



FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
Washington, DC

January 10, 2025

VIA UPS

Mae Graham

[REDACTED]
Macon, MO 63552

RE: MUR 8104
Henry Martin for Congress

Dear Ms. Graham:

This is in reference to the complaint you filed with the Federal Election Commission on January 17, 2023, concerning Henry Martin for Congress. Based on that complaint, on December 9, 2024, the Commission voted to dismiss and close the file, effective January 10, 2025.

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

The Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended, allows a complainant to seek judicial review of the Commission's dismissal of this action within 60 days of the dismissal, which became effective today. *See* 52 U.S.C. § 30109(a)(8). If you have any questions, please contact Rocelyn Halili, the attorney assigned to this matter, at (202) 694-1650.

Sincerely,

Aaron Rabinowitz

Aaron Rabinowitz
Assistant General Counsel

Enclosure:
Enforcement Priority System Dismissal Report

1 **BEFORE THE FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION**
2
3 **ENFORCEMENT PRIORITY SYSTEM**
4 **DISMISSAL REPORT**
5

6 **MUR 8104**

Respondent: Henry Martin for Congress and
Ambrosia Ferree in her official
capacity as treasurer

7
8
9
10 **Complaint Receipt Date:** January 18, 2023

11
12 **Response Date:** August 11, 2023

13
14 

15
16 **Alleged Statutory/**

17 **Regulatory Violations:** 52 U.S.C. § 30104(a), (b)
18 11 C.F.R. §§ 104.1(a), 104.3
19

20 The Complaint alleges that Henry Martin for Congress and Ambrosia Ferree in her
21 official capacity as treasurer (the “Committee”), the principal campaign committee of 2022
22 congressional candidate Henry Martin,¹ violated the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as
23 amended (the “Act”), when the Committee’s reported ending cash on hand balance in its 2022
24 Pre-Primary Report failed to match its beginning cash on hand balance in its subsequent 2022
25 October Quarterly Report, reflecting an unexplained increase of \$30,554.03.² In Response, the
26 Committee states that it does not “fully understand the issue,” claiming that its “reports have
27 been consistent.”³

28 Based on its experience and expertise, the Commission has established an Enforcement
29 Priority System using formal, pre-determined scoring criteria to allocate agency resources and

¹ Henry Martin for Congress, Amended Statement of Organization (Sept. 19, 2022).

² Compl. at 1 (Jan. 18, 2023).

³ Resp. at 1 (Aug. 11, 2023). The Reports Analysis Division issued several Requests for Additional Information to the Committee, requesting that it explain the discrepancy. *E.g.*, RFAI, 2022 April Quarterly Report (Oct. 4, 2022), <https://docquery.fec.gov/pdf/830/202210040300154830/202210040300154830.pdf>. To date, the Committee has not provided a response.

1 assess whether particular matters warrant further administrative enforcement proceedings. These
 2 criteria include (1) the gravity of the alleged violation, taking into account both the type of
 3 activity and the amount in violation; (2) the apparent impact the alleged violation may have had
 4 on the electoral process; (3) the complexity of the legal issues raised in the matter; and (4) recent
 5 trends in potential violations and other developments in the law. This matter is rated as low
 6 priority for Commission action after application of these pre-established criteria. Given that low
 7 rating, and the low dollar amount at issue, we recommend that the Commission dismiss the
 8 Complaints consistent with the Commission's prosecutorial discretion to determine the proper
 9 ordering of its priorities and use of agency resources.⁴ We also recommend that the Commission
 10 close the file and send the appropriate letters.

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

10/30/2024

Date

Lisa J. Stevenson
 Acting General Counsel

BY:



Claudio J. Pavia
 Deputy Associate General Counsel for
 Enforcement



Aaron Rabinowitz
 Assistant General Counsel



Rocelyn Halili
 Attorney

⁴ *Heckler v. Chaney*, 470 U.S. 821, 831-32 (1985).