



FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20463

Sikandar Shukla
Revv, LLC
1101 K Street NW, 8th Floor
Washington, DC 20005

CONFIDENTIAL

JAN 26 2018

RE: MUR 7254
Sikandar Shukla

Dear Mr. Shukla:

On June 26, 2017, the Federal Election Commission ("Commission") notified you of a complaint alleging violations of certain sections of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended (the "Act"). On January 5, 2018, based upon the information contained in the complaint and the available information, the Commission decided to dismiss allegations that you violated provisions of the Act. The Commission then closed its file in this matter. A copy of the General Counsel's Report, which more fully explains the basis for the Commission's decision, is enclosed.

Documents related to the case will be placed on the public record within 30 days. See Statement of Policy Regarding Disclosure of Closed Enforcement and Related Files, 68 Fed. Reg. 70,426 (Dec. 18, 2003) and Statement of Policy Regarding Placing First General Counsel's Reports on the Public Record, 74 Fed. Reg. 66132 (Dec. 14, 2009). If you have any questions, please contact Don Campbell, the attorney assigned to this matter, at (202) 694-1650.

Sincerely,

Lisa J. Stevenson
Acting General Counsel

BY: 
Jeff S. Jordan
Assistant General Counsel

Enclosure:
General Counsel's Report

BEFORE THE FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

**ENFORCEMENT PRIORITY SYSTEM
DISMISSAL REPORT**

MUR: 7254

Respondents: Donald J. Trump for President, Inc.
and Bradley T. Crate, as treasurer
(the "Committee")
Revv, LLC
Nick Marcelli
Gerrit Lansing
Chris Georgia
Sikandar Shukla

Complaint Receipt Date: June 21, 2017

Response Date: July 13, 2017; July 27, 2017

EPS Rating:

Alleged Statutory

52 U.S.C. § 30122;

Regulatory Violations:

11 C.F.R. § 110.4(b)(1)(i), (ii)

The Complainant claims that she received an email on July 16, 2016, thanking her for making a \$5 donation to the Committee. The Complainant asserts that she made no such donation, and informed the Committee as such soon after receiving the email. The Complaint claims that the Committee and/or the owners and operators of Revv, LLC ("Revv"), the online platform the Committee used to process campaign contributions, failed to use proper safeguards to prevent the receipt of fraudulent donations or contributions made in the name of another.¹ The Complainant also states that she emailed Revv and requested a refund.

Both Respondents argue that the Complaint does not allege a violation under the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended ("the Act"), or Commission regulations. Revv, which operates an online contribution portal, states that it received a \$5 contribution for the Committee from the Complainant, for which it received a proper authorization from Stripe, its payment

¹ The Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended, and Commission regulations provide that no person shall make a contribution in the name of another person, or knowingly permit his or her name to be used to effect such a contribution. 52 U.S.C. § 30122; 11 C.F.R. § 110.4(b)(1)(i), (ii).

processor. While Revv maintains that it committed no violation, it nonetheless refunded \$5 to the Complainant on July 13, 2017.

Based on its experience and expertise, the Commission has established an Enforcement Priority System using formal, pre-determined scoring criteria to allocate agency resources and assess whether particular matters warrant further administrative enforcement proceedings. These criteria include (1) the gravity of the alleged violation, taking into account both the type of activity and the amount in violation; (2) the apparent impact the alleged violation may have had on the electoral process; (3) the complexity of the legal issues raised in the matter; and (4) recent trends in potential violations and other developments in the law. This matter is rated as low priority for Commission action after application of these pre-established criteria. Given that low rating, the low amount at issue, and the refund issued to the Complainant, we recommend that the Commission dismiss the Complaint consistent with the Commission's prosecutorial discretion to determine the proper ordering of its priorities and use of agency resources.² We also recommend that the Commission close the file as to all the Respondents and send the appropriate letters.


Lisa J. Stevenson
Acting General Counsel

Kathleen M. Guith
Associate General Counsel

11.15.17

Date

BY:


Stephen Gura
Deputy Associate General Counsel

² *Heckler v. Chaney*, 470 U.S. 821, 831-32 (1985).

Donald E. Campbell
Attorney