GALENA WEST Enforcement Chief RUTH YANG Commission Counsel Fair Political Practices Commission 1102 Q Street, Suite 3000 Sacramento, CA 95811 Telephone: (916) 322-5660 Facsimile: (916) 322-1932				
Attorneys for Complainant Enforcement Division of the Fair Political Practices Commission				
BEFORE THE FAIR POLITICAL PRACTICES COMMISSION				
STATE OF CALIFORNIA				
In the Matter of:	FPPC No. 16/414			
QUALITY EDUCATION IN SUPPORT OF RECALL LORONA, OROSCO, LOPEZ, SARA RODRIGUEZ, HARPREET PUREWAL, FRANK HOYT, and JOHN HOYT,	STIPULATION, DECISION, AND ORDER			
Respondents.				
INTROD	UCTION			
Quality Education in Support of Recall Lorona, Orosco, Lopez (the "Committee") qualified as a				
committee primarily formed to support a recall of John Lorona, Roger Orosco, and Gilbert Lopez on or				
about April 21, 2015, when it received over \$1,000 in contributions. Sara Rodriguez ("Rodriguez") was				
the Committee's treasurer at all times while it was open. Harpreet Purewal ("Purewal"), Frank Hoyt				
("F. Hoyt"), and John Hoyt ("J. Hoyt") each were the Committee's principal officers at all times while it				
was open. Respondents violated the Political Reform	Act (the "Act"), ¹ by receiving cash contributions of			
\$100 or more and failing to report nonmonetary contributions.				
¹ The Political Poform Act is contained in Covernme	nt Code sections \$1000 through 01014, and all statutory			

¹ The Political Reform Act is contained in Government Code sections 81000 through 91014, and all statutory references are to this code. The regulations of the Fair Political Practices Commission are contained in Sections 18110 through 18997 of Title 2 of the California Code of Regulations, and all regulatory references are to this source.

1	SUMMARY OF THE LAW		
2	The violations in this case occurred in 2015, and all legal references and discussions of law pertain		
3	to the Act's provisions as they existed at that time.		
4	Need for Liberal Construction and Vigorous Enforcement of the Act		
5	When enacting the Act, the people of California found and declared that previous laws regulating		
6	political practices suffered from inadequate enforcement by state and local authorities. ² Thus, it was		
7	decreed that the Act "should be liberally construed to accomplish its purposes." ³ One purpose of the Act		
8	is to promote transparency by ensuring that receipts and expenditures in election campaigns are fully		
9	and truthfully disclosed so that voters are fully informed and improper practices are inhibited. ⁴ Another		
10	purpose of the Act is to provide adequate enforcement mechanisms so that the Act will be "vigorously		
11	enforced." ⁵		
12	Cash Contributions		
13	No contribution of \$100 or more shall be made or received in cash. ⁶ All contributions of \$100 or		
14	more must be made in the form of a written instrument containing the name of the contributor and the		
15	name of the payee, and drawn from the account of the contributor. ⁷		
16	Duty to Disclose Nonmonetary Contributions		
17	A contribution includes any goods received by a committee at no charge. ⁸ A nonmonetary		
18			
19	committee, on the date that funds are expended by the contributor for goods or services, if the specific		
20	expenditure is made at the behest of the committee. ⁹		
21	Each campaign statement must include, for the corresponding reporting period, the total amount		
22	of contributions received, total cumulative amount of contributions received, and total amount of		
23	contributions received from persons who have given a cumulative amount of \$100 or more. ¹⁰ Once \$100		
24			
25	² Section 81001, subd. (h). ³ Section 81003.		
26	⁴ Section 81002, subd. (a). ⁵ Section 81002, subd. (f).		
27	⁶ Section 84300, subd. (a). ⁷ Section 84300, subd. (c).		
28	⁸ Regulation 18215, subd. (b)(3). ⁹ Regulation 18421.1, subd. (f)(1).		
	¹⁰ Section 84211, subds. (a) and (c). 2		
	STIPULATION, DECISION, AND ORDER		

or more is received from a contributor, the committee must report the contributor's full name, street
 address, occupation, and employer along with the date and amount of the contribution, and cumulative
 amount of contributions.¹¹

Joint and Several Liability

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

It is the duty of a committee treasurer and principal officers to ensure that the committee complies with the Act.¹² A principal officer is an individual who is primarily responsible for approving the political activities of a committee.¹³ If two or more individuals share the primary responsibility for approving the political activities of a committee, each individual is a principal officer.¹⁴ A treasurer and principal officers for a committee may be held jointly and severally liable, along with the committee, for violations committee by the committee.¹⁵

SUMMARY OF THE FACTS

In February 2015, the Selma Unified School District Board, specifically Lorona, Orosco, and Lopez, voted 3-2 to release its superintendent from his contract. Rodriguez, Purewal, F. Hoyt, and J. Hoyt believed that the school board had made a mistake in firing the superintendent, so they got involved in the recall campaign against the three board members and formed the Committee. The Committee filed its initial statement of organization on March 11, 2015 to support that recall campaign. The Committee qualified on April 21, 2015 when it received over \$1,000 in contributions. During the reporting period of January 1, 2015 through June 30, 2015, there were five instances in which the Committee received cash contributions or money order that were \$100 or more. Those prohibited cash contributions totaled \$1,293.

Additionally, Purewal designed, ordered, and paid for magnets, signs, and billboards in support of the recall campaign. Purewal paid \$45.00 for a custom logo design on March 17, 2015; \$1,247.29 for 90 magnets and 50 small signs (24 inches by 18 inches) on April 29, 2015; and \$1,312.23 for 50 small signs and 4 billboards (4 feet by 8 feet) on June 17, 2015. These nonmonetary contributions from Purewal totaled \$2,604.52. The Committee failed to report the nonmonetary contributions on its campaign statements.

25 26 27

¹¹ Section 84211, subd. (f).

¹² Sections 81004, 84100, 84104, and 84213; Regulation 18427.

¹³ Section 82047.6, subd. (a).

¹⁴ Section 82047.6, subd. (b).

¹⁵ Sections 83116.5 and 91006.

Because the Committee failed to identify the campaign related materials purchased by Purewal as nonmonetary contributions, it resulted in a failure to include a proper disclosure statement on the billboards. For this reason, the Enforcement Division does not pursue a count for an advertisement disclosure violation.

On November 3, 2015, voters recalled Lorona, Orosco, and Lopez. The Committee was terminated on December 29, 2015.

VIOLATION

Count 1: Prohibited Cash Contributions of \$100 or More

The Committee, Rodriguez, Purewal, F. Hoyt, and J. Hoyt accepted cash contributions of \$100 or more, in violation of Government Code section 84300, subdivisions (a) and (c).

Count 2: Failure to Timely Disclose Nonmonetary Contributions

The Committee, Rodriguez, Purewal, F. Hoyt, and J. Hoyt failed to timely disclose the receipt and remittance of nonmonetary contributions of campaign materials, in violation of Government Code section 84211, subdivisions (a), (c), (f), and (k).

PROPOSED PENALTY

This matter consists of two counts. The maximum penalty that may be imposed is \$5,000 per count. Thus, the maximum penalty that may be imposed is \$10,000.

In determining the appropriate penalty for a particular violation of the Act, the Commission considers the facts of the case, the public harm involved, and the purpose of the Act. Also, the Commission considers factors such as: (a) the seriousness of the violation; (b) the presence or absence of any intention to conceal, deceive, or mislead; (c) whether the violation was deliberate, negligent, or inadvertent; (d) whether the violation was isolated or part of a pattern; (e) whether corrective amendments voluntarily were filed to provide full disclosure; and (f) whether the violator has a prior record of violations.¹⁶ These three violations resulted in a lack of transparency for the public into the Committee's campaign due to various reporting issues, but the violations seems to have been negligent. Voluntary

¹⁶ Regulation 18361.5, subd. (d).

corrective amendments were not necessary in this case, and none of the respondents have a prior history with the Enforcement Division.

The Commission also considers penalties in prior cases with comparable violations. Recent cases with a similar violation include the following:

Count 1

In the Matter of Committee to Elect Sandra Brown for Sheriff 2014, Sandra Brown, and Edward Murray; FPPC No. 17/017. (The Commission approved a stipulated agreement on April 19, 2018.) The committee received twelve cash contributions of \$100 or more totaling approximately \$1,750. The Commission approved a penalty of \$2,000 for this violation.

Count 2

In the Matter of Ben Allen, Ben Allen for State Senate 2014, and David Gould; FPPC No. 14/1071. (The Commission approved a stipulated agreement on August 20, 2015.) The committee received the use of an office space for campaign headquarters through two discounted four-month leases. With each fourmonth lease, respondents received a nonmonetary contribution of \$4,100. These undisclosed contributions equated less than one percent of the total contributions received by the committee. The Commission approved a penalty of \$2,000 each for two violations.

Like *Allen*, the Committee failed to disclose a similar amount of nonmonetary contributions. Unlike *Allen*, the nonmonetary contributions received by the Committee accounted for almost fifteen percent of the total contributions. However, the total value of the nonmonetary contributions received in this case was small.

For the foregoing reasons, the following penalties are recommended:

Count	nt Violation		Proposed Penalty
1	Prohibited Cash Contributions of \$100 or More		\$2,000
2	2 Failure to Timely Disclose Nonmonetary Contributions		\$2,000
		Total	\$4,000

CONCLUSION

Complainant, the Enforcement Division of the Fair Political Practices Commission, and Respondents Quality Education in Support of Recall Lorona, Orosco, Lopez, Sara Rodriguez, Harpreet Purewal, Frank Hoyt, and John Hoyt hereby agree as follows:

1. Respondents violated the Act as described in the foregoing pages, which are a true and accurate summary of the facts in this matter.

2. This stipulation will be submitted for consideration by the Fair Political Practices Commission at its next regularly scheduled meeting—or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard.

3. This stipulation resolves all factual and legal issues raised in this matter—for the purpose of reaching a final disposition without the necessity of holding an administrative hearing to determine the liability of the Respondents pursuant to Section 83116.

4. The Respondents have consulted their attorney(s) and understand, and hereby knowingly and voluntarily waive, any and all procedural rights set forth in Sections 83115.5, 11503, 11523, and Regulations 18361.1 through 18361.9. This includes, but is not limited to the right to appear personally at any administrative hearing held in this matter, to be represented by an attorney at the Respondents' own expense, to confront and cross-examine all witnesses testifying at the hearing, to subpoen a witnesses to testify at the hearing, to have an impartial administrative law judge preside over the hearing as a hearing officer, and to have the matter judicially reviewed.

5. The Respondents agree to the issuance of the decision and order set forth below. Also, the Respondents agree to the Commission imposing against it an administrative penalty in the amount of \$4,000. One or more cashier's checks or money orders totaling said amount—to be paid to the General Fund of the State of California—is/are submitted with this stipulation as full payment of the administrative penalty described above, and same shall be held by the State of California until the Commission issues its decision and order regarding the matter.

6. If the Commission declines to approve this stipulation—then this stipulation shall become null and void, and within fifteen business days after the Commission meeting at which the stipulation is rejected, all payments tendered by the Respondents in connection with this stipulation shall be reimbursed to the Respondents. If this stipulation is not approved by the Commission, and if a full evidentiary hearing before the Commission becomes necessary, neither any member of the Commission, nor the Executive Director, shall be disqualified because of prior consideration of this Stipulation.

1	7. The parties to this agreement may execute their respective signature pages separately. A
2	copy of any party's executed signature page including a hardcopy of a signature page transmitted via fax
3	or as a PDF email attachment is as effective and binding as the original.
4	

5	Dated:	
6		Galena West, Chief of Enforcement Fair Political Practices Commission
7		
8	Dated:	
9		Sara Rodriguez, individually and on behalf of Quality
10		Education in Support of Recall Lorona, Orosco, Lopez
11	Dated:	
12	Dated:	Harpreet Purewal, individually and on behalf of Quality
13		Education in Support of Recall Lorona, Orosco, Lopez
14		
15	Dated:	
16		Frank Hoyt, individually and on behalf of Quality Education in Support of Recall Lorona, Orosco, Lopez
17		Laucation in Support of Recail Lorona, Croseo, Lopel
18	Dated:	
19		John Hoyt, individually and on behalf of Quality
20		Education in Support of Recall Lorona, Orosco, Lopez
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
		7
		STIPULATION, DECISION, AND ORDER
		FPPC Case No. 16/414

The foregoing stipulation of the parties "In the Matter of Quality Education in Support of Recall
Lorona, Orosco, Lopez, Sara Rodriguez, Harpreet Purewal, Frank Hoyt, and John Hoyt," FPPC No.
16/414, is hereby accepted as the final decision and order of the Fair Political Practices Commission,
effective upon execution below by the Chair.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Alice T. Germond, Chair Fair Political Practices Commission