



FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20463

By First Class Mail

MAY - 8 2018

NHT Productions, LLC
P.O. Box 266
Eaton Rapids, MI 48827

RE: MUR 7092

Dear Sir or Madam:

On June 29 and July 18, 2016, the Federal Election Commission (the "Commission") notified you of a complaint alleging violations of certain sections of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended.

On April 24, 2018, the Commission found, on the basis of the information in the complaint, supplemental complaint, and other available information, that there is no reason to believe that you violated 52 U.S.C. § 30114(b)(1). Accordingly, the Commission closed its file in this matter as it pertains to you. The Factual and Legal Analysis, explaining the Commission's finding, is enclosed.

The Commission reminds you that the confidentiality provisions of 52 U.S.C. § 30109(a)(12)(A) remain in effect, and that this matter is still open with respect to other respondents. The Commission will notify you when the entire file has been closed.

If you have any questions, please contact Ana Peña-Wallace, the attorney assigned to this matter, at (202) 694-1650.

Sincerely,

Mark Shonkwiler
Assistant General Counsel

Enclosure
Factual and Legal Analysis

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

FACTUAL AND LEGAL ANALYSIS

3 **RESPONDENT:** NHT Productions, LLC MUR 7092

5 I. INTRODUCTION

6 This matter was generated by a complaint filed with the Federal Election Commission
7 (the “Commission”) pursuant to 52 U.S.C. § 30109(a)(1). The Complaint concerns payments
8 made by an unauthorized political committee, Socially Responsible Government and Grace
9 Rogers in her official capacity as treasurer (“SRG”), which solicited contributions through its
10 website, www.feelbern.org. SRG’s website advocated the election of former 2016 Presidential
11 candidate Bernie Sanders. The Complaint alleges that vendors who received disbursements from
12 SRG violated the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended (the “Act”), by converting
13 committee funds to personal use.¹

14 The Complaint in MUR 7092 identifies payments made by SRG to NHT Productions (the
15 “Respondent” or “vendor”).² The Complaint alleges that the Respondent skirted the law by SRG
16 funneling expenditures through “recently created shell corporations” to personally benefit the
17 Respondent,³ and concludes that the vendor misused committee funds in violation of the Act’s
18 prohibition against the personal use of campaign funds.⁴ NHT did not submit a response to the
19 Complaint.

¹ Compl., MUR 7092 at 5–8 (June 24, 2016) (“MUR 7092 Compl.”).

2 MUR 7092 Compl. at 5-8.

3 *Id.* at App. I-J.

4 *Id. at 8*

MUR 7092 (NHT Productions, LLC)
Factual and Legal Analysis
Page 2 of 2

1 The Act prohibits the conversion of “contributions accepted by a candidate” to personal
2 use.⁵ Because SRG is an unauthorized committee, the Act’s personal use provisions are not
3 applicable here. Therefore, the Commission finds no reason to believe that NHT Productions,
4 LLC violated 52 U.S.C. § 30114(b)(1).

5

52 U.S.C. § 30114(a).