

## FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

Washington, DC 20463

## **VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL**

July 29, 2020

Harry N. Niska Howse & Thompson, P.A. 3189 Fernbrook Lane N. Plymouth, MN 55447 hniska@howselaw.com

RE: MUR 7676

Michelle Fischbach Fischbach for Congress and Paul Kilgore, as treasurer

Dear Mr. Niska:

On January 2, 2020, the Federal Election Commission ("Commission") notified your clients of a complaint alleging violations of certain sections of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended (the "Act") and Commission regulations. A copy of the complaint was forwarded to your clients at that time. On July 24, 2020, based upon the information contained in the complaint and information provided by respondents, the Commission voted to dismiss allegations that Michelle Fischbach, Fischbach for Congress and Paul Kilgore, as treasurer, violated provisions of the Act. The Commission then closed its file in this matter. 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). If you have any questions, please contact Don Campbell, the attorney assigned to this matter, at (202) 694-1650.

Sincerely,

Lisa J. Stevenson

**Acting General Counsel** 

BY: Jeff S. Jordan

Assistant General Counsel

Enclosure:

General Counsel's Report

1	BEFORE THE FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION				
1 2 3 4	ENFORCEMENT PRIORITY SYSTEM DISMISSAL REPORT				
5 6 7 8 9	<b>MUR:</b> 7676	Respondent:	Michelle Fischbach Fischbach for Congress and Paul Kilgore, as treasurer (the "Committee")		
11 12 13 14 15	Complaint Receipt Date: December Response Date: February 13, 2020	27, 2019			
16 17 18	Alleged Statutory/ Regulatory Violations:		S.C. § 30120(a)(1) and (c)(1-3); F.R. § 110.11(a)(1), (b)(1), (c)(1-2)		
19	The Complaint alleges that the	e Committee distribu	ted, via email, two fundraising letters that		
20	lacked a complete box around the Committee's disclaimers, asserting that both letters have a partial				
21	line above and below the disclaimer. The Response argues that emails do not require a box around				
22	disclaimers because that requirement applies only to printed public communications, and, in any event,				
23	any violation is technical. <sup>2</sup>				
24	Based on its experience and expertise, the Commission has established an Enforcement				
25	Priority System using formal, pre-determined scoring criteria to allocate agency resources and				
26	assess whether particular matters warrant further administrative enforcement proceedings. These				
27	criteria include (1) the gravity of the alleged violation, taking into account both the type of activity				
28	and the amount in violation; (2) the apparent impact the alleged violation may have had on the				
29	electoral process; (3) the complexity of the legal issues raised in the matter; and (4) recent trends in				
30	potential violations and other developments in the law. This matter is rated as low priority for				
31	Commission action after application of	of these pre-establish	ed criteria. Given that low rating, the		

Compl. at 1 (December 27, 2019). The Complaint included copies of the two emails. *Id.* at 2-5.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Resp. at 2-3 (February 13, 2020), citing 11 C.F.R. § 110.11(c)(2).

## MUR767600023

EPS Dismissal Report MUR 7676 (Fischbach for Congress) Page 2 of 2

- technical nature of the alleged violation, and that recipients would likely understand that the
- 2 Committee was responsible for the emails, we recommend that the Commission dismiss the
- 3 Complaint consistent with the Commission's prosecutorial discretion to determine the proper
- 4 ordering of its priorities and use of agency resources.<sup>3</sup> We also recommend that the Commission
- 5 close the file as to all Respondents and send the appropriate letters.

6			
7			Lisa J. Stevenson
8			Acting General Counsel
9			
10			Charles Kitcher
11			Acting Associate General Counsel
12			f = 0
13	3.6.20	BY:	Steple fina
14	Date		Stephen Gura
15			Deputy Associate General Counsel
16			1 to ( b)
17			J-0 92
18			Jeff S. Jordan
19			Assistant General Counsel
20			
21			Calais AnisH
22			Donald E. Campbell
23			Attorney

\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Heckler v. Chaney, 470 U.S. 821, 831-32 (1985).