1 2 3 4 5	GALENA WEST Chief of Enforcement THERESA GILBERTSON Commission Counsel Fair Political Practices Commission 1102 Q Street, Suite 3000 Sacramento, CA 95811 Telephone: (916) 323-6421 Email: tgilbertson@fppc.ca.gov
6	Attorneys for Complainant
7	Enforcement Division of the Fair Political Practices Commission
8 9	BEFORE THE FAIR POLITICAL PRACTICES COMMISSION STATE OF CALIFORNIA
10	In the Matter of: FPPC Case No. 16/649
11	
12	KARINA ONOFRE FOR CA STATE ASSEMBLY 74TH DISTRICT andSTIPULATION, DECISION AND ORDER
13	KARINA ONOFRE,
14	Respondents.
15	
16	INTRODUCTION
17	This matter arose from a non-filer referral from the Secretary of State. Respondent Karina Onofre
18	for CA State Assembly 74th District 2016 ("Committee") was the candidate-controlled committee formed
19	to support Respondent Karina Onofre ("Onofre") in her unsuccessful run for State Assembly in the
20	November 8, 2016 General Election. Onofre acted as her own treasurer. The Committee and Onofre
21	violated the Political Reform Act ¹ by failing to timely file pre-election campaign statements and made
22	personal use of campaign funds.
23	personar abe of earlipingh fanabi
24	
25	
26	
27 28	¹ The Political Reform Act—sometimes simply referred to as the Act—is contained in Government Code sections 81000 through 91014. 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. All regulatory references are to this source.

SUMMARY OF THE LAW

Need for Liberal Construction and Vigorous Enforcement of the Political Reform Act

When enacting the Political Reform Act, the people of California found and declared that previous laws regulating political practices suffered from inadequate enforcement by state and local authorities.² Thus, it was decreed that the Act "should be liberally construed to accomplish its purposes."³ One purpose of the Act is to promote transparency by ensuring that receipts and expenditures in election campaigns are fully and truthfully disclosed so that voters are fully informed and improper practices are inhibited.⁴ Along these lines, the Act includes a comprehensive campaign reporting system.⁵ Another purpose of the Act is to provide adequate enforcement mechanisms so that the Act will be "vigorously enforced."⁶

Pre-election Campaign Statements

A controlled committee must file two pre-election campaign statements before the election in which the candidate is listed on the ballot.⁷ A committee must file the first pre-election campaign statement for the period 45 days before the election, no later than 40 days before the election.⁸ A committee must also file a second pre-election campaign statement for the period ending 17 days before the election no later than 12 days before the election.⁹ Whenever the deadline falls on a Saturday, Sunday, or official state holiday, the filing deadline for a statement shall be extended to the next regular business day.¹⁰

Prohibition Against Personal Use of Committee Funds

The Act holds that contributions deposited into a campaign bank account are held in trust for expenses associated with the election of the candidate or for expenses associated with holding office.¹¹ An expenditure to seek office is lawful if it is reasonably related to a political purpose.¹² Expenditures that

² Section 81001, subdivision (h). ³ Section 81003.	
⁴ Section 81002, subdivision (a).	
 ⁵ Sections 84200, et seq. ⁶ Section 81002, subdivision (f). 	
 ⁷ Section 84200.5. ⁸ Section 84200.8, subdivision. (a). 	
⁹ Section 84200.8, subdivision. (b). ¹⁰ Regulation 18116, subdivision. (a).	
¹¹ Section 89510.	
¹² Section 89512, subdivision (a).	

confer a substantial personal benefit must be directly related to a political, legislative, or governmental purpose.¹³ "Substantial personal benefit" is defined as an expenditure of campaign funds that results in a direct personal benefit with a value of more than two hundred dollars (\$200) to an elected official.¹⁴ A qualifying personal benefit would include any time the candidate actually makes personal use of an asset obtained as a result of the committee expenditure.¹⁵ The Act states that campaign funds shall not be used for business or casual clothing, except specialty clothing that is not suitable for everyday use, including, but not limited to, formal wear, if this attire is to be worn by the candidate or elected office and is directly related to a political, legislative, or governmental purpose.¹⁶

Campaign funds cannot be used for the payment or reimbursement for the purchase, lease, or refurbishment of any appliance or equipment, where the legal title resides, in whole or in part, in a candidate or elected official, or a member of his or her immediate family.¹⁷ If the committee holds the title of the appliance or equipment, the use must be directly related to a political legislative or governmental purposes and any other usage must be only incidental.¹⁸

Joint and Several Liability of Committee and Treasurer

Under the Act, it is the duty of the candidate and treasurer of a controlled committee to ensure that the committee complies with all the requirements of the Act concerning the receipt, expenditure, and reporting of funds.¹⁹ The candidate and treasurer may be held jointly and severally liable, along with the committee and candidate, for violations committed by the committee.²⁰

SUMMARY OF THE FACTS

The Committee filed an initial statement of organization with the Secretary of State on June 16, 2016, indicating that it did not yet qualify. Onofre listed another individual as the treasurer of her committee, however, this individual did not sign the statement of organization, nor any of the campaign statements filed by the Committee. Onofre signed on both the candidate line and the line for the named

¹⁵ Reg. 18960.

- $\frac{17}{18}$ Section 89517, subdivision (a).
- ¹⁸ Section 89517, subdivision (c).

¹³ Section 89512.

¹⁴ Section 89511, subdivision (b)(3).

¹⁶ Section 89513, subdivision (b).

¹⁹ Sections 81004, 84100, 84213, and Regulation 18427.

²⁰ Sections 83116.5 and 91006.

treasurer on the statement of organization. Onofre signed for and filed all campaign statements filed on behalf of the Committee. Therefore, Onofre acted as her own treasurer.

According to campaign records, the Committee qualified on or about September 1, 2016 after receiving \$2,000 in contributions. Onofre, after successfully winning the primary, was unsuccessful in the November 8, 2016 General Election.²¹ The Committee was terminated on May 16, 2018. As part of an investigation into the Committee's campaign activity, the Enforcement Division obtained committee records, including bank statements, invoices, contributor checks, and receipts.

Failure to File Pre-Election Statements

Onofre was listed on the November ballot and therefore, the Committee was required to file two pre-election statements. The Committee failed to timely file the first pre-election statement for the period of July 1, 2016 to September 24, 2016 due on September 29, 2016. The Committee filed this statement on August 30, 2018, nearly two years late. The Committee reported \$2,246 in contributions and \$3,953 in expenditures. The Committee failed to timely file the second pre-election statement for the period of September 25, 2016 to October 22, 2016 due on October 27, 2016. The Committee filed this statement on August 30, 2018, nearly two years late. The Committee reported \$2,000 in contributions and \$4,680 in expenditures.

The Committee was not terminated after the election until May of 2018 and had a continuing obligation to file campaign statements. Instead, the Committee filed a semiannual campaign statement for the reporting period of October 23, 2016 through February 23, 2018. This statement was filed on August 30, 2018, causing many of the \$6,680 in contributions and \$4,680 in expenditures to be reported late.

Personal Use

Committee records indicate that Onofre withdrew large sums of cash from the committee bank account and then used this cash, in part, to purchase a computer that conferred substantial personal benefit to the candidate. Onofre reported this expenditure as a campaign expenditure. Onofre provided a receipt dated October 29, 2016 for a MacBook Pro laptop computer, paying \$1,321.68 in cash to the Apple Store. Though a committee can purchase office equipment, the title of the equipment must be held in the name

 $^{^{21}}$ Onofre opened a separate committee for the primary election and filed a short form indicating that she raised and spent less than \$2,000. The committee was terminated June 6, 2016.

of the committee. In addition, the candidate must show that the purchase was directly related to a political purpose and any personal use cannot be more than incidental. Onofre lost the election 10 days after making the purchase, thereby ending any direct political purpose the computer may have had. There is no indication that Onofre purchased the computer from the Committee or that the Committee otherwise properly disposed of the computer after the Committee terminating, indicating that Onofre used the computer for her personal benefit in a more than incidental manner.

In addition, Onofre reported on campaign statements and provided a receipt for an expenditure made at Macy's Department Store. The description for the purchase is "Election Day Victory Suit" and was purchased on November 4th, 2016, four days prior to the election and was a purchase in the amount of \$411.49 for two items. This purchase violates the Act because a business suit is not a permissible campaign purchase under the Act.

VIOLATIONS

Count 1: Failure to Timely File Pre-Election Statements

The Committee and Onofre failed to timely file two pre-election statements for the reporting period of July 1, 2016 through September 24, 2016 by the deadline of September 29, 2016 and for the reporting period of September 25, 2016 through October 22, 2016 by the deadline of October 27, 2016 in violation of Section 84200.5.

Count 2: Personal Use of Campaign Funds

Onofre made a payment with campaign funds for a personal laptop and personal clothing that was not related to a political, legislative, or governmental purpose, in violation of Sections 89512, 89513, subdivision (d), and 89517.

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 \$10,000.²²

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 purposes of the Act. Also, the Commission considers factors such as: (a) the seriousness of the violation; (b) the presence or absence of any intention

28

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

²² See Section 83116, subdivision (c).

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.²³

Here, the violations show a negligent disregard for basic campaign accounting and reporting rules and involves personal use of campaign funds. Respondents have no prior history of violations. Respondents have filed the outstanding campaign statements. In further aggravation, the Committee and Onofre failed to comply with the Act's requirements to file 24-hour reports (3 reports for a total of \$5,500 in contributions), to maintain complete records, to utilize a single, designated campaign bank account for all committee expenditures, and Onofre failed to fully disclose her income on a candidate Statement of Economic Interests. In consideration for entering into a settlement and taking into account the small size of the unsuccessful campaign and the limited experience of the candidate, these violations are not being charged separately but will be considered only as an aggravating factor.

The Commission considers penalties in prior cases with the same or similar violations and comparable facts.

With respect to Count 1: In the Matter of Bluff Cove Homeowners' Association Measure E Opposition Committee, Jennifer Hope, and Robert T. Chapman Jr.; FPPC Case No. 18/188. The committee, a primarily formed local ballot measure committee failed to timely file two pre-election statements disclosing approximately \$10,431 in expenditures and approximately \$2,032 in contributions. In October 2018, the Commission approved a penalty of \$1,500 for this count. Onofre failed to disclose a similar amount of activity prior to the election, including \$4,246 in contributions and \$6,246 in expenditures. In aggravation, Onofre failed to timely file a semiannual campaign statement to report the remainder of her 2016 activity. In light of the additional potential reporting violations, a penalty of \$2,500 is justified.

With respect to Count 2: *In the Matter of Jackie Wong for School Board 2016 and Jackie Wong*; FPPC No. 17/621, the respondents spent \$1,466 from five purchases for office equipment, software, and smartphones that were not related to a political, legislative, or governmental purpose. The Commission imposed a penalty of \$3,000. Here, Onofre purchased a personal computer for \$1,321 and a suit for an

28

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

²³ Regulation 18361.5, subdivision (d).

election day campaign event during the final stretch of the campaign and kept the computer after the election without purchasing it from the committee. Her purchase of clothing, personal use of the computer and failure to reimburse the committee is a violation of the Act. Therefore, a penalty of \$3,000 is recommended against Onofre.

After considering the factors listed in Regulation 18361.5, prior similar cases, and other relevant facts, a penalty of \$2,500 is recommended for the Committee and Onofre and a penalty of \$3,000 is recommended for Onofre. The total penalty in this matter is \$5,500.

CONCLUSION

Complainant, the Enforcement Division of the Fair Political Practices Commission, and Respondents Karina Onofre for CA State Assembly 74th District and Karina Onofre 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 Respondents pursuant to Section 83116.

4. 19 Respondents 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. 20 This includes, but is not limited to the right to appear personally at any administrative hearing held in this 22 matter, to be represented by an attorney at Respondents' own expense, to confront and cross-examine all 23 witnesses testifying at the hearing, to subpoen awitnesses to testify at the hearing, to have an impartial 24 administrative law judge preside over the hearing as a hearing officer, and to have the matter judicially 25 reviewed.

26 5. Respondents agree to the issuance of the decision and order set forth below. Also, 27 Respondents agree to the Commission imposing against them an administrative penalty in the amount of 28 \$5,500. One or more cashier's checks or money orders totaling said amount—to be paid to the General

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

21

STIPULATION. DECISION AND ORDER FPPC Case No. 16/649

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 this matter.

6. If the Commission refuses 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 Respondents in connection with this stipulation shall be reimbursed to 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.

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

14 15 16 17	Dated: Galena West, Chief of Enforcement Fair Political Practices Commission
18	Dated:
19	Karina Onofre, individually and on behalf of the Committee, Karina Onofre for CA State Assembly 74 th
20	District
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	8 STIPULATION, DECISION AND ORDER FPPC Case No. 16/649

1	The foregoing stipulation of the parties "Karina Onofre for CA State Assembly 74th District and
2	Karina Onofre," FPPC Case No. 16-649, is hereby accepted as the final decision and order of the Fair
3	Political Practices Commission, effective upon execution below by the Chair.
4	IT IS SO ORDERED.
5	Detail
6	Dated: Richard C. Miadich, Chair
7	Fair Political Practices Commission
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	9 STIPULATION, DECISION AND ORDER
	FPPC Case No. 16/649