

1 **FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION**

2  
3 **FIRST GENERAL COUNSEL'S REPORT**

4  
5 MUR 7308

6 DATE FILED: January 4, 2018

7 DATE OF NOTIFICATION: January 12, 2018

8 LAST RESPONSE RECEIVED: March 26, 2018

9 DATE ACTIVATED: April 4, 2018

10 EXPIRATION OF STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS:

11 August 20, 2016 -

12 December 4, 2017

13  
14 ELECTION CYCLE: 2012

15  
16  
17 **COMPLAINANT:**

Tyler Erdman

18  
19 **RESPONDENTS:**

Adam H. Victor

TransGas Development Systems, LLC

Garry Coulter

Nana Yoshioka

Marta Dani

Randall Harris

Noel Daley

Michael C.J. Vanderkemp

Joshua Krakowsky

Glenn Willard

20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30 **RELEVANT STATUTES**

52 U.S.C. § 30116(a)

52 U.S.C. § 30118

52 U.S.C. § 30122

31  
32  
33  
34 **INTERNAL REPORTS CHECKED:** Disclosure Reports

35  
36 **FEDERAL AGENCIES CHECKED:** None

37 **I. DISCUSSION**

38 The Complainant in MUR 7308 asks the Commission to reconsider his previous  
39 complaints in MURs 7005 and 7056, which alleged that Adam H. Victor made contributions in

1 the names of employees, business associates, and members of Victor's family.<sup>1</sup> Those earlier  
2 matters resulted in a conciliation agreement with Victor and TransGas Development Systems,  
3 LLC, in which the Respondents admitted to knowingly and willfully violating the Federal  
4 Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended (the "Act"), and paid a \$65,000 civil penalty.<sup>2</sup> The  
5 Commission did not pursue the straw donors through which Victor made his contributions.<sup>3</sup>  
6 Complainant now alleges that Victor, through intimidation, bribery, threats of physical harm, and  
7 other methods, caused the Commission to receive false or misleading testimony from respondent  
8 straw donors in the earlier matters.<sup>4</sup> The Complaint requests, among other things, that the  
9 Commission reopen MURs 7005 and 7056, including Victor's conciliation agreement, and seek  
10 harsher penalties against him.<sup>5</sup>

11 Specifically, the new Complaint asserts that Victor threatened the straw donors if they  
12 refused to sign the witness statements in response to the Complaints in MURs 7005 and 7056.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> MUR 7308 Compl. at 3-4; *see also* First Gen. Counsel's Rpt. at 1-7, MURs 7005 and 7056 (Adam H. Victor, *et al.*). Two political committees were the recipients of the contributions: Manchin for West Virginia, the principal campaign committee of Joe Manchin III's 2012 Senate campaign, and Friends of Herman Cain, the principal campaign committee for Herman Cain's 2012 presidential campaign. Neither committee was named as a respondent in MURs 7005 and 7056 or in the instant matter.

<sup>2</sup> *See* Conciliation Agreement, MURs 7005 and 7056. TransGas Development Systems, LLC ("TGDS"), is a single-member LLC of which Victor is the sole member. *Id.* at ¶ IV.1. Victor was also criminally prosecuted and pled guilty to one count of making contributions in the names of others in violation of 52 U.S.C. §§ 30122 and 30109(d)(1)(D)(i) and 18 U.S.C. § 2. *See* Plea Agreement, *United States v. Victor*, 1:17-cr-00053 (D.D.C. Apr. 19, 2017). On March 6, 2018, Victor was sentenced to probation for a term of one year, a \$52,500 fine, and a \$100 assessment. *See* Judgment in a Criminal Case, *United States v. Victor*, 1:17-cr-00053 (D.D.C. Mar. 8, 2018).

<sup>3</sup> *See* First Gen. Counsel's Rpt. at 15, MURs 7005 and 7056; Second Amended Certification, MURs 7005 and 7056 (Nov. 16, 2016); Memorandum to the Commission, Pre-Probable Cause Conciliation and Case Closing at 2-4, MURs 7005 and 7056 (July 26, 2017); Certification, MURs 7005 and 7056 (Aug. 3, 2017).

<sup>4</sup> MUR 7308 Compl. at 3-8.

<sup>5</sup> *Id.* at 43.

<sup>6</sup> *Id.* at 4-5. The Complainant refers to several witness statements that had declared under penalty of perjury that payments from Victor or his companies were reimbursements for travel expenses, purchases or, other personal expenses of the alleged straw donors, and several other witness statements that "unidentified payments and/or checks referenced in [the MUR 7005 Complaint] were not paid to [Respondent]." *Id.* at 21; *see also* First Gen. Counsel's Rpt. at 6-7, MURs 7005 and 7056.

1 It also alleges that two of Victor's lawyers, Joshua Krakowsky and Glenn Willard, participated in  
2 this conspiracy by drafting false declarations for the conduits.<sup>7</sup> According to Complainant, these  
3 actions resulted in reduced civil penalties and, with respect to some respondents, the inability for  
4 the Commission to find reason to believe and arrive at a civil penalty.<sup>8</sup>

5 Respondents Krakowsky and Willard each assert that the Complaint does not allege that  
6 they respectively engaged in activity that violated the Act.<sup>9</sup> Krakowsky states that he "never  
7 prepared any document that to [his] knowledge was false in any way and submitted to the  
8 FEC."<sup>10</sup> He also maintains that he has "never prepared any draft witness statements that [he]  
9 knew contained false information" and does not "recall ever meeting in person with any  
10 witnesses involved in this case other than Adam Victor."<sup>11</sup> The only other responses to the MUR  
11 7308 Complaint came from Marta Dani and Nana Yoshioka, who each maintained that further  
12 comment was unnecessary given the resolution of MURs 7005 and 7056.<sup>12</sup> Yoshioka further  
13 requested that the Commission dismiss the Complaint.<sup>13</sup>

14 A number of the allegations in this matter, such as conspiracy, bribery, and witness  
15 tampering, are not within the Commission's jurisdiction. To the extent the new Complaint  
16 provides new information regarding alleged violations of the Act, the contributions at issue

---

<sup>7</sup> MUR 7308 Compl. at 5-6. The Complaint also alleges that Krakowsky bribed a witness on Victor's behalf during litigation unrelated to the allegations addressed in MURs 7005 and 7056. *Id.* at 31-35.

<sup>8</sup> *Id.* at 16. The MUR 7308 Complaint names as respondents many of the same alleged straw donors, excluding Victor's family members, named in MURs 7005 and 7056.

<sup>9</sup> Krakowsky Resp. at 2 (Mar. 16, 2018); Willard Resp. at 1 (Feb. 2, 2018).

<sup>10</sup> Krakowsky Resp. at 2.

<sup>11</sup> *Id.*

<sup>12</sup> Dani Resp. at 1 (Mar. 26, 2018); Yoshioka Resp. at 1 (Feb. 22, 2018).

<sup>13</sup> Yoshioka Resp. at 1.

1 occurred during the 2012 election cycle and are beyond the statute of limitations.<sup>14</sup> In addition,  
2 the Commission conciliated with Victor on a knowing and willful basis with a civil penalty  
3 suggesting that Victor's alleged coercion of witnesses did not result in  
4 more favorable treatment.<sup>15</sup>

5 Because the Commission conciliated with Victor in MURs 7005 and 7056 and all the  
6 violations of the Act alleged in the new Complaint are beyond the statute of limitations, we  
7 recommend that the Commission dismiss MUR 7308.

8  
9 Finally,

10 we recommend that the Commission close the file in this matter.

11 **II. RECOMMENDATIONS**

12 1. Dismiss the allegations in the MUR 7308 Complaint;

---

<sup>14</sup> The Complaint provides new information concerning alleged straw donor Garry Coulter, alleging that the check ledger of TGDS references a check in the amount of \$7,500 payable to Coulter dated December 21, 2011. MUR 7308 Compl. at 18-19. The Complaint asserts that \$2,500 of that amount was used to cover Coulter's \$2,500 contribution to Manchin for West Virginia on December 30, 2011, with the remainder reflecting Coulter's monthly \$5,000 consulting fee from TGDS. *Id.* This proximity of a check from Victor with a political contribution is consistent with the pattern for certain straw donors in MURs 7005 and 7056. *See* First Gen. Counsel's Rpt. at 8-9, MURs 7005 and 7056. Coulter did not respond to the MUR 7308 Complaint, although in response to the MUR 7005 Complaint he denied participating in a straw donor scheme and claimed that all of the payments he received were management consulting services. Coulter Resp. to MUR 7005 Complaint at 1-2 (Feb. 18, 2016). Coulter's \$2,500 contribution to the Manchin Committee was included among Victor's conduit contributions at the reason to believe stage of the earlier matters. *See* First Gen. Counsel's Rpt. at 14-15, MURs 7005 and 7056; Factual and Legal Analysis addressed to Victor at 12, MURs 7005 and 7056; Second Amended Certification, MURs 7005 and 7056 (Nov. 16, 2016). Victor's affidavit admitting to making numerous contributions in the name of another, negotiated during the investigative stage, does not include Coulter's contribution, at Victor's request and in light of the lack of evidence showing that Coulter's contributions were reimbursed. *See* Gen. Counsel's Rpt. #2 at 2 n.5, MURs 7005 and 7056; Certification, MURs 7005 and 7056 (Apr. 27, 2017). As a result, the conciliation agreement accepted by the Commission does not include Coulter's contribution. *See* Memorandum to the Commission, Pre-Probable Cause Conciliation and Case Closing, MURs 7005 and 7056 (June 26, 2017); Certification, MURs 7005 and 7056 (Aug. 3, 2017). In any event, the Coulter contribution is beyond the statute of limitations.

<sup>15</sup> Further, it was apparent at that time that the factual statements in the witness affidavits were not credible. *See* First Gen. Counsel's Rpt. at 12, MURs 7005 and 7056 (characterizing the witnesses' explanations regarding the sequence of events as "remarkable coincidences," and not as likely as the explanation that "Victor gave them money for the purpose of making political contributions").

- 1            2.
- 2            3.     **Approve the attached Factual and Legal Analysis;**
- 3            4.     **Approve the appropriate letters; and**
- 4            5.     **Close the file.**

Lisa J. Stevenson  
Acting General Counsel

6  
7  
8  
9  
10     6/13/18

11     Date

*Kathleen M. Guith*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Kathleen M. Guith  
Associate General Counsel for Enforcement

12  
13  
14  
15  
16     *Mark Allen*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Mark Allen  
Assistant General Counsel

17  
18  
19  
20     *Roy Q. Lockett*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Roy Q. Lockett  
Attorney

21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26     Attachment  
27     Factual and Legal Analysis

10004444-1000



1 made his contributions.<sup>3</sup> Complainant now alleges that Victor, through intimidation, bribery,  
2 threats of physical harm, and other methods, caused the Commission to receive false or  
3 misleading testimony from respondent straw donors in the earlier matters.<sup>4</sup> The Complaint  
4 requests, among other things, that the Commission reopen MURs 7005 and 7056, including  
5 Victor's conciliation agreement, and seek harsher penalties against him.<sup>5</sup>

6 Specifically, the new Complaint asserts that Victor threatened the straw donors if they  
7 refused to sign the witness statements in response to the Complaints in MURs 7005 and 7056.<sup>6</sup>  
8 It also alleges that two of Victor's lawyers, Joshua Krakowsky and Glenn Willard, participated in  
9 this conspiracy by drafting false declarations for the conduits.<sup>7</sup> According to Complainant, these  
10 actions resulted in reduced civil penalties and, with respect to some respondents, the inability for  
11 the Commission to find reason to believe and arrive at a civil penalty.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> See First Gen. Counsel's Rpt. at 15, MURs 7005 and 7056; Second Amended Certification, MURs 7005 and 7056 (Nov. 16, 2016); Memorandum to the Commission, Pre-Probable Cause Conciliation and Case Closing at 2-4, MURs 7005 and 7056 (July 26, 2017); Certification, MURs 7005 and 7056 (Aug. 3, 2017).

<sup>4</sup> MUR 7308 Compl. at 3-8.

<sup>5</sup> *Id.* at 43.

<sup>6</sup> *Id.* at 4-5. The Complainant refers to several witness statements that had declared under penalty of perjury that payments from Victor or his companies were reimbursements for travel expenses, purchases or, other personal expenses of the alleged straw donors, and several other witness statements that "unidentified payments and/or checks referenced in [the MUR 7005 Complaint] were not paid to [Respondent]." *Id.* at 21; see also First Gen. Counsel's Rpt. at 6-7, MURs 7005 and 7056.

<sup>7</sup> MUR 7308 Compl. at 5-6. The Complaint also alleges that Krakowsky bribed a witness on Victor's behalf during litigation unrelated to the allegations addressed in MURs 7005 and 7056. *Id.* at 31-35.

<sup>8</sup> *Id.* at 16. The MUR 7308 Complaint names as respondents many of the same alleged straw donors, excluding Victor's family members, named in MURs 7005 and 7056.

1 Respondents Krakowsky and Willard each assert that the Complaint does not allege that they  
2 respectively engaged in activity that violated the Act.<sup>9</sup> Krakowsky states that he “never prepared  
3 any document that to [his] knowledge was false in any way and submitted to the FEC.”<sup>10</sup> He also  
4 maintains that he has “never prepared any draft witness statements that [he] knew contained false  
5 information” and does not “recall ever meeting in person with any witnesses involved in this  
6 case other than Adam Victor.”<sup>11</sup> The only other responses to the MUR 7308 Complaint came  
7 from Marta Dani and Nana Yoshioka, who each maintained that further comment was  
8 unnecessary given the resolution of MURs 7005 and 7056.<sup>12</sup> Yoshioka further requested that the  
9 Commission dismiss the Complaint.<sup>13</sup>

10 A number of the allegations in this matter, such as conspiracy, bribery, and witness  
11 tampering, are not within the Commission’s jurisdiction. To the extent the new Complaint  
12 provides new information regarding alleged violations of the Act, the contributions at issue

---

<sup>9</sup> Krakowsky Resp. at 2 (Mar. 16, 2018); Willard Resp. at 1 (Feb. 2, 2018).

<sup>10</sup> Krakowsky Resp. at 2.

<sup>11</sup> *Id.*

<sup>12</sup> Dani Resp. at 1 (Mar. 26, 2018); Yoshioka Resp. at 1 (Feb. 22, 2018).

<sup>13</sup> Yoshioka Resp. at 1.



1 occurred during the 2012 election cycle and are beyond the statute of limitations.<sup>14</sup> In addition,  
2 the Commission conciliated with Victor on a knowing and willful basis with a substantial civil  
3 penalty, suggesting that Victor's alleged coercion of witnesses did not result in more favorable  
4 treatment.<sup>15</sup>

5 Because the Commission conciliated with Victor in MURs 7005 and 7056 and all the  
6 violations of the Act alleged in the new Complaint are beyond the statute of limitations, the  
7 Commission has determined to dismiss the Complaint in MUR 7308.

---

<sup>14</sup> The Complaint provides new information concerning alleged straw donor Garry Coulter, alleging that the check ledger of TGDS references a check in the amount of \$7,500 payable to Coulter dated December 21, 2011. MUR 7308 Compl. at 18-19. The Complaint asserts that \$2,500 of that amount was used to cover Coulter's \$2,500 contribution to Manchin for West Virginia on December 30, 2011, with the remainder reflecting Coulter's monthly \$5,000 consulting fee from TGDS. *Id.* This proximity of a check from Victor with a political contribution is consistent with the pattern for certain straw donors in MURs 7005 and 7056. See First Gen. Counsel's Rpt. at 8-9, MURs 7005 and 7056. Coulter did not respond to the MUR 7308 Complaint, although in response to the MUR 7005 Complaint he denied participating in a straw donor scheme and claimed that all of the payments he received were management consulting services. Coulter Resp. to MUR 7005 Complaint at 1-2 (Feb. 18, 2016). Coulter's \$2,500 contribution to the Manchin Committee was included among Victor's conduit contributions at the reason to believe stage of the earlier matters. See First Gen. Counsel's Rpt. at 14-15, MURs 7005 and 7056; Factual and Legal Analysis addressed to Victor at 12, MURs 7005 and 7056; Second Amended Certification, MURs 7005 and 7056 (Nov. 16, 2016). Victor's affidavit admitting to making numerous contributions in the name of another, negotiated during the investigative stage, does not include Coulter's contribution, at Victor's request and in light of the lack of evidence showing that Coulter's contributions were reimbursed. See Gen. Counsel's Rpt. #2 at 2 n.5, MURs 7005 and 7056; Certification, MURs 7005 and 7056 (Apr. 27, 2017). As a result, the conciliation agreement accepted by the Commission does not include Coulter's contribution. See Memorandum to the Commission, Pre-Probable Cause Conciliation and Case Closing, MURs 7005 and 7056 (June 26, 2017); Certification, MURs 7005 and 7056 (Aug. 3, 2017). In any event, the Coulter contribution is beyond the statute of limitations.

<sup>15</sup> Further, it was apparent at that time that the factual statements in the witness affidavits were not credible. See First Gen. Counsel's Rpt. at 12, MURs 7005 and 7056 (characterizing the witnesses' explanations regarding the sequence of events as "remarkable coincidences," and not as likely as the explanation that "Victor gave them money for the purpose of making political contributions").