

## FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

Washington, D.C. 20463

## **MEMORANDUM**

2 3

1

**TO**: The Commission

4 5

**FROM**: Lisa J. Stevenson

6

Acting General Counsel

7 8

Charles Kitcher

9

Acting Associate General Counsel for Enforcement

10 11

**BY**: Mark Allen **MA** 

12

**Assistant General Counsel** 

13 14

Anne B. Robinson ABR

15

5

16 17

18

**SUBJECT**: MUR 7450 (AshBritt, Inc., et al.) – AshBritt's Request for Pre-Probable Cause

Conciliation

Attorney

19 20

21

22

23

On July 23, 2019, the Commission found reason to believe that AshBritt, Inc. ("AshBritt"), a federal contractor, violated 52 U.S.C. § 30119(a)(1) and 11 C.F.R. § 115.2(a) by making a \$500,000 contribution to America First Action, Inc. and Jon Proch in his official capacity as treasurer ("AFA"), an independent-expenditure-only committee. <sup>1</sup> The Commission took no action at this time as to the allegations regarding AFA. <sup>2</sup> The Commission also approved the use of compulsory process. <sup>3</sup>

242526

27

28

29

30

AshBritt has requested pre-probable cause conciliation and refused to provide discovery responses beyond the record set forth in the Commission's Factual and Legal Analysis. As discussed below, we recommend that the Commission deny the request because it appears to be an effort to prevent the Commission from learning what happened and AshBritt has refused to provide tolling despite knowing that the Commission lacks a quorum such that it could approve a conciliated resolution of the matter.

31 32

Certification, MUR 7450 (AshBritt, Inc.) (July 24, 2019).

 $<sup>^{2}</sup>$  Id.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Certification, MUR 7450 (AshBritt, Inc.) (July 29, 2019).

MUR 7450 (AshBritt, Inc., et al.) Page 2 of 4

5

6

7

8

On August 9, 2019, we notified counsel for AshBritt, by email and mail, of the Commission's reason to believe findings and enclosed Requests for Written Answers and Production of Documents ("informal discovery"). On August 21, 2019, we received a letter and designation from new counsel requesting that the Commission enter into pre-probable cause conciliation with AshBritt and "stay" the informal discovery responses that were due on September 9, 2019. Counsel's letter did not offer to share information with the Commission that would clarify the factual record, nor did it offer to admit liability in a conciliation agreement. Instead, the letter indicated that counsel was prepared to contest the Commission's findings.

cause conciliation at this time would be premature. We noted that we would need additional

probable cause conciliation.8 We also noted that counsel's August 21 letter said that AshBritt

a Conciliation Agreement admitting it violated the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as

contested the Commission's findings, which we understood to mean that AshBritt would not sign

information before we could consider recommending that the Commission enter into pre-

On September 5, 2019, we responded by email explaining that entering into pre-probable

9 10

11 12

13 14 15

16 17 18

19 20

2122232425

2627

28

Counsel for AshBritt responded by letter stating that "the decision of whether to conciliate . . . rests solely with the Commission, not staff in OGC" and characterizing as erroneous the "notion that an admission of a legal violation is a necessary condition for conciliation." The letter further stated that "though we understand OGC will likely make a negative recommendation to the Commission, Ashbritt [sic] will await a formal vote from the Commission to its conciliation request before responding to the Requests for Written Answers and Production of Documents." To date, AshBritt has not responded to our informal discovery or the Commission's reason to believe findings even as we have continued to request that it do

amended (the "Act").9

so.

Letter from Benjamin Ginsberg, counsel for AshBritt, to Anne Robinson, FEC (August 21, 2019).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> *Id*.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> *Id*.

Email from Anne Robinson, FEC, to Benjamin Ginsberg, counsel for AshBritt (Sept. 5, 2019). Although AshBritt's counsel notes that it first requested pre-probable cause conciliation ten days before the Commission lost its quorum, the OGC staff attorney assigned to this matter notified AshBritt's counsel on August 23, 2019, that she would be out of the office the week of August 26 and follow up with him when she returned to the office during the week of September 3, 2019.

<sup>8</sup> *Id.* 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> *Id*.

Letter from Benjamin Ginsberg, counsel for AshBritt, to Anne Robinson, FEC (Sept. 6, 2019).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> *Id*.

MUR 7450 (AshBritt, Inc., et al.) Page 3 of 4

On September 25, 2019, we asked AshBritt's counsel to clarify whether AshBritt was continuing to request that the Commission enter into pre-probable cause conciliation despite the Commission's lack of quorum, and, if so, whether AshBritt would agree to toll the statute of limitations until the Commission regains a quorum. We further explained that the Commission typically seeks an admission of a violation of the Act during pre-probable cause conciliation, in addition to information that will expand and clarify the record. We requested that counsel confirm whether AshBritt would maintain its position that it would not provide an admission nor additional information. He

On October 1, 2019, AshBritt's counsel sent a short response stating that AshBritt:

confirms its request under 11 C.F.R. § 111.18 that the Commission vote to enter into pre-probable cause conciliation negotiations in order to bring an efficient end to this matter. AshBritt will await the Commission vote to which is it entitled before taking any further action in this matter, and sees no reason for a tolling agreement.<sup>15</sup>

We recommend that AshBritt's request for pre-probable cause conciliation be denied. AshBritt has provided no additional information to the Commission since the reason to believe findings and has refused to respond to informal discovery pending a vote that cannot be completed while the Commission lacks a quorum. As we noted in the First General Counsel's Report, we are investigating whether the \$500,000 disbursed from AshBritt's account belonged to AFA or AshBritt Chairman Randall Perkins at the time the contribution was made. We are seeking targeted information regarding AshBritt's bylaws as it relates to AshBritt's "loan/distribution accounts" and information regarding Perkins's authority to "charge" such an expense to his "loan/distribution account," in addition to documentation of the purported "charge" to the account.

Further, Perkins's statements recently reported in the media are consistent with our recommendations in the First General Counsel's Report and the Commission's decision to investigate this matter. We noted in the First General Counsel's Report that "the proposed investigation would examine the circumstances of the contribution and may provide information

Letter from Anne Robinson, FEC, to Benjamin Ginsberg, counsel for AshBritt (Sept. 25, 2019).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup> *Id*.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>14</sup> *Id*.

Letter from Benjamin Ginsberg, counsel for AshBritt, to Anne Robinson, FEC (Oct. 1, 2019).

First Gen. Counsel's Rpt. at 9.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>17</sup> *Id*.

MUR 7450 (AshBritt, Inc., et al.) Page 4 of 4

1 regarding any knowledge on the part of AFA . . . . "18 In a *ProPublica* article that was published

- 2 in October 2019, Perkins is quoted as saying: "When I wrote the check, I cleared it with
- 3 America First [Action]." This statement is in tension with AFA's Response to the Complaint,
- 4 in which it stated that it had "no knowledge Ashbritt [sic] is a federal government contractor"
- when it originally reported AshBritt as the contributor and that Perkins "subsequently informed"

6 the committee that Perkins "used his personal funds for the contribution." 20

7 8

9

10

11 12

13

The conclusory points set forth in AshBritt's correspondence are not well taken and generally appear to be aimed at preventing the Commission from clarifying the record as to the factual matters described above. In addition, AshBritt has reaffirmed its request to conciliate despite being aware that the Commission is lacking sufficient members to do so, while at the same time refusing to provide tolling. Pursuant to the available information, the statute of limitations in this matter begins to run on April 11, 2023. Accordingly, we recommend that the Commission reject AshBritt's request to enter into pre-probable cause conciliation. In the

14 Commission reject AshBritt's request to enter into meantime, we intend to continue our investigation.

## **RECOMMENDATION:**

16 17 18

- 1. Reject AshBritt's request to enter into pre-probable cause conciliation; and
- 2. Approve the appropriate letter.

2021

19

2223

24

2526

27

<sup>18</sup> *Id.* at 8-9.

Mike Spies, Derek Willis, and J. David McSwane, *The Pro-Trump Super PAC at the Center of the Ukraine Scandal Has Faced Multiple Campaign Finance Complaints*, PROPUBLICA (Oct. 18, 2019), https://www.propublica.org/article/the-pro-trump-super-pac-at-the-center-of-the-ukraine-scandal-has-faced-multiple-campaign-finance-complaints.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>20</sup> AFA Resp. at 1 (Sept. 25, 2018).