



FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
Washington, DC

VIA ELECTRONIC AND CERTIFIED MAIL
RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

dorothy@endcitizensunited.com

June 30, 2021

Tiffany Muller, End Citizens United
100 M St. SE
Washington, DC 20003

RE: MUR 7802

Dear Ms. Muller:

The Federal Election Commission reviewed the allegations in your complaint received on September 21, 2020. On June 25, 2021, based upon the information provided in the complaint, and information provided by the respondents, the Commission decided to exercise its prosecutorial discretion to dismiss the allegations as to Nicole for New York and Laura Schwartz, in her official capacity as treasurer, and Nicole Malliotakis, and close its file in this matter. Accordingly, the Commission closed its file in this matter on June 25, 2021. 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).

The Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended, allows a complainant to seek judicial review of the Commission's dismissal of this action. *See* 52 U.S.C. § 30109(a)(8).

Sincerely,

Lisa J. Stevenson
Acting General Counsel

Stephen Gura

BY: Stephen Gura
Deputy Associate General Counsel

Enclosure
General Counsel's Report

BEFORE THE FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

ENFORCEMENT PRIORITY SYSTEM

DISMISSAL REPORT

MUR: MUR 7802

Respondents: Nicole for New York
and Laura Schwartz, as treasurer
(the “Committee”)
Nicole Malliotakis

Complaint Receipt Date: Sept. 21, 2020

Response Date: Oct. 13, 2020

Alleged Statutory/ Regulatory Violations:

52 U.S.C. §§ 30120;
11 C.F.R. §§ 110.11(c)

The Complaint alleges that two television advertisements paid for by the Committee in
t of Nicole Malliotakis's campaign for New York's 11th Congressional district contained
cient disclaimers.¹ Specifically, the Complaint alleges that the advertisements failed to
e a written statement at the end of the advertisement, stating that the candidate approved the
unication.² The Response asserts that the advertisements originally included a verbal
mer by the candidate and a written disclaimer disclosing the source of funding, but
vnowledges that the original advertisements did not include a written disclaimer showing
al by the candidate.³ The Response further states that upon receipt of the Complaint, the
ittee adjusted the advertisements to include a written disclaimer of approval from the
ate.⁴

¹ Compl. at 1-4 (Sept. 21, 2020).

² *Id.* at 2. The Complaint acknowledges that each advertisement included a verbal disclaimer by Malliotakis and included a written disclaimer at the end indicating who paid for the advertisement. *Id.*

³ Resp. at 1 (Oct. 13, 2020).

⁴ *Id.* at 1-2. The Response also states that the Committee will ensure that all future television advertisements will fully conform to 11 C.F.R. § 110.11. *Id.* The Response also attaches what it purports to be a corrected disclaimer showing the candidate's approval of the advertisement. *Id.* at Attach.

EPS Dismissal Report
MUR 7802 (Nicole for New York, *et al.*)
Page 2 of 2

1 Based on its experience and expertise, the Commission has established an Enforcement
2 Priority System using formal, pre-determined scoring criteria to allocate agency resources and
3 assess whether particular matters warrant further administrative enforcement proceedings. These
4 criteria include (1) the gravity of the alleged violation, taking into account both the type of activity
5 and the amount in violation; (2) the apparent impact the alleged violation may have had on the
6 electoral process; (3) the complexity of the legal issues raised in the matter; and (4) recent trends in
7 potential violations and other developments in the law. This matter is rated as low priority for
8 Commission action after application of these pre-established criteria. Given that low rating, the
9 technical nature of the violation, and the remedial actions taken by the Respondents, we recommend
10 that the Commission dismiss the Complaint consistent with the Commission’s prosecutorial
11 discretion to determine the proper ordering of its priorities and use of agency resources.⁵ We also
12 recommend that the Commission close the file as to all respondents and send the appropriate letters.

Lisa J. Stevenson
Acting General Counsel

Charles Kitcher
Acting Associate General Counsel

06.07.21

Date

BY: Stephen Gura
Stephen Gura

Deputy Associate General Counsel

Miss Dorothy S.

Jeff S. Jordan by Sy
Jeff S. Jordan

JEN S. JORDAN
Assistant Gen.

Assistant General Counsel

100

Donald E. Campbell

Donald E. Campbell

Donald E. Campbell

⁵ *Heckler v. Chaney*, 470 U.S. 821, 831-32 (1985).