



FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
Washington, DC 20463

Coalition for Trump Superstore
Robert Jeter

Sylvania, OH 43560

May 5, 2022

RE: MUR 7401

Dear Mr. Jeter:

On June 11, 2018, the Federal Election Commission notified you and the Coalition for Trump Superstore of a complaint alleging violations of certain sections of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended ("the Act"). A copy of the complaint was forwarded to you at that time.

Upon further review of the allegations contained in the complaint, the Commission, on July 11, 2019, voted to dismiss the allegation that you and the Coalition for Trump Superstore violated 52 U.S.C. §§ 30116 and 30118 and 11 C.F.R. § 109.21 by making and accepting prohibited contributions in the form of coordinated communications or expenditures. The Factual and Legal Analyses, which more fully explain the Commission's decision, are enclosed for your information. In addition, the Commission was equally divided as to whether you and the Coalition for Trump Superstore violated 52 U.S.C. § 30124(b) for the fraudulent solicitation of funds. On April 28, 2022, the Commission voted to close the file in this matter.

Documents related to the case will be placed on the public record within 30 days. *See* Disclosure of Certain Documents in Enforcement and Other Matters, 81 Fed. Reg. 50,702 (Aug. 2, 2016).

If you have any questions, please contact Nicholas Bamman, the attorney assigned to this matter, at (202) 694-1650 or nbamman@fec.gov.

Sincerely,

Theodore Lutz
Theodore Lutz
Assistant General Counsel

Enclosure
Factual and Legal Analyses

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
FACTUAL AND LEGAL ANALYSIS

RESPONDENT: Coalition for Trump Superstore MUR: 7401

I. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

6 The Complaint generally alleges that various individuals and organizations coordinated
7 communications with Donald J. Trump and his principal campaign committee, Donald J. Trump
8 for President, Inc. and Bradley T. Crate in his official capacity as treasurer (“Trump
9 Committee”). Based on alleged meetings between various individuals and organizations, the
10 substance of which is vague and unsubstantiated by the Complaint’s attachments, the Complaint
11 concludes that various individuals and organizations coordinated communications with the
12 Trump Committee.¹

13 II. LEGAL ANALYSIS

14 The Act prohibits corporations from making, and candidates or their committees from
15 knowingly accepting, contributions in connection with any election to political office.²
16 Expenditures made by any person “in cooperation, consultation, or concert with, or at the request
17 or suggestion of” a candidate or his authorized committee or agent qualify as an in-kind
18 contribution to the candidate and must be reported as expenditures made by the candidate’s
19 authorized committee.³

20 A communication that is coordinated with a candidate or his authorized committee is
21 considered an in-kind contribution and is subject to the limits, prohibitions, and reporting

¹ See Compl. at 1, 3.

² 52 U.S.C. § 30118(a).

³ 52 U.S.C. § 30116(a)(7)(B); 11 C.F.R. § 109.20(a), (b).

MUR 7401 (Coalition for Trump Superstore)

Factual and Legal Analysis

Page 2 of 2

1 requirements of the Act.⁴ A communication is coordinated with a candidate, his authorized
2 committee, or agent of either, if it meets a three-prong test set forth in the Commission's
3 regulations: (1) it is paid for, in whole or in part, by a person other than the candidate or
4 authorized committee; (2) it satisfies a content standard in 11 C.F.R. § 109.21(c); and (3) it
5 satisfies a conduct standard in 11 C.F.R. § 109.21(d). All three prongs must be satisfied for a
6 communication to be considered coordinated under Commission regulations.⁵

7 Here, the Complaint does not identify any specific communications with which to
8 conduct a coordination analysis. Nor do the conclusory allegations of meetings between various
9 individuals and organizations, indicate, based on the available information in the record, any
10 impermissible coordination under the Act or Commission regulations. Because the allegations
11 fail to indicate that a violation occurred, the Commission dismisses the allegations that various
12 individuals and organizations made, and the Trump Committee accepted, prohibited
13 contributions in the form of coordinated communications or expenditures in violation of
14 52 U.S.C. §§ 30116 and 30118 and 11 C.F.R. § 109.21.

⁴ 52 U.S.C. § 30116; 11 C.F.R. § 109.21(b).

⁵ 11 C.F.R. § 109.21(a); *see also* Explanation and Justification, *Coordinated and Independent Expenditures*, 68 Fed. Reg. 421, 453 (Jan. 3, 2003).

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
FACTUAL AND LEGAL ANALYSIS

RESPONDENT: Robert Jeter MUR: 7401

I. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

6 The Complaint generally alleges that various individuals and organizations coordinated
7 communications with Donald J. Trump and his principal campaign committee, Donald J. Trump
8 for President, Inc. and Bradley T. Crate in his official capacity as treasurer (“Trump
9 Committee”). Based on alleged meetings between various individuals and organizations, the
10 substance of which is vague and unsubstantiated by the Complaint’s attachments, the Complaint
11 concludes that various individuals and organizations coordinated communications with the
12 Trump Committee.¹

13 II. LEGAL ANALYSIS

14 The Act prohibits corporations from making, and candidates or their committees from
15 knowingly accepting, contributions in connection with any election to political office.²
16 Expenditures made by any person “in cooperation, consultation, or concert with, or at the request
17 or suggestion of” a candidate or his authorized committee or agent qualify as an in-kind
18 contribution to the candidate and must be reported as expenditures made by the candidate’s
19 authorized committee.³

20 A communication that is coordinated with a candidate or his authorized committee is
21 considered an in-kind contribution and is subject to the limits, prohibitions, and reporting

¹ See Compl. at 1, 3.

² 52 U.S.C. § 30118(a).

³ 52 U.S.C. § 30116(a)(7)(B); 11 C.F.R. § 109.20(a), (b).

MUR 7401 (Robert Jeter)
Factual and Legal Analysis
Page 2 of 2

1 requirements of the Act.⁴ A communication is coordinated with a candidate, his authorized
2 committee, or agent of either, if it meets a three-prong test set forth in the Commission's
3 regulations: (1) it is paid for, in whole or in part, by a person other than the candidate or
4 authorized committee; (2) it satisfies a content standard in 11 C.F.R. § 109.21(c); and (3) it
5 satisfies a conduct standard in 11 C.F.R. § 109.21(d). All three prongs must be satisfied for a
6 communication to be considered coordinated under Commission regulations.⁵

7 Here, the Complaint does not identify any specific communications with which to
8 conduct a coordination analysis. Nor do the conclusory allegations of meetings between various
9 individuals and organizations, indicate, based on the available information in the record, any
10 impermissible coordination under the Act or Commission regulations. Because the allegations
11 fail to indicate that a violation occurred, the Commission dismisses the allegations that various
12 individuals and organizations made, and the Trump Committee accepted, prohibited
13 contributions in the form of coordinated communications or expenditures in violation of
14 52 U.S.C. §§ 30116 and 30118 and 11 C.F.R. § 109.21.

⁴ 52 U.S.C. § 30116; 11 C.F.R. § 109.21(b).

⁵ 11 C.F.R. § 109.21(a); *see also* Explanation and Justification, *Coordinated and Independent Expenditures*, 68 Fed. Reg. 421, 453 (Jan. 3, 2003).