

**Memorandum
Fair Political Practices Commission**

To: FPPC Chair Ravel, and Commissioners Casher, Eskovitz, Wasserman and Wynne

From: Zackery P. Morazzini, General Counsel
Heather M. Rowan, Senior Commission Counsel

Subject: Pending Litigation

Date: April 15, 2013

ProtectMarriage.Com et al. v. Bowen et al.

On January 9, 2009 in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California, plaintiffs ProtectMarriage.com - Yes on 8, a Project of California Renewal and National Organization for Marriage California - Yes on 8, Sponsored by National Organization for Marriage filed this action. It is a “defendants class action” lawsuit against defendants responsible either for enforcement of the Act, or maintenance and publication of the campaign reports at issue in this case (including the Commission, Attorney General, Secretary of State and various district and city attorneys).

Plaintiffs challenge the Act’s campaign disclosure requirements on contributions to ballot measure committees as unconstitutional. They cite a variety of adverse actions against persons who supported Proposition 8, which was on the November 2008 ballot, alleging that some of these persons were identified through campaign contribution information made public as required by the Act’s campaign reporting and disclosure provisions. The Complaint seeks to permanently enjoin the future disclosure of all of plaintiffs’ contributors, expunge the records of all of plaintiffs’ past contributors, and to invalidate as unconstitutional the Act’s \$100 disclosure threshold for contributors to ballot measure committees, the Act’s requirement for post-election disclosure of contributors to ballot measure committees, and the Act’s failure to purge the records of contributors to ballot measure committees after the election. In all counts, plaintiffs seek declaratory and injunctive relief, and an award of attorney’s fees.

On August 25, 2011 Plaintiffs served a Motion for Summary Judgment. Defendants served their Response and a Cross-Motion on September 15, 2011. District Judge Morrison C. England, Jr. heard argument on these cross-motions on October 20, 2011. At the conclusion of the hearing Judge England announced that he was inclined to grant Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment, and to deny Plaintiffs’ Motion. On November 4, 2011 the Court served its Memorandum and Order, and entered final Judgment in favor of Defendants.

On December 2, 2011 Plaintiffs appealed the District Court’s Judgment. The briefing before the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals has been completed; no hearing date has been announced.

Tony Dane v. Fair Political Practices Commission

Tony Dane, a respondent in an Enforcement Division case, filed a motion to quash an enforcement division subpoena in a Las Vegas, Nevada court that was issued to Wells Fargo Bank. FPPC then filed a motion to compel production in Sacramento Superior Court and prevailed in both cases. Tony Dane then sued the FPPC in Nevada for malicious prosecution and abuse of process. On June 14, 2012 the Nevada judge dismissed the malicious prosecution claim, but declined to dismiss the abuse of process claim on the basis that Dane had alleged ill will (essentially that the FPPC was out to get him based upon his political beliefs). The judge ruled that under the state's loose "notice pleading" standards this was sufficient to preserve that cause of action. The FPPC filed an answer, and the parties are in the discovery phase of litigation.

Shong-Ching Tong v. Fair Political Practices Commission

On February 10, 2012, Shong-Ching Tong ("Tong") filed a writ of administrative mandamus against the Fair Political Practices Commission ("Commission"), seeking relief from the Commission's Decision and Order in Case No. 10/449. On December 19, 2012, the Court dismissed the case due to Tong's status as a vexatious litigant. On January 4, 2013, the Court vacated its December 19, 2012, order that the case be dismissed, and ordered the Commission to produce the administrative record. The hearing has been set for June 28, 2013, in Department 86 of the Los Angeles County Superior Court.