

NOV - 3 2009

## CERTIFIED MAIL RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

| David | Bearder | 1        |       |
|-------|---------|----------|-------|
| Grand | Ranida  | MI 40505 | <br>_ |

**RE:** MUR 6190

Kelly Bearden, Norman R. Byrne, Rosemary Byrne, Byrne Electrical, Inc., Daniel P. Byrne, Katherine Scudder

Molly M. Nowak

Dear Mr. Bearden:

On October 20, 2009, the Federal Election Commission reviewed the allegations in your complaint dated May 6, 2009, and voted to dismiss the allegation that Kelly Bearden made a contribution in your name in violation of 2 U.S.C. §§ 441f and 441a(a)(1)(A), and found no reason to believe that Kelly Bearden, Norman R. Byrne, Rosemary Byrne, Byrne Electrical, Inc., Daniel P. Byrne, Katherine Scudder, or Molly M. Nowak violated 2 U.S.C. § 441f in connection with the allegation that Norman R. Byrne reimbursed contributions. Accordingly, on October 20, 2009, the Commission closed the file in this matter.

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). The Factual and Legal Analysis, which more fully explain the Commission's findings, is enclosed.

MUR 6190 David Bearden Page 2

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 2 U.S.C. § 437g(a)(8).

Sincerely,

Mark Allen

Assistant General Counsel

Enclosure
Factual and Legal Analysis

| 1                                      | FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION  |   |   |                              |  |  |
|--|--|---|---|------------------------------|--|--|
| 2<br>3                                 | FACTUAL AND LEGAL ANALYSIS   |   |   |                              |  |  |
| 4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11 | RESP   | ONDENTS:  | Kelly B. Bearden Norman R. Byrne Rosemary Byrne Byrne Electrical, Inc. Daniel P. Byrne Katherine Scudder Molly M. Nowak | MUR 6190                     |  |  |
| 13<br>14                               | ī.   | GENERATION O  | F MA'TTER   |                              |  |  |
| 15<br>16                               |  | This matter was ge  | nerated by a Complaint filed with th  | oc Federal Election          |  |  |
| 17                                     | Comm   | commission ("the Commission") by David W. Bearden. See 2 U.S.C. § 437g(a)(1). |   |                              |  |  |
| 18<br>19<br>20                         | II.  | INTRODUCTION  | <u>1</u>  |                              |  |  |
|  |  | Complainant allege  | s that Kelly Beardon, his estranged   | spouse, violated the         |  |  |
| 21                                     | Federa   | al Election Campaign  | Aet of 1971, as amended ("the Act   | ") when she made a           |  |  |
| 22                                     | contrib  | oution in the amount  | of \$2,000 in his name to John McC  | ain, 2008, Inc., ("the       |  |  |
| 23                                     | Comm   | iittee" or "McCain C  | committee") the authorized committee  | ee of presidential candidate |  |  |
| 24                                     | John N   | AcCain. Complainar  | nt alleges that the contribution was r  | nade hy a check drawn on     |  |  |
| 25                                     | the cou  | uple's joint account v  | without his knowledge or approval.  | The Complaint also           |  |  |
| 26                                     | alleges that in June of 2008, Kelly Beardon told the Complainant that her father, Norman |   |   |                              |  |  |
| 27                                     | Byrne, had directed family members and "some employees\ officers" of Byrne Electrical,   |   |   |                              |  |  |
| 28                                     | Inc. to contribute to the McCain campaign and that Norman Byrne reimbursed those         |   |   |                              |  |  |
| 29                                     | contrib  | outions. Complaint a  | at 2.   |                              |  |  |
| 30                                     |  | Respondents deny t  | he allegations. They assert the Con   | nplaint is motivated by the  |  |  |
| 31                                     | conten   | tious divoree procee  | dings between the Complainant and   | Respondent Kelly             |  |  |
| 32                                     | Bearde   | en. Bearden acknow  | ledges making a contribution from t   | the couple's joint account;  |  |  |

- I however, she asserts that the contribution was made with personal funds and was not
- 2 reimbursed by Norman Byrne or any other person. All Respondents assert that the
- allegations in the Complaint are speculative and lack factual support, and they seek
- 4 dismissal of the Complaint.
- 5 Based upon the Complaint, the Responses, and other available information, the
- 6 Commission finds no reason to believe that Respondents violated 2 U.S.C. § 44 If and
- 7 closes the file in this matter.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

## III. <u>FACTUAL AND LEGAL ANALYSIS</u>

## A. Factual Background

Complainant received a letter dated September 4, 2008, from the McCain

Committee that thanked him for his contribution and sought to obtain the Complainant's occupation and employer information.¹ Complaint Exhibit B. The letter did not specify the date, amount, or circumstances of the Complainant's eontribution. The Complaint suggests that this September 4 eorrespondence was the Complainant's initial notice that a contribution had been made in his name to the Committee. Complainant asserts that this contribution was made without his knowledge or approval and that his access to the joint account, from which the contribution was made, was limited to ATM and credit card transactions. Complaint at 1. Complainant asserts that contributing to any political candidate violates his personal beliefs, and in March of 2008, Kelly Bearden had "represented to [him] that the household was under severe financial distress." *Id.* at 2.

The September 4 letter was addressed to the Complainant at

Rapids, MI. The Committee's 2008 April Quarterly Report reflects an address for the Complainant of

Ada, MI. This latter address is Bearden's current address and appears to be the former marital residence of Complainant and Bearden. See Bearden Response, Exhibit 1 at 1, 2; see also Bearden Affidavit at 1. Neither the Complainant nor Bearden provide information as to how the Committee obtained Complainant's subsequent address.

1

MUR 6190
Factual and Legal Analysis (Kelly Bearden, et al.)
Page 3

2 Byrne "reimbursed her, all direct family members and some employees\ of licers of Byrne 3 Industrial Specialists Incorporated that made similar contributions to the McCain 4 campaign at Mr. Byrne's direction because Mr. and Mrs. Byrne had reached the lawful 5 financial limit." Complaint at 2. In support of this allegation, Complainant provided a 6 chart listing contributions made by Byrne family members to the McCain Committee by 7 date and amount, indicating contributions from several Byrne family members on the 8 same day on three occasions during 2007-2008. See Complaint Exhibit C. 9 According to Bearden's Response, in February of 2008, she made a contribution 10 to the McCain Committee with a cheek drawn on the joint account she and the 11 Complainant maintained. The names of both the Complainant and Bearden were 12 imprinted on the check, and each had access to the account funds. Bearden Response at 13 2-4. The couple's monthly account statement shows that check number 8682 in the 14 amount of \$2,300 was paid on March 11, 2008. See Complaint Exhibit A. Bearden 15 asserts that this contribution was intended as a joint contribution to the McCain 16 Committee, and, in fact, the Complainant "not only enthusiastically attended the [related] 17 fundraiser for Scn. McCain but also got his picture taken with Sen. McCain and proudly 18 displayed said photograph in a prominent location in his living room." Bearden 19 Response at 3; see also Bearden Affidavit at 2. Bearden claims that "Complainant now 20 wishes to rescind his portion of a joint-contribution that was made with his wife, which 21 he is now -- more than a year after the fact -- claiming that he didn't authorize or 22 support." Bearden Response at 2. Bearden also asserts that the contribution to the 23 McCain Committee is consistent with other contributions that the couple made jointly to

Complainant also alleges that in June of 2008, Bearden told him that Norman

- 1 political and charitable organizations. Bearden Response at 3; see also Bearden
- 2 Exhibit 1.2 Only Bearden signed the check and forwarded the contribution to the McCain
- 3 Committee. Id. at 4.
- 4 All Respondents assert that the timing and filing of the Complaint is motivated by
- 5 the contentious divorce proceedings between the Complainant and Kelly Bearden and
- 6 specifically deny the allegations of the Complaint. Respondents also provided swom
- 7 affidavits attesting that they have previously made contributions to candidates on the state
- 8 and federal levels, all their contributions were made with personal funds, and neither
- 9 Norman Byrne nor any other individual or entity reinbursed them for their contributions
- 10 to the McCain Committee. See Affidavits of Norman Byrne, Daniel Byrne, Molly
- 11 Nowak, Katherine Scudder, and Kelly Bearden.
- 12 B. Analysis

13

- 1. Spousal Reimbursement Allegation
- 14 The Act limits an individual's contributions to a candidate or his authorized
- committee to an aggregate of \$2,300 per election for the 2008 election cycle.
- 16 2 U.S.C. § 441a(a)(1)(A). The Act also prohibits contributions made in the name of
- another. 2 U.S.C. § 441f.<sup>3</sup> Further, no person shall knowingly permit his or her name to

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Exhibit 1 consists of three letters dated October 23, 2006, January 24, 2007, and February 2, 2007, reflecting joint charitable donations made by Complainant and Kelly Bearden. None of the three donations were to state or federal political candidates or parties.

On June 8, 2009, the federal district court in the Central District of California dismissed two counts of a criminal indictment wherein the federal government alleged that Pierce O'Donnell violated 2 U.S.C. § 441f by reimbursing conduit contributions to the 2004 presidential campaign of Sen. John Edwards. The district court ruled in part that section 441f did not apply to indirect contributions made through a conduit or intermediary. The U.S. Department of Justice filed a notice of appeal to the Ninth Circuit. U.S. v. O'Donnell, C.D. Cal, No. 08-872, appeal docketed, No. 90-567 (9th Cir. June 16, 2009). The conduct in the O'Donnell matter occurred in the 9th Circuit. The alleged activity in MUR 6190 took place in the 7th Circuit. Excluding the O'Donnell dismissal, numerous federal district courts in the Second, Third, Fourth,

| MUR 6190          |                 |             |      |
|-------------------|-----------------|-------------|------|
| Factual and Legal | Analysis (Kelly | Bearden, et | al.) |
| Page 5            |                 |             |      |

- be used to make such a contribution or knowingly accept a contribution made by one
- 2 person in the name of another. Id. Examples of contributions in the name of another
- 3 include:

16

- 4 (i) giving money or anything of value, all or part of which was provided to
  5 the contributor by another person (the true contributor) without disclosing
  6 the source of money or the thing of value to the recipient candidate or
  7 committee at the time the contribution is made, or
- 8 (ii) making a contribution of money or anything of value and attributing as the source of the money or thing of value another person when in fact the contributor is the source.
- 11 11 C.F.R. § 110.4(h)(2)(i)-(ii).
- 12 Complainant alleges that Kelly Bearden made the March 11, 2008, contribution in 13 the amount of \$2,000 to the McCain Committee in his name and thus violated the Act. 14 See 2 U.S.C. § 441f. Bearden denies the allegation. According to her Response, she and 15 the Complainant both intended to make the contribution. However, only she signed the
- 17 reports, Beardon had previously contributed \$1,000 to the Committee on July 27, 2007,

\$2,300 check to the McCain Committee. According to the Committee's disclosure

- 18 and \$1,000 on January 22, 2008. These contributions were designated for the primary
- 19 election. Another \$2,300 from Bearden on March 11, 2008, would bring her aggregate
- 20 contribution to \$4,300 for the primary and would have resulted in an excessive
- 21 contribution to the McCain Committee. See 2 U.S.C. § 441a(a)(1)(A).
- 22 Pursuant to the Commission's regulations, committee treasurers are responsible
- 23 for ascertaining whether contributions received, when aggregated with other
- 24 contributions from the same contributor, exceed the contribution limitations. 11 C.F.R.
- 25 § 103.3(b). If a treasurer determines that a contribution exceeds the contribution

- 1 limitations, the treasurer has sixty (60) days to refund the excessive contribution, or
- 2 obtain a written redesignation or reattribution of the excessive portion. 11 C.F.R.
- 3 § 103.3(b)(3). If the committee receives an excessive contribution made by a written
- 4 instrument imprinted with the name of more than one individual, yet signed by only one
- 5 individual, Commission regulations allow for presumptive reattribution of the excessive
- 6 portion to the other individual who did not sign a joint instrument, provided it does not
- 7 result in an excessive contribution for any contributor. 11 C.F.R. § 110.1(k)(3)(ii)(B)(1).
- 8 The committee must notify each contributor of this action within 60 days of the receipt of
- 9 the contribution and must offer the contributor the option to receive a refund. 11 C.F.R.
- 10 § 110.1(k)(3)(ii)(B)(2)-(3).
- Bearden acknowledged that the Complainant did not sign the \$2,300 check for the
- 12 March 11, 2008, contribution. See Bearden Response at 4. The Committee's 2008 April
- 13 Quarterly Report memo entry for the March 11, 2008, contribution from Bearden states
- 14 "reattribution to spouse." The available information suggests that upon receipt of the
- 15 \$2,300 contribution from Bearden on March 11, 2008, the McCain Committee
- 16 reattributed the \$2,000 excessive portion to the Complainant, whose name was also
- 17 imprinted on the check.<sup>4</sup> Neither the Complainant nor Bearden provided information one
- 18 way or the other as to whether the McCain Committee notified either individual of the
- excessive contribution and offered a refund. See 11 C.F.R. § 110.1(k)(3)(ii)(B)(2)-(3).
- 20 Subsequently, the Committee forwarded the September 4, 2008, letter to the Complainant
- 21 requesting occupation and employer information in connection with his contribution.
- 22 Thus, Kelly Bearden may not have made a prohibited contribution in the name of

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> The Complaint and Bearden's Response both recognize this process. See Complaint at 1 and Bearden Response at 4.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

MUR 6190 Factual and Legal Analysis (Kelly Bearden, et al.) Page 7

- 1 another, but rather may have made an excessive contribution to the McCain Committee
- that was reattributed to the Complainant. See 2 U.S.C. § 441a(a)(1)(A); 11 C.F.R.
- 3 § 110.1(k)(3). In view of the circumstances surrounding Kelly Bearden's contributions to
- 4 the Committee, the Commission, in an exercise of its prosecutorial discretion, dismisses
- 5 the allegation that she made a contribution in Complainant's name in violation of
- 6 2 U.S.C. §§ 441f and 441a(a)(1)(A). See Heckler v. Chaney, 470 U.S. 821, 831 (1985).

## 2. Family Reimbursement Allegation

Complainant also alleges that Norman Byrne reimbursed contributions to the McCain Committee made by "family members and some employees\ officers" of Byrne Electrical, Inc. Complainant alleges that Kelly Bearden told him of these reimbursements "on or around June 2008...." Complaint at 2. Complainant also provided a chart listing family member contributions to the McCain Committee indicating multiple family member contributions on the same day on three occasions. Complaint Exhibit C.

Respondent Norman Byrne denies by affidavit that he ever reimbursed, directly or indirectly, contributions made by any family member or individual affiliated with Byrne Electrical, Inc. Norman Byrne Affidavit at 1-2. Kelly Bearden, Daniel Byrne, Molly Nowak, and Katherine Scudder similarly deny by affidavits that they received funds for their contributions from Norman Byrne or any other source. Respondents aver that they have a personal history of making contributions with their personal funds to political

Sespondents Rosemary Byrne and Byrne Electrical, Inc. filed short responses seeking dismissal of the Complaint because it fails to allege any action taken by either respondent that would constitute a violation of the Act. In Rosemary Byrne's Response, she notes the Complaint's sole reference to her is the following sentence, "On or around June 2008 Kelly Bearden stated to me that she made contributions to the McCain campaign at her father Norman Byrne's request because he and his wife Rosemary Byrne had already reached the legal limit." Rosemary Byrne Response at 1. Similarly, Byrne Electrical, Inc.'s Response also notes that the Complaint fails to allege any specific violations by the corporation, and asserts that even if Norman Byrne had reimbursed political contributions made by his family members, that would constitute a violation of the Act by Mr. Byrne, not Byrne Electrical. Byrne Electrical, Inc. Response at 1-2.

- candidates on the state and federal level as well as to charitable organizations. See
- 2 Allidavits of Norman Byrne, Daniel Byrne, Molly Nowak, Katherine Scudder and Kelly
- 3 Bearden.<sup>6</sup>
- 4 Further, Kelly Bearden specifically denies that she informed the Complainant that
- 5 Norman Byrne requested that she and her siblings contribute to the McCain campaign.
- 6 Bearden Affidavit at 2. In her response, Bearden asserts that as a result of the contentious
- and on-going divorce proceedings between her and the Complainant, as of May of 2008,
- 8 the primary means for communication between the two was through counsel. Bearden
- 9 Response at 2. Rearden declares in her affidavit that she did not discuss the political
- 10 contributions of her father or other family members with the Complainant. See Bearden
- 11 Assidavit at 2.
- 12 Considering that the allegation is limited to a single alleged statement by Kelly
- 13 Bearden supported only by the Complainant's list of Respondents' contributions to the
- 14 McCain Committee, there does not appear to be a sufficient basis to open an investigation
- in this matter. Although there are similarities in the dates and amounts of Respondents'
- 16 contributions, this information is insufficient to support the Complainant's allegation that
- 17 Norman Byrne reimbursed Kelly Bearden, Daniel Byrne, Katherine Scudder and Molly
- 18 Nowak for contributions they made to the McCain Committee. Accordingly, the
- 19 Commission finds no reason to believe that Kelly B. Bearden, Norman R. Byrne,
- 20 Rosemary Byrne, Byrne Electrical Inc., Daniel P. Byrne, Katherine Scudder, or Molly M.
- 21 Nowak violated 2 U.S.C. § 441f and closes the file in this matter.

22

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> However, the Commission's database does not indicate any previous contributions to federal committees by Kelly Bearden, Katherine Scudder, or Molly Nowak.