				RECEIVED FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION	
	Peter Reynolds/FEC/US 06/09/2010 05:13 PM	То	Robert Knop/FEC/US@FEC	2010 JUN -9 PM 5: 1	
		cc			PM 5:16
		bcc			
		Subject	w: Comment on Advisory Opinion 20 COUNS		GENERAL Sel.
Office of Ge 999 E. Stree Washingtor 202-694-13 preynolds@	ction Commission eneral Counsel - Enforcement et, NW n, DC 20463 43		10 05:14 PM		
	"Tayrani, Amir C." <atayrani@gibsondunn.com< td=""><td>Ta</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></atayrani@gibsondunn.com<>	Ta			
	< r a yrani@gibsondunii.com > 06/09/2010 04:58 PM		PReynolds@fec.gov		
		CC			
		Subject	Comment on Advisory Opinio	n 2010-08	

Attached is a comment on the draft advisory opinion. We'll bring the original with us to the meeting tomorrow.

Best regards,

Amir

Amir Cameron Tayrani

GIBSON DUNN

Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP 1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20036-5306 Tel +1 202.887.3692 • Fax +1 202.530.9645

<<Comment.pdf>>

This message may contain confidential and privileged information. If it has been sent to you in error, please reply to advise the sender of the error and then immediately delete this message.



.

•

.

.

GIBSON DUNN

Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP

1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W. Washington, DC 20036-5306 Tel 202.955.8500 www.gibsondunn.com

٠.

1

۰.

• -

;

:

Theodore B. Olson Direct: 202.955.8668 Fax: 202.530.9575 TOlson@gibsondunn.com

Client:

June 9, 2010

Ms. Thomasenia P. Duncan, Esq. General Counsel Federal Election Commission 999 E Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20463

Re: Advisory Opinion 2010-08

Dear Ms. Duncan:

I write on behalf of Citizens United in response to Drafts A and B of Advisory Opinion 2010-08. Although the short 24-hour public comment period precludes us from filing a more detailed response, little analysis is necessary to reveal the legal and logical flaws in Draft B of the Advisory Opinion, which would limit the media exception to Citizens United's distribution of films through "broadcast, cable, or satellite television" and exclude from the scope of the exception films distributed by theatrical release and as DVDs.

This artificially narrow interpretation of the media exception is arbitrary, irrational, and unreasonable. Draft B is flatly inconsistent with the Commission's recent acknowledgement that the media exception "protects news stories, commentaries, and editorials *no matter in what medium they are published*." Explanation and Justification for Final Rules on Internet Communications, 71 Fed. Reg. 18,589, 18,608 (Apr. 12, 2006) (emphasis added).

Historically, theaters are a traditional forum for conveying news, commentary, and other information to the public. Indeed, until the invention of the television, Americans routinely visited movie theaters to view film footage of news event, including extensive coverage of World War II. There is no logical basis for denying the media exception where a viewer purchases a ticket to view a film in a movie theater, but to grant the exception where the same person pays a cable or satellite service a fee to view the same film on television.

As for DVDs, similar to the Internet, they did not exist when the media exception was first enacted in 1974. Denying the media exception to films distributed by DVD is wholly inconsistent with the Commission's past practice of "extend[ing] the media exemption to forms of media that did not exist or were not widespread when Congress enacted the exemption in 1974." 71 Fed. Reg. at 18,608.

GIBSON DUNN

Ms. Thomasenia P. Duncan, Esq. June 9, 2010 Page 2

For each of these reasons, the Commission should adopt Draft A of Advisory Opinion 2010-08.

۰.

÷

Respectfully submitted,

Do

Theodore B. Olson