

Federal Election Commission
ATTN: F. Andrew Turley
999 E Street, NW
Washington, DC 20463

Re: MUR 4541

Dear Mr. Turley:

I received your letter dated February 7, 1997, concerning the above referenced MUR. As litigation counsel for Ross Perot and Perot '96, I am now quite familiar with the unfounded allegations made by Edward Dyck in this and other complaints filed before the Commission. Of course, Mr. Dyck has sued Mr. Perot, the campaign and other persons associated with the campaign in litigation across the country. Because he has been unsuccessful in forcing Mr. Perot and the campaign to pay him large sums of money, he hopes to gain leverage by attacking the lawyers who represent the parties he has sued. Also, Mr. Dyck, who now represents himself *pro se* and fails to follow any evidentiary rules, appears to believe that filing these baseless complaints before the Commission will result in some advantage to him in the pending litigation inasmuch as he attempts to use these complaints as evidence in the pending lawsuits. This Commission should not permit this useful process to be usurped for such a harassing and improper purpose.

Most of the lawyers mentioned by Mr. Dyck have not taken any position before the Commission. Some of the attorneys named have had no involvement whatsoever in this case. Apart from representing my clients, I have not engaged in any of the actions alleged by Mr. Dyck in the complaint.

Respondents' prior responses show that there is no factual basis for Mr. Dyck's ludicrous allegations. Moreover, having personally deposed Mr. Dyck for several days (under oath when the unfounded nature of his allegations was readily exposed) and having been present at the deposition of Sandra McClure, I know that there is simply no basis for the allegations made by Mr. Dyck. Mr. Dyck is the subject of pending sanctions motions in all pending litigation because he

continues to bring bad-faith claims wholly lacking in evidentiary support. This complaint is no different and should be dismissed.

Sincerely,

Kim J. Askew

97U4353936

WASHINGTON, D.C.
NEW YORK, NEW YORK
KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI
OVERLAND PARK, KANSAS
PHOENIX, ARIZONA
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA
SANTA MONICA, CALIFORNIA
IRVINE, CALIFORNIA

JOHN W. LEMKEMEIER

BRYAN CAVE LLP

ONE METROPOLITAN SQUARE
211 N. BROADWAY, SUITE 3600
ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI 63102-2750
(314) 259-2000
FACSIMILE: (314) 259-2020

LONDON, ENGLAND
RIYADH, SAUDI ARABIA
KUWAIT CITY, KUWAIT
ABU DHABI, UNITED ARAB EMIRATES
DUBAI, UNITED ARAB EMIRATES
HONG KONG
ASSOCIATED OFFICE IN SHANGHAI

February 21, 1997

RECEIVED
FEDERAL ELECTION
COMMISSION
OFFICE OF GENERAL
COUNSEL
FEB 25 10 25 AM '97

VIA FACSIMILE ((202) 219-3923) AND REGULAR MAIL

F. Andrew Turley, Esq.
Office of General Counsel
Federal Election Commission
999 E Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20463

RE: MUR 4541 (Response of John W. Lemkemeier)

Dear Mr. Turley:

This letter is in response to your letter dated February 7, 1997, notifying me of the complaint and amended complaint sent to you by Edward Dyck. Mr. Dyck appararently alleges that I committed wrongdoing in connection with a report filed with the Federal Election Commission ("FEC") by the Perot Reform Committee, Inc. ("PRC") stating that PRC had paid $8,223.26 to Sandra McClure for consulting services.

Mr. Dyck and Ms. McClure were volunteers for Ross Perot's 1992 petition drive in Missouri. In 1994, Mr. Dyck sued Ms. McClure and many other parties in federal court in Missouri over certain alleged events relating to the Missouri petition drive. On information and belief, the claims against Ms. McClure are currently the subject of a summary judgment motion filed by Ms. McClure.

Ms. McClure is represented in this litigation by the law firm of Kohn, Shands, Elbert, Gianoulakis & Giljum, LLP ("Kohn Shands"). From August 1995 until November 1996, while I was an associate at Kohn Shands, I worked with Alan Kohn on Ms. McClure's defense in this litigation. In November 1996, I left Kohn Shands to pursue a different type of practice at a different law firm and ceased representing Ms. McClure at that time.

97040039937

Mr. Dyck's allegation against me in connection with the FEC report filed by the PRC has absolutely no basis. I have never represented or had any involvement with the PRC, and had no knowledge (until Mr. Dyck filed this FEC complaint) that the PRC had filed this report with the FEC. I have never filed any report with the FEC or made representations to the FEC of any kind. During the period in which I participated in the representation of Ms. McClure as an associate at Kohn Shands, Ms. McClure to my knowledge never filed any report with the FEC or made representations to the FEC of any kind.

Mr. Dyck's attack in his FEC complaint against the lawyers who have participated in the defense of parties he has sued is a transparent attempt at harassment. His allegations against me are offensive and, for the reasons stated, wholly without merit. I ask that they be dismissed.

Please contact me at 314/259-2000 with any questions regarding the foregoing.

Sincerely,

John W. Lemkemeier

John W. Lemkemeier

ARMSTRONG, TEASDALE, SCHLAFLY & DAVIS
A PARTNERSHIP INCLUDING PROFESSIONAL CORPORATIONS

ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELORS
ONE METROPOLITAN SQUARE, SUITE 2600
ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI 63102-2740
(314) 621-5070
FAX (314) 621-5065

Carol A. Platt

KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI
BELLEVILLE, ILLINOIS
OLATHE, KANSAS

RECEIVED
FEDERAL ELECTION
COMMISSION
OFFICE OF GENERAL
COUNSEL

MAR 3 2 38 PM '97

February 24, 1997

Mr. F. Andrew Turley, Esq.
Federal Election Commission
999 E Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20463

Re: MUR 4541

Dear Mr. Turley:

Thank you for allowing me an opportunity to respond to the complaint filed against me by Edward I. Dyck. I received notice of the complaint on February 13, 1997.

This complaint is completely without merit. I have served as local counsel to Ross Perot and the Perot Petition Committee since March of 1995. During that time, my participation in the litigation to which Mr. Dyck and the Perot Petition Committee are parties has been limited to taking depositions and drafting and filing briefs and motions pertinent to the claims asserted against the Perot Petition Committee by Mr. Dyck and his co-plaintiffs.

I therefore have no knowledge of any disbursements of political funds or the reporting thereof to the Federal Elections Commission. Nor am I aware of any illegal activity whatsoever, either in the conduct of Mr. Perot's political campaigns or any litigation resulting from them.

If there are further questions regarding this matter, please feel free to contact me. For the reasons set forth above, I believe that Mr. Dyck's complaint is utterly without merit, and should be dismissed in its entirety.

Very truly yours,

Carol A. Platt

Carol A. Platt

AGENDA DOCUMENT NO. 97-55

BEFORE THE FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION SECRETARIAT

AUG 14 4 ... '97

In the Matter of)
)
) ENFORCEMENT PRIORITY
)

SENSITIVE

AUG 19 1997

EXECUTIVE SESSION

SUBMITTED LATE

GENERAL COUNSEL'S REPORT

I. INTRODUCTION.

The cases listed below have been identified as either stale or of low priority based upon evaluation under the Enforcement Priority System (EPS). This report is submitted to recommend that the Commission no longer pursue these cases.

II. CASES RECOMMENDED FOR CLOSURE.

A. Cases Not Warranting Further Action Relative to Other Cases Pending Before the Commission

EPS was created to identify pending cases which, due to the length of their pendency in inactive status or the lower priority of the issues raised in the matters relative to others presently pending before the Commission, do not warrant further expenditure of resources. Central Enforcement Docket (CED) evaluates each incoming matter using Commission-approved criteria which results in a numerical rating of each case.

Closing such cases permits the Commission to focus its limited resources on more important cases presently pending before it. Based upon this review, we have identified 34 cases which do not warrant further action relative to other pending matters.[1]

9 7 0 4 3 3 3 4 9 4 0

---

[1] These cases are: MUR 4479 (*Ward for Congress*); MUR 4478 (*Citizens for Tom Reynolds*); MUR 4492 (*Friends of Ken Poston*); MUR 4498 (*Darryl Roberts for Congress*); MUR 4506 (*The Hon. Ted Little*); MUR 4512 (*Friends of Lane Evans*); MUR 4517 (*Unknown Respondent*); MUR 4518 (*Kansans for Rathbun*); MUR 4520 (*Larry Lerner for*

Attachment 1 to this report contains summaries of each case, the EPS rating, and the factors leading to assignment of a low priority and recommendation not to further pursue the matter.

B. Stale Cases

Effective enforcement relies upon the timely pursuit of complaints and referrals to ensure compliance with the law. Investigations concerning activity more distant in time usually require a greater commitment of resources, primarily due to the fact that the evidence of such activity becomes more remote and consequently more difficult to develop. Focusing investigative efforts on more recent and more significant activity also has a more positive effect on the electoral process and the regulated community. In recognition of these facts, EPS also provides us with the means to identify those cases which, though earning a higher rating when received, remained unassigned due to a lack of resources for effective investigation. The utility of commencing an investigation declines as these cases age, until they reach a point when activation of a case would not be an efficient use of the Commission's resources.

Congress); MUR 4522 (*Republican Party of Bexar County*); MUR 4523 (*Cong. Andrea Seastrand*); MUR 4524 (*Danny Covington Campaign Fund Committee*); MUR 4526 (*Hoeffell for Congress*); MUR 4528 (*Pete King for Congress*); MUR 4529 (*Pete King for Congress*); MUR 4532 (*Citizen's Committee for Gilman for Congress*); MUR 4535 (*Visclosky for Congress*); MUR 4537 (*Di Nicola for Congress*); MUR 4541 (*Ross Perot*); MUR 4548 (*Blagojevich for Congress*); MUR 4550 (*Friends of Wamp for Congress*); MUR 4551 (*John N. Hostettler*); MUR 4557 (*De La Rosa for Congress*); MUR 4559 (*Bill Baker for Congress*); MUR 4560 (*George Stuart Jr. for Congress*); MUR 4562 (*Wayne E. Schile*); MUR 4566 (*Al Gore*); MUR 4574 (*Danny Covington Campaign Fund Committee*); MUR 4576 (*Volunteers for Shimkus*); MUR 4579 (*New Zion Baptist Church*); MUR 4580 (*Friends of Mike Forbes*); MUR 4584 (*Bill Baker for Congress*); MUR 4588 (*Navarro for Congress*); and MUR 4613 (*Guy Kelley for Congress*).

2 The U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, however, held in *Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee v. FEC*, Civil Action No. 95-0349 (D.D.C. April 17, 1996), that 24 months was too long a time in which to hold a case in an inactive status.

97043039941

Twenty one cases have remained on the Central Enforcement Docket for a sufficient period of time to render them stale, all of which are recommended for closure in this Report.[4] This group includes four MURs that became stale several months ago, but were held pending criminal prosecution by the Department of Justice.[5] DOJ obtained convictions in the two criminal cases related to these four MURs (*U.S. v. Jay Kim* and *U.S. v. Dynamic Energy Resources*) based upon guilty pleas by the key defendants, who are also the principal respondents in our pending matters. Pursuit of civil enforcement action in view of the satisfactory results obtained in the criminal cases would not be the most effective use of the Commission's scarce resources at this time.

We recommend that the Commission exercise its prosecutorial discretion and direct closure of the cases listed below, effective August 29, 1997. Closing these cases as

---

[4] These cases are: MUR 4274 (*GOPAC*); MUR 4358 (*Miller for Senate*); MUR 4361 (*ABC-TV*); MUR 4368 (*Citizens Business Bank*); MUR 4380 (*AFGE Local 2391 PAC*); MUR 4385 (*Dial for Congress*); MUR 4386 (*Zimmer for Senate*); MUR 4396 (*ABC*); MUR 4404 (*Friends of Steve Stockman*); MUR 4410 (*39th Legislative District*); MUR 4417 (*Our Choice II*); MUR 4422 (*Desana for Congress Committee*); and Pre-MUR 336 (*Park National Bank & Trust*).

[5] These cases are: MUR 3796 (*Jay Kim for Congress*); MUR 3798 (*Jay Kim*); MUR 4275 (*Jay Kim*); and MUR 4356 (*Dynamic Energy Resources*). In dismissing the Jay Kim cases, we also recommend closing Pre-MUR 352, which is the transmittal of the guilty plea agreement and related documentation in the criminal case against Congressman Kim forwarded by United States Attorney's office.

of this date will permit CED and the Legal Review Team the necessary time to prepare closing letters and case files for the public record.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS.

A. Decline to open a MUR, close the file effective August 29, 1997, and approve the appropriate letters in the following matters:

Pre-MUR 336 Pre-MUR 352

B. Take no action, close the file effective August 29, 1997, and approve the appropriate letters in the following matters:

MUR 3796	MUR 4396	MUR 4522	MUR 4559
MUR 3798	MUR 4404	MUR 4523	MUR 4560
MUR 4274	MUR 4410	MUR 4524	MUR 4562
MUR 4275	MUR 4417	MUR 4526	MUR 4566
	MUR 4422	MUR 4528	MUR 4574
MUR 4356	MUR 4470	MUR 4529	MUR 4576
MUR 4358	MUR 4478	MUR 4532	MUR 4579
MUR 4361	MUR 4492	MUR 4535	MUR 4580
MUR 4368	MUR 4498	MUR 4537	MUR 4584
	MUR 4506	MUR 4541	MUR 4588
MUR 4380	MUR 4512	MUR 4548	MUR 4613
MUR 4385	MUR 4517	MUR 4550	
MUR 4386	MUR 4518	MUR 4551	
	MUR 4520	MUR 4557	

8/14/97
Date

LM Noble (JH)
Lawrence M. Noble
General Counsel

Attachment:
Case Summaries

97044353949 43

BEFORE THE FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

In the Matter of	)	
	)	Agenda Document No. X97-55
Enforcement Priority	)	

CERTIFICATION

I, Marjorie W. Emmons, recording secretary for the Federal Election Commission executive session on August 19, 1997, do hereby certify that the Commission decided by a vote of 4-1 to take the following actions with respect to Agenda Document No. X97-55:

A. Decline to open a MUR, close the file effective August 29, 1997, and approve the appropriate letters in the following matters:

1. Pre-MUR 336. 2. Pre-MUR 352.

B. Take no action, close the file effective August 29, 1997, and approve the appropriate letters in the following matters:

1. MUR 3796.	2. MUR 3798.	3. MUR 4274.
4. MUR 4275.	5. MUR 4356.	6. MUR 4358.
7. MUR 4361.	8. MUR 4368.	9. MUR 4380.
10. MUR 4385.	11. MUR 4386.	12. MUR 4396.
13. MUR 4404.	14. MUR 4410.	15. MUR 4417.
16. MUR 4422.	17. MUR 4470.	18. MUR 4478.

(continued)

97U4353949 4

19. MUR 4492.	20. MUR 4498.	21. MUR 4506.
22. MUR 4512.	23. MUR 4517.	24. MUR 4518.
25. MUR 4520.	26. MUR 4522.	27. MUR 4523.
28. MUR 4524.	29. MUR 4526.	30. MUR 4528
31. MUR 4529.	32. MUR 4532.	33. MUR 4535.
34. MUR 4537.	35. MUR 4541.	36. MUR 4548
37. MUR 4550.	38. MUR 4551.	39. MUR 4557.
40. MUR 4559.	41. MUR 4560.	42. MUR 4562.
43. MUR 4566.	44. MUR 4574.	45. MUR 4576.
46. MUR 4579.	47. MUR 4580.	48. MUR 4584.
49. MUR 4588.	50. MUR 4613.	

Commissioners Aikens, McDonald, McGarry, and Thomas voted affirmatively for the decision; Commissioner Elliott dissented.

Attest:

8-21-97
Date

Marjorie W. Emmons
Marjorie W. Emmons
Secretary of the Commission

9704383349945

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20463

August 29, 1997

CERTIFIED MAIL
RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

Edward I. Dyck
253 Heather Crest Drive
Chesterfield, MO 63017

RE: MUR 4541

Dear Mr. Dyck:

On October 25, 1996, the Federal Election Commission received your complaint alleging certain violations of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended ("the Act").

After considering the circumstances of this matter, the Commission has determined to exercise its prosecutorial discretion and to take no action against the respondents. See attached narrative. Accordingly, the Commission closed its file in this matter on August 29, 1997. This matter will become part of the public record within 30 days.

The Act allows a complainant to seek judicial review of the Commission's dismissal of this action. See 2 U.S.C. § 437g(a)(8).

Sincerely,

F. Andrew Turley
Supervisory Attorney
Central Enforcement Docket

Attachment
Narrative

9704353946

MUR 4541
ROSS PEROT

Edward Dyck alleges that Ross Perot, his committees, the treasurers, and Sandra McClure misreported an $8,223.26 expenditure to Ms. McClure as "consulting fees" which should have been reported as payment of her legal bills arising out of a civil lawsuit. In an amendment to the complaint, Mr. Dyck claims that Mr. Perot paid for investigating volunteers and adds respondents Carol Platt, Alan Kohn, R. Clayton Mulford, Kim J. Askew, John K. Lemkemeier, G. Carroll Stribling and Thomas Luce, III -- all past or present counsel to several of the original respondents.

Respondent Alan Kohn, counsel for Ms. McClure, states that she did not file the report and that Mr. Dyck's complaints and lawsuits are harassment of her and her attorneys.

Respondent R. Clayton Mulford, counsel to Ross Perot, Perot Reform Committee Inc., Mike Poss, as treasurer, Perot '96, Inc., and Mike Poss, as treasurer, states on their behalf, and his own, that the money paid to Ms. McClure was in fact for consulting fees and expenses. The money mentioned in the amendment was to obtain a restraining order stopping threatening activities around volunteer offices, not to investigate volunteers. He asserts that this is just one of Mr. Dyck's many baseless complaints and lawsuits against his clients and Ms. McClure.

Respondent law firm Askew, Kohn, Lemkemeier and Mulford state in its separate response that Mr. Dyck has brought baseless lawsuits before the courts and Commission to try to siphon money from Mr. Perot. These cases, they state, continually have been dismissed as groundless, and after each dismissal, he simply files again in a different venue.

Respondent Thomas Luce denies any knowledge of Mr. Dyck, or of any facts alleged in his complaint. Respondent Stribuling refutes the allegations against him, and likewise denies knowledge of any of the facts alleged. Ms. Platt also claims no knowledge of this matter, and believes that the complaint is wholly without merit.

This matter is less significant relative to other matters pending before the Commission.

9 / 0 4 5 3 3 4 9 4 7

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20463

August 29, 1997

John W. Lemkemeier, Esq.
Bryan Cave LLP
One Metropolitan Square
211 N. Broadway, Suite 3600
St. Louis, MO 63102-2750

RE: MUR 4541

Dear Mr. Lemkemeier:

On February 7, 1997, the Federal Election Commission notified you of a complaint alleging certain violations of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended. A copy of the complaint was enclosed with that notification.

After considering the circumstances of this matter, the Commission has determined to exercise its prosecutorial discretion and to take no action against you. See attached narrative. Accordingly, the Commission closed its file in this matter on August 29, 1997.

The confidentiality provisions of 2 U.S.C. § 437g(a)(12) no longer apply and this matter is now public. In addition, although the complete file must be placed on the public record within 30 days, this could occur at any time following certification of the Commission's vote. If you wish to submit any factual or legal materials to appear on the public record, please do so as soon as possible. While the file may be placed on the public record prior to receipt of your additional materials, any permissible submissions will be added to the public record when received.

If you have any questions, please contact Jennifer Henry on our toll-free number, (800)-424-9530. Our local number is (202) 219-3690.

Sincerely,

F. Andrew Turley
Supervisory Attorney
Central Enforcement Docket

Attachment
Narrative

9704383349948

MUR 4541
ROSS PEROT

Edward Dyck alleges that Ross Perot, his committees, the treasurers, and Sandra McClure misreported an $8,223.26 expenditure to Ms. McClure as "consulting fees" which should have been reported as payment of her legal bills arising out of a civil lawsuit. In an amendment to the complaint, Mr. Dyck claims that Mr. Perot paid for investigating volunteers and adds respondents Carol Platt, Alan Kohn, R. Clayton Mulford, Kim J. Askew, John K. Lemkemeier, G. Carroll Stribling and Thomas Luce, III -- all past or present counsel to several of the original respondents.

Respondent Alan Kohn, counsel for Ms. McClure, states that she did not file the report and that Mr. Dyck's complaints and lawsuits are harassment of her and her attorneys.

Respondent R. Clayton Mulford, counsel to Ross Perot, Perot Reform Committee Inc., Mike Poss, as treasurer, Perot '96, Inc., and Mike Poss, as treasurer, states on their behalf, and his own, that the money paid to Ms. McClure was in fact for consulting fees and expenses. The money mentioned in the amendment was to obtain a restraining order stopping threatening activities around volunteer offices, not to investigate volunteers. He asserts that this is just one of Mr. Dyck's many baseless complaints and lawsuits against his clients and Ms. McClure.

Respondent law firm Askew, Kohn, Lemkemeier and Mulford state in its separate response that Mr. Dyck has brought baseless lawsuits before the courts and Commission to try to siphon money from Mr. Perot. These cases, they state, continually have been dismissed as groundless, and after each dismissal, he simply files again in a different venue.

Respondent Thomas Luce denies any knowledge of Mr. Dyck, or of any facts alleged in his complaint. Respondent Stribuling refutes the allegations against him, and likewise denies knowledge of any of the facts alleged. Ms. Platt also claims no knowledge of this matter, and believes that the complaint is wholly without merit.

This matter is less significant relative to other matters pending before the Commission.

97043353949

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20463

August 29, 1997

G. Carroll Stribling, Jr., Esq.
Ziercher & Hocker, P.C.
231 South Bemiston, 8th Floor
Clayton, MO 63105-1914

RE: MUR 4541

Dear Mr. Stribling:

On February 7, 1997, the Federal Election Commission notified you of a complaint alleging certain violations of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended. A copy of the complaint was enclosed with that notification.

After considering the circumstances of this matter, the Commission has determined to exercise its prosecutorial discretion and to take no action against you. See attached narrative. Accordingly, the Commission closed its file in this matter on August 29, 1997.

The confidentiality provisions of 2 U.S.C. § 437g(a)(12) no longer apply and this matter is now public. In addition, although the complete file must be placed on the public record within 30 days, this could occur at any time following certification of the Commission's vote. If you wish to submit any factual or legal materials to appear on the public record, please do so as soon as possible. While the file may be placed on the public record prior to receipt of your additional materials, any permissible submissions will be added to the public record when received.

If you have any questions, please contact Jennifer Henry on our toll-free number, (800)-424-9530. Our local number is (202) 219-3690.

Sincerely,

F. Andrew Turley
Supervisory Attorney
Central Enforcement Docket

Attachment
Narrative

97U43034950

MUR 4541
ROSS PEROT

Edward Dyck alleges that Ross Perot, his committees, the treasurers, and Sandra McClure misreported an $8,223.26 expenditure to Ms. McClure as "consulting fees" which should have been reported as payment of her legal bills arising out of a civil lawsuit. In an amendment to the complaint, Mr. Dyck claims that Mr. Perot paid for investigating volunteers and adds respondents Carol Platt, Alan Kohn, R. Clayton Mulford, Kim J. Askew, John K. Lemkemeier, G. Carroll Stribling and Thomas Luce, III -- all past or present counsel to several of the original respondents.

Respondent Alan Kohn, counsel for Ms. McClure, states that she did not file the report and that Mr. Dyck's complaints and lawsuits are harassment of her and her attorneys.

Respondent R. Clayton Mulford, counsel to Ross Perot, Perot Reform Committee Inc., Mike Poss, as treasurer, Perot '96, Inc., and Mike Poss, as treasurer, states on their behalf, and his own, that the money paid to Ms. McClure was in fact for consulting fees and expenses. The money mentioned in the amendment was to obtain a restraining order stopping threatening activities around volunteer offices, not to investigate volunteers. He asserts that this is just one of Mr. Dyck's many baseless complaints and lawsuits against his clients and Ms. McClure.

Respondent law firm Askew, Kohn, Lemkemeier and Mulford state in its separate response that Mr. Dyck has brought baseless lawsuits before the courts and Commission to try to siphon money from Mr. Perot. These cases, they state, continually have been dismissed as groundless, and after each dismissal, he simply files again in a different venue.

Respondent Thomas Luce denies any knowledge of Mr. Dyck, or of any facts alleged in his complaint. Respondent Stribuling refutes the allegations against him, and likewise denies knowledge of any of the facts alleged. Ms. Platt also claims no knowledge of this matter, and believes that the complaint is wholly without merit.

This matter is less significant relative to other matters pending before the Commission.

9704303495 1

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20463

August 29, 1997

Kim J. Askew, Esq.
Hughes & Luce, L.L.P.
1717 Main Street, Suite 2800
Dallas, TX 75201

RE: MUR 4541

Dear Ms. Askew:

On February 7, 1997, the Federal Election Commission notified you of a complaint alleging certain violations of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended. A copy of the complaint was enclosed with that notification.

After considering the circumstances of this matter, the Commission has determined to exercise its prosecutorial discretion and to take no action against you. See attached narrative. Accordingly, the Commission closed its file in this matter on August 29, 1997.

The confidentiality provisions of 2 U.S.C. § 437g(a)(12) no longer apply and this matter is now public. In addition, although the complete file must be placed on the public record within 30 days, this could occur at any time following certification of the Commission's vote. If you wish to submit any factual or legal materials to appear on the public record, please do so as soon as possible. While the file may be placed on the public record prior to receipt of your additional materials, any permissible submissions will be added to the public record when received.

If you have any questions, please contact Jennifer Henry on our toll-free number, (800)-424-9530. Our local number is (202) 219-3690.

Sincerely,

F. Andrew Turley
Supervisory Attorney
Central Enforcement Docket

Attachment
Narrative

9 7 0 4 3 3 4 9 5 2

MUR 4541
ROSS PEROT

Edward Dyck alleges that Ross Perot, his committees, the treasurers, and Sandra McClure misreported an $8,223.26 expenditure to Ms. McClure as "consulting fees" which should have been reported as payment of her legal bills arising out of a civil lawsuit. In an amendment to the complaint, Mr. Dyck claims that Mr. Perot paid for investigating volunteers and adds respondents Carol Platt, Alan Kohn, R. Clayton Mulford, Kim J. Askew, John K. Lemkemeier, G. Carroll Stribling and Thomas Luce, III -- all past or present counsel to several of the original respondents.

Respondent Alan Kohn, counsel for Ms. McClure, states that she did not file the report and that Mr. Dyck's complaints and lawsuits are harassment of her and her attorneys.

Respondent R. Clayton Mulford, counsel to Ross Perot, Perot Reform Committee Inc., Mike Poss, as treasurer, Perot '96, Inc., and Mike Poss, as treasurer, states on their behalf, and his own, that the money paid to Ms. McClure was in fact for consulting fees and expenses. The money mentioned in the amendment was to obtain a restraining order stopping threatening activities around volunteer offices, not to investigate volunteers. He asserts that this is just one of Mr. Dyck's many baseless complaints and lawsuits against his clients and Ms. McClure.

Respondent law firm Askew, Kohn, Lemkemeier and Mulford state in its separate response that Mr. Dyck has brought baseless lawsuits before the courts and Commission to try to siphon money from Mr. Perot. These cases, they state, continually have been dismissed as groundless, and after each dismissal, he simply files again in a different venue.

Respondent Thomas Luce denies any knowledge of Mr. Dyck, or of any facts alleged in his complaint. Respondent Stribuling refutes the allegations against him, and likewise denies knowledge of any of the facts alleged. Ms. Platt also claims no knowledge of this matter, and believes that the complaint is wholly without merit.

This matter is less significant relative to other matters pending before the Commission.

9 / 0 4 3 3 3 4 9 5 3

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20463

August 29, 1997

Carol A. Platt, Esq.
Armstrong, Teasdale, Schlafly & Davis
One Metropolitan Square, Suite 2600
St. Louis, MO 63102-2740

RE: MUR 4541

Dear Ms. Platt:

On February 7, 1997, the Federal Election Commission notified you of a complaint alleging certain violations of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended. A copy of the complaint was enclosed with that notification.

After considering the circumstances of this matter, the Commission has determined to exercise its prosecutorial discretion and to take no action against you. See attached narrative. Accordingly, the Commission closed its file in this matter on August 29, 1997.

The confidentiality provisions of 2 U.S.C. § 437g(a)(12) no longer apply and this matter is now public. In addition, although the complete file must be placed on the public record within 30 days, this could occur at any time following certification of the Commission's vote. If you wish to submit any factual or legal materials to appear on the public record, please do so as soon as possible. While the file may be placed on the public record prior to receipt of your additional materials, any permissible submissions will be added to the public record when received.

If you have any questions, please contact Jennifer Henry on our toll-free number, (800)-424-9530. Our local number is (202) 219-3690.

Sincerely,

F. Andrew Turley
Supervisory Attorney
Central Enforcement Docket

Attachment
Narrative

9/U4383495 4

MUR 4541
ROSS PEROT

Edward Dyck alleges that Ross Perot, his committees, the treasurers, and Sandra McClure misreported an $8,223.26 expenditure to Ms. McClure as "consulting fees" which should have been reported as payment of her legal bills arising out of a civil lawsuit. In an amendment to the complaint, Mr. Dyck claims that Mr. Perot paid for investigating volunteers and adds respondents Carol Platt, Alan Kohn, R. Clayton Mulford, Kim J. Askew, John K. Lemkemeier, G. Carroll Stribling and Thomas Luce, III -- all past or present counsel to several of the original respondents.

Respondent Alan Kohn, counsel for Ms. McClure, states that she did not file the report and that Mr. Dyck's complaints and lawsuits are harassment of her and her attorneys.

Respondent R. Clayton Mulford, counsel to Ross Perot, Perot Reform Committee Inc., Mike Poss, as treasurer, Perot '96, Inc., and Mike Poss, as treasurer, states on their behalf, and his own, that the money paid to Ms. McClure was in fact for consulting fees and expenses. The money mentioned in the amendment was to obtain a restraining order stopping threatening activities around volunteer offices, not to investigate volunteers. He asserts that this is just one of Mr. Dyck's many baseless complaints and lawsuits against his clients and Ms. McClure.

Respondent law firm Askew, Kohn, Lemkemeier and Mulford state in its separate response that Mr. Dyck has brought baseless lawsuits before the courts and Commission to try to siphon money from Mr. Perot. These cases, they state, continually have been dismissed as groundless, and after each dismissal, he simply files again in a different venue.

Respondent Thomas Luce denies any knowledge of Mr. Dyck, or of any facts alleged in his complaint. Respondent Stribuling refutes the allegations against him, and likewise denies knowledge of any of the facts alleged. Ms. Platt also claims no knowledge of this matter, and believes that the complaint is wholly without merit.

This matter is less significant relative to other matters pending before the Commission.

9 7 0 4 3 0 3 4 9 5 5

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20463

August 29, 1997

Thomas W. Luce, III, Esq.
Hughes & Luce, L.L.P.
1717 Main Street, Suite 2800
Dallas, TX 75201

RE: MUR 4541

Dear Mr. Luce:

On February 7, 1997, the Federal Election Commission notified you of a complaint alleging certain violations of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended. A copy of the complaint was enclosed with that notification.

After considering the circumstances of this matter, the Commission has determined to exercise its prosecutorial discretion and to take no action against you. See attached narrative. Accordingly, the Commission closed its file in this matter on August 29, 1997.

The confidentiality provisions of 2 U.S.C. § 437g(a)(12) no longer apply and this matter is now public. In addition, although the complete file must be placed on the public record within 30 days, this could occur at any time following certification of the Commission's vote. If you wish to submit any factual or legal materials to appear on the public record, please do so as soon as possible. While the file may be placed on the public record prior to receipt of your additional materials, any permissible submissions will be added to the public record when received.

If you have any questions, please contact Jennifer Henry on our toll-free number, (800)-424-9530. Our local number is (202) 219-3690.

Sincerely,

F. Andrew Turley
Supervisory Attorney
Central Enforcement Docket

Attachment
Narrative

9704383495 6

MUR 4541
ROSS PEROT

Edward Dyck alleges that Ross Perot, his committees, the treasurers, and Sandra McClure misreported an $8,223.26 expenditure to Ms. McClure as "consulting fees" which should have been reported as payment of her legal bills arising out of a civil lawsuit. In an amendment to the complaint, Mr. Dyck claims that Mr. Perot paid for investigating volunteers and adds respondents Carol Platt, Alan Kohn, R. Clayton Mulford, Kim J. Askew, John K. Lemkemeier, G. Carroll Stribling and Thomas Luce, III -- all past or present counsel to several of the original respondents.

Respondent Alan Kohn, counsel for Ms. McClure, states that she did not file the report and that Mr. Dyck's complaints and lawsuits are harassment of her and her attorneys.

Respondent R. Clayton Mulford, counsel to Ross Perot, Perot Reform Committee Inc., Mike Poss, as treasurer, Perot '96, Inc., and Mike Poss, as treasurer, states on their behalf, and his own, that the money paid to Ms. McClure was in fact for consulting fees and expenses. The money mentioned in the amendment was to obtain a restraining order stopping threatening activities around volunteer offices, not to investigate volunteers. He asserts that this is just one of Mr. Dyck's many baseless complaints and lawsuits against his clients and Ms. McClure.

Respondent law firm Askew, Kohn, Lemkemeier and Mulford state in its separate response that Mr. Dyck has brought baseless lawsuits before the courts and Commission to try to siphon money from Mr. Perot. These cases, they state, continually have been dismissed as groundless, and after each dismissal, he simply files again in a different venue.

Respondent Thomas Luce denies any knowledge of Mr. Dyck, or of any facts alleged in his complaint. Respondent Stribuling refutes the allegations against him, and likewise denies knowledge of any of the facts alleged. Ms. Platt also claims no knowledge of this matter, and believes that the complaint is wholly without merit.

This matter is less significant relative to other matters pending before the Commission.

9704383495 7

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20463

August 29, 1997

R. Clayton Mulford, Esq.
Hughes & Luce, L.L.P.
1717 Main Street, Suite 2800
Dallas, TX 75201

RE: MUR 4541

Dear Mr. Mulford:

On February 7, 1997, the Federal Election Commission notified you of an amendment to a complaint alleging certain violations of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended. A copy of the complaint was enclosed with that notification.

After considering the circumstances of this matter, the Commission has determined to exercise its prosecutorial discretion and to take no action against you. See attached narrative. Accordingly, the Commission closed its file in this matter on August 29, 1997.

The confidentiality provisions of 2 U.S.C. § 437g(a)(12) no longer apply and this matter is now public. In addition, although the complete file must be placed on the public record within 30 days, this could occur at any time following certification of the Commission's vote. If you wish to submit any factual or legal materials to appear on the public record, please do so as soon as possible. While the file may be placed on the public record prior to receipt of your additional materials, any permissible submissions will be added to the public record when received.

If you have any questions, please contact Jennifer Henry on our toll-free number, (800)-424-9530. Our local number is (202) 219-3690.

Sincerely,

F. Andrew Turley
Supervisory Attorney
Central Enforcement Docket

Attachment
Narrative

9704383349958

MUR 4541
ROSS PEROT

Edward Dyck alleges that Ross Perot, his committees, the treasurers, and Sandra McClure misreported an $8,223.26 expenditure to Ms. McClure as "consulting fees" which should have been reported as payment of her legal bills arising out of a civil lawsuit. In an amendment to the complaint, Mr. Dyck claims that Mr. Perot paid for investigating volunteers and adds respondents Carol Platt, Alan Kohn, R. Clayton Mulford, Kim J. Askew, John K. Lemkemeier, G. Carroll Stribling and Thomas Luce, III -- all past or present counsel to several of the original respondents.

Respondent Alan Kohn, counsel for Ms. McClure, states that she did not file the report and that Mr. Dyck's complaints and lawsuits are harassment of her and her attorneys.

Respondent R. Clayton Mulford, counsel to Ross Perot, Perot Reform Committee Inc., Mike Poss, as treasurer, Perot '96, Inc., and Mike Poss, as treasurer, states on their behalf, and his own, that the money paid to Ms. McClure was in fact for consulting fees and expenses. The money mentioned in the amendment was to obtain a restraining order stopping threatening activities around volunteer offices, not to investigate volunteers. He asserts that this is just one of Mr. Dyck's many baseless complaints and lawsuits against his clients and Ms. McClure.

Respondent law firm Askew, Kohn, Lemkemeier and Mulford state in its separate response that Mr. Dyck has brought baseless lawsuits before the courts and Commission to try to siphon money from Mr. Perot. These cases, they state, continually have been dismissed as groundless, and after each dismissal, he simply files again in a different venue.

Respondent Thomas Luce denies any knowledge of Mr. Dyck, or of any facts alleged in his complaint. Respondent Stribuling refutes the allegations against him, and likewise denies knowledge of any of the facts alleged. Ms. Platt also claims no knowledge of this matter, and believes that the complaint is wholly without merit.

This matter is less significant relative to other matters pending before the Commission.

9 7 0 4 3 8 3 4 9 5 9

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20463

August 29, 1997

Alan C. Kohn, Esq.
Kohn, Shands, Elbert, Gianoulakis & Giljum, LLP
One Mercantile Center, Suite 2410
St. Louis, MO 63101

RE: MUR 4541

Dear Mr. Kohn:

On February 7, 1997, the Federal Election Commission notified you of a amendment to a complaint alleging certain violations of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended. A copy of the complaint was enclosed with that notification.

After considering the circumstances of this matter, the Commission has determined to exercise its prosecutorial discretion and to take no action against you. See attached narrative. Accordingly, the Commission closed its file in this matter on August 29, 1997.

The confidentiality provisions of 2 U.S.C. § 437g(a)(12) no longer apply and this matter is now public. In addition, although the complete file must be placed on the public record within 30 days, this could occur at any time following certification of the Commission's vote. If you wish to submit any factual or legal materials to appear on the public record, please do so as soon as possible. While the file may be placed on the public record prior to receipt of your additional materials, any permissible submissions will be added to the public record when received.

If you have any questions, please contact Jennifer Henry on our toll-free number, (800)-424-9530. Our local number is (202) 219-3690.

Sincerely,

F. Andrew Turley
Supervisory Attorney
Central Enforcement Docket

Attachment
Narrative

97044534960

MUR 4541
ROSS PEROT

Edward Dyck alleges that Ross Perot, his committees, the treasurers, and Sandra McClure misreported an $8,223.26 expenditure to Ms. McClure as "consulting fees" which should have been reported as payment of her legal bills arising out of a civil lawsuit. In an amendment to the complaint, Mr. Dyck claims that Mr. Perot paid for investigating volunteers and adds respondents Carol Platt, Alan Kohn, R. Clayton Mulford, Kim J. Askew, John K. Lemkemeier, G. Carroll Stribling and Thomas Luce, III -- all past or present counsel to several of the original respondents.

Respondent Alan Kohn, counsel for Ms. McClure, states that she did not file the report and that Mr. Dyck's complaints and lawsuits are harassment of her and her attorneys.

Respondent R. Clayton Mulford, counsel to Ross Perot, Perot Reform Committee Inc., Mike Poss, as treasurer, Perot '96, Inc., and Mike Poss, as treasurer, states on their behalf, and his own, that the money paid to Ms. McClure was in fact for consulting fees and expenses. The money mentioned in the amendment was to obtain a restraining order stopping threatening activities around volunteer offices, not to investigate volunteers. He asserts that this is just one of Mr. Dyck's many baseless complaints and lawsuits against his clients and Ms. McClure.

Respondent law firm Askew, Kohn, Lemkemeier and Mulford state in its separate response that Mr. Dyck has brought baseless lawsuits before the courts and Commission to try to siphon money from Mr. Perot. These cases, they state, continually have been dismissed as groundless, and after each dismissal, he simply files again in a different venue.

Respondent Thomas Luce denies any knowledge of Mr. Dyck, or of any facts alleged in his complaint. Respondent Stribuling refutes the allegations against him, and likewise denies knowledge of any of the facts alleged. Ms. Platt also claims no knowledge of this matter, and believes that the complaint is wholly without merit.

This matter is less significant relative to other matters pending before the Commission.

97044353496 1

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20463

August 29, 1997

Alan C. Kohn, Esq.
Kohn, Shands, Elbert, Gianoulakis & Giljum, LLP
One Mercantile Center, Suite 2410
St. Louis, MO 63101

RE: MUR 4541
Sandra McClure

Dear Mr. Kohn:

On November 1, 1996, the Federal Election Commission notified your client of a complaint alleging certain violations of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended. A copy of the complaint was enclosed with that notification.

After considering the circumstances of this matter, the Commission has determined to exercise its prosecutorial discretion and to take no action against your client. See attached narrative. Accordingly, the Commission closed its file in this matter on August 29, 1997.

The confidentiality provisions of 2 U.S.C. § 437g(a)(12) no longer apply and this matter is now public. In addition, although the complete file must be placed on the public record within 30 days, this could occur at any time following certification of the Commission's vote. If you wish to submit any factual or legal materials to appear on the public record, please do so as soon as possible. While the file may be placed on the public record prior to receipt of your additional materials, any permissible submissions will be added to the public record when received.

If you have any questions, please contact Jennifer Henry on our toll-free number, (800)-424-9530. Our local number is (202) 219-3690.

Sincerely,

F. Andrew Turley
Supervisory Attorney
Central Enforcement Docket

Attachment
Narrative

9704353949962

MUR 4541
ROSS PEROT

Edward Dyck alleges that Ross Perot, his committees, the treasurers, and Sandra McClure misreported an $8,223.26 expenditure to Ms. McClure as "consulting fees" which should have been reported as payment of her legal bills arising out of a civil lawsuit. In an amendment to the complaint, Mr. Dyck claims that Mr. Perot paid for investigating volunteers and adds respondents Carol Platt, Alan Kohn, R. Clayton Mulford, Kim J. Askew, John K. Lemkemeier, G. Carroll Stribling and Thomas Luce, III -- all past or present counsel to several of the original respondents.

Respondent Alan Kohn, counsel for Ms. McClure, states that she did not file the report and that Mr. Dyck's complaints and lawsuits are harassment of her and her attorneys.

Respondent R. Clayton Mulford, counsel to Ross Perot, Perot Reform Committee Inc., Mike Poss, as treasurer, Perot '96, Inc., and Mike Poss, as treasurer, states on their behalf, and his own, that the money paid to Ms. McClure was in fact for consulting fees and expenses. The money mentioned in the amendment was to obtain a restraining order stopping threatening activities around volunteer offices, not to investigate volunteers. He asserts that this is just one of Mr. Dyck's many baseless complaints and lawsuits against his clients and Ms. McClure.

Respondent law firm Askew, Kohn, Lemkemeier and Mulford state in its separate response that Mr. Dyck has brought baseless lawsuits before the courts and Commission to try to siphon money from Mr. Perot. These cases, they state, continually have been dismissed as groundless, and after each dismissal, he simply files again in a different venue.

Respondent Thomas Luce denies any knowledge of Mr. Dyck, or of any facts alleged in his complaint. Respondent Stribuling refutes the allegations against him, and likewise denies knowledge of any of the facts alleged. Ms. Platt also claims no knowledge of this matter, and believes that the complaint is wholly without merit.

This matter is less significant relative to other matters pending before the Commission.

9704503496 3

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20463

August 29, 1997

R. Clayton Mulford, Esq.
Hughes & Luce, L.L.P.
1717 Main Street, Suite 2800
Dallas, TX 75201

RE: MUR 4541
Ross Perot, Perot Reform Committee, Inc., Mike Poss, Treasurer,
Perot '96, Inc., Mike Poss, Treasurer

Dear Mr. Mulford:

On November 1, 1996, the Federal Election Commission notified your clients of a complaint alleging certain violations of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended. A copy of the complaint was enclosed with that notification.

After considering the circumstances of this matter, the Commission has determined to exercise its prosecutorial discretion and to take no action against your clients. See attached narrative. Accordingly, the Commission closed its file in this matter on August 29, 1997.

The confidentiality provisions of 2 U.S.C. § 437g(a)(12) no longer apply and this matter is now public. In addition, although the complete file must be placed on the public record within 30 days, this could occur at any time following certification of the Commission's vote. If you wish to submit any factual or legal materials to appear on the public record, please do so as soon as possible. While the file may be placed on the public record prior to receipt of your additional materials, any permissible submissions will be added to the public record when received.

If you have any questions, please contact Jennifer Henry on our toll-free number, (800)-424-9530. Our local number is (202) 219-3690.

Sincerely,

F. Andrew Turley
Supervisory Attorney
Central Enforcement Docket

Attachment
Narrative

97044353949964

MUR 4541
ROSS PEROT

Edward Dyck alleges that Ross Perot, his committees, the treasurers, and Sandra McClure misreported an $8,223.26 expenditure to Ms. McClure as "consulting fees" which should have been reported as payment of her legal bills arising out of a civil lawsuit. In an amendment to the complaint, Mr. Dyck claims that Mr. Perot paid for investigating volunteers and adds respondents Carol Platt, Alan Kohn, R. Clayton Mulford, Kim J. Askew, John K. Lemkemeier, G. Carroll Stribling and Thomas Luce, III -- all past or present counsel to several of the original respondents.

Respondent Alan Kohn, counsel for Ms. McClure, states that she did not file the report and that Mr. Dyck's complaints and lawsuits are harassment of her and her attorneys.

Respondent R. Clayton Mulford, counsel to Ross Perot, Perot Reform Committee Inc., Mike Poss, as treasurer, Perot '96, Inc., and Mike Poss, as treasurer, states on their behalf, and his own, that the money paid to Ms. McClure was in fact for consulting fees and expenses. The money mentioned in the amendment was to obtain a restraining order stopping threatening activities around volunteer offices, not to investigate volunteers. He asserts that this is just one of Mr. Dyck's many baseless complaints and lawsuits against his clients and Ms. McClure.

Respondent law firm Askew, Kohn, Lemkemeier and Mulford state in its separate response that Mr. Dyck has brought baseless lawsuits before the courts and Commission to try to siphon money from Mr. Perot. These cases, they state, continually have been dismissed as groundless, and after each dismissal, he simply files again in a different venue.

Respondent Thomas Luce denies any knowledge of Mr. Dyck, or of any facts alleged in his complaint. Respondent Stribuling refutes the allegations against him, and likewise denies knowledge of any of the facts alleged. Ms. Platt also claims no knowledge of this matter, and believes that the complaint is wholly without merit.

This matter is less significant relative to other matters pending before the Commission.

9 7 0 4 3 8 3 4 9 6 5

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20463

THIS IS THE END OF MUR # 4541

DATE FILMED 9-23-97 CAMERA NO. 4

CAMERAMAN JMH

9704383349966