

1 KENDALL L.D. BONEBRAKE
Chief of Enforcement
2 NEAL BUCKNELL
Senior Commission Counsel
3 **FAIR POLITICAL PRACTICES COMMISSION**
1102 Q Street, Suite 3050
4 Sacramento, CA 95811
5 Telephone: (279) 237-5938
6 Attorneys for Complainant, the Enforcement
Division of the Fair Political Practices Commission
7

8 **BEFORE THE FAIR POLITICAL PRACTICES COMMISSION**
9 **STATE OF CALIFORNIA**
10

11 In the Matter of

12 MICHAEL GATTO AND JOSHUA
13 MEISTER,

14 Respondents.

FPPC Case No. 2020-00945

STIPULATION, DECISION AND ORDER

Date Submitted to Commission: August 2026

15 **INTRODUCTION**

16 This matter arose from a sworn complaint regarding a mailing sent in connection with the
17 November 3, 2020 General Election. During the November 3, 2020 General Election, the Respondents,
18 Michael Gatto (“Gatto”) and Joshua Meister (“Meister”), paid for an advertisement communication
19 distributed to voters that unambiguously urged a vote against two clearly identified candidates. As such,
20 an independent expenditure committee was formed (the “Committee”).

21 Gatto and Meister violated the Political Reform Act (the “Act”)¹ by failing to timely file a 24-
22 hour Independent Expenditure Report, failing to timely file a semi-annual campaign statement, and
23 failing to include proper disclosure statements in an advertisement. These violations appear to have been
24 negligent, as opposed to intentional.

25 ///

26 _____
27 ¹ The Act is contained in Government Code sections 81000 through 91014. All statutory references are to this code. The
28 regulations of the Fair Political Practices Commission are contained in Sections 18104 through 18998 of Title 2 of the
California Code of Regulations. All regulatory references are to this source.

SUMMARY OF THE LAW

The Act and its regulations are amended from time to time. Unless otherwise noted, all legal references and discussions of law pertain to the Act's provisions as they existed at the time of the violations in this case (2020).

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

When enacting the Act, the people of California found and declared that previous laws regulating political practices suffered from inadequate enforcement by state and local authorities.² For this reason, the Act is to be construed liberally 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

Definition of Expenditure

"Expenditure" means a payment, a forgiveness of a loan, a payment of a loan by a third party, or an enforceable promise to make a payment, unless it is clear from the surrounding circumstances that it is not made for political purposes. An expenditure is made on the date the payment is made or on the date consideration, if any, is received, whichever is earlier.⁷

A payment is made for political purposes if it is for purposes of influencing or attempting to influence the action of the voters for or against the nomination or election of a candidate or candidates, or the qualification or passage of any measure.⁸

///

///

² Section 81001, subd. (h).

³ Section 81003.

⁴ Section 81002, subd. (a).

⁵ Sections 84200, *et seq.*

⁶ Section 81002, subd. (f).

⁷ Section 82025, subd. (a).

⁸ Section 82025, subd. (b)(1).

1 “Expenditure” includes any monetary or nonmonetary payment made by any person that is used
2 for communications that expressly advocate the nomination, election, or defeat of a clearly identified
3 candidate or candidates, or the qualification, passage, or defeat of a clearly identified ballot measure.⁹

4 “Clearly identified” is further defined as including when a communication states a candidate’s
5 name, makes an unambiguous reference to their office or status as a candidate, or unambiguously
6 describes them in any manner. A group of candidates is clearly identified if the communication makes
7 an unambiguous reference to some well-defined characteristic of the group, even if the communication
8 does not name each candidate.¹⁰

9 A communication “expressly advocates” the nomination, election, or defeat of a candidate if it
10 contains express words of advocacy such as, “vote for,” “elect,” “support,” “cast your ballot,” “vote
11 against,” “defeat,” “reject,” “sign petitions for,” or, within 60 days before an election in which the
12 candidate appears on the ballot, the communication otherwise refers to a clearly identified candidate or
13 measure so that the communication, taken as a whole, unambiguously urges a particular result in an
14 election.¹¹

15 A communication, taken as a whole, unambiguously urges a particular result in an election if it is
16 not susceptible of any reasonable interpretation other than as an appeal to vote for or against a specific
17 candidate or measure. A communication is not susceptible of any reasonable interpretation other than as
18 an appeal to vote for or against a specific candidate or measure when, taken as a whole, it could only be
19 interpreted by a reasonable person as containing an appeal to vote for or against a specific candidate or
20 measure because of both of the following: First, the electoral portion of the communication is
21 unmistakable, unambiguous, and suggestive of only one meaning. Second, reasonable minds could not
22 differ as to whether it encourages a vote for or against a clearly identified candidate or measure, or
23 encourages some other kind of action on a legislative, executive, or judicial matter or issue.¹² The statute
24 offers examples of statements that in most contexts would not be susceptible of any reasonable
25 interpretation other than as an appeal to vote for or against a specific candidate or measure: “Smith’s the

26 ⁹ Section 82025, subd. (c).

27 ¹⁰ Section 82025, subd. (c)(1)(A)-(B).

28 ¹¹ Section 82025, subd. (c)(2).

¹² Section 82025, subd. (c)(2)(A).

One”; “No Measure A”; “Rally ‘round O’Malley”; “Create jobs with Measure X”; “Only Nancy Brown can clean out City Hall”; “Proposition 123 - your last chance to save California”; “Joe Green will earn your trust”; “Bob Boone is unqualified for office and a special-interest puppet”; “Shirley Hall - bad for California, bad for you.”¹³ The statute also offers examples of statements that would be susceptible of a reasonable interpretation other than as an appeal to vote for or against a specific candidate or measure: “Assembly Member Nancy Brown needs to be tough on criminals. Call her and tell her to stand firm on AB 100”; “Poor children need a home too. Support the Mayor’s stance against more budget cuts”; “Thank you, Supervisor Smith, for continuing to support our farmers.”¹⁴

The definition of “expenditure” also includes a safe harbor provision.¹⁵ A communication would not be considered an expenditure within the meaning of this section when both of the following apply: First, the communication does not mention an election, candidacy, political party unless required by law, opposing candidate, or voting by the general public, and it does not take a position on the character, qualifications, or fitness for office of a candidate or officeholder, or the merits of a ballot measure. Second, the communication focuses on a legislative, executive, or judicial matter or issue, either urging a candidate to take a particular position or action with respect to the matter or issue, or urging the public to adopt a particular position and to contact the candidate with respect to the matter or issue.

If a communication does not qualify for the safe harbor provision, the commission shall consider if the communication has an interpretation other than as an appeal to vote for or against a clearly identified candidate or measure, in order to determine if, on balance, the communication is not susceptible of any reasonable interpretation other than as an appeal to vote for or against a clearly identified candidate or measure.¹⁶

Definition of Independent Expenditure

“Independent expenditure” means an expenditure made by a person in connection with a communication which expressly advocates the election or defeat of a clearly identified candidate or the qualification, passage, or defeat of a clearly identified measure, or taken as a whole and in context,

¹³ Section 82025, subd. (c)(2)(B).

¹⁴ Section 82025, subd. (c)(2)(C).

¹⁵ Section 82025, subd. (c)(2)(D).

¹⁶ Section 82025, subd. (c)(2)(E).

unambiguously urges a particular result in an election but which is not made to or at the behest of the affected candidate or committee.¹⁷

Definition of Independent Expenditure Committee

“Committee” means, in relevant part, any person or combination of persons who directly or indirectly makes independent expenditures totaling \$1,000 or more in a calendar year, and is commonly referred to as an independent expenditure committee.¹⁸

Semi-Annual Campaign Statements

The Act requires committees to file campaign statements and reports at specific times disclosing information regarding contributions received and expenditures made by the campaign committees.¹⁹

Committees shall file semi-annual statements each year no later than July 31, for the period ending June 30, and no later than January 31, for the period ending December 31.²⁰

“Period covered” by a campaign statement means, unless a different period is specified, the period beginning the day after the closing date of the most recent campaign statement which was required to be filed and ending with the closing date of the statement in question. If a person has not previously filed a campaign statement, the period covered begins on January 1.²¹

24-hour Independent Expenditure Reports

A committee that makes a late independent expenditure shall report the late independent expenditure by facsimile transmission, guaranteed overnight delivery, or personal delivery within 24 hours of the time it is made.²² A late independent expenditure is defined as an independent expenditure that totals in the aggregate \$1,000 or more and is made for or against a specific candidate or measure involved in an election during the 90-day period preceding the date of the election or on the date of the election.²³

///

¹⁷ Section 82031.

¹⁸ Section 82013.

¹⁹ See Section 84200, *et seq.*

²⁰ Section 84200.

²¹ Section 82046, subd. (b).

²² Section 84204.

²³ Section 82036.5.

1 If the filing due date for a statement or report falls on a Saturday, Sunday, or official state
2 holiday, then the filing due date shall be extended to the next regular business day.²⁴ This extension does
3 not apply to 24-hour reports when the due date for these reports falls on a Saturday, Sunday, or official
4 state holiday immediately prior to an election.²⁵

5 **Disclosure Requirements for Advertisements**

6 Advertisement means any general or public communication that is authorized and paid for by a
7 committee for purposes of supporting or opposing a candidate or candidates for elective office or a
8 ballot measure or ballot measures.²⁶ Any advertisement paid for by an independent expenditure
9 committee shall include the words "Paid for by" followed by the name that the filer is required to use on
10 campaign statements pursuant to subdivision (o) of Section 84211.²⁷

11 Print advertisements, such as a mailing, shall include all required disclosures as follows: the
12 disclosure area shall have a solid white background and shall be in a printed or drawn box on the bottom
13 of at least one page that is set apart from any other printed matter. All text in the disclosure shall be in a
14 contrasting color.²⁸

15 An advertisement supporting or opposing a candidate that is paid for by an independent
16 expenditure shall include a statement that it was not authorized by a candidate or committee controlled
17 by a candidate.²⁹

18 **SUMMARY OF THE FACTS**

19 **The Mailer**

20 The Enforcement Division received a sworn complaint regarding a mailer that did not include
21 required sender identification information, which was disseminated in California City prior to the
22 November 3, 2020 General Election. The mailer is attached as Exhibit A.

23 ///

24 _____
25 ²⁴ Regulation 18116, subd. (a).

26 ²⁵ Regulation 18116, subd. (b).

27 ²⁶ Section 84501.

28 ²⁷ Section 84502, subdivision (b).

²⁸ Section 84504.2, subdivision (a)(1).

²⁹ Section 84506.5.

1 The front of the mailer includes the language “CALIFORNIA CITY SUED” in large capital
2 letters. The phrasing is against a backdrop of a graphic with two men shaking hands with what appears
3 to be an exchange of money. At the bottom of the front side of the mailer, in smaller print, there is an
4 exclamation mark in red and in a yellow highlighted box followed by the words:
5 “COUNCILMEMBERS ACCUSED OF BRIBERY, ABUSE OF THEIR AUTHORITY, & BLATANT
6 VIOLATIONS IN COURT FILINGS.”

7 On the back of the mailer, the phrasing from the front regarding what the council members are
8 accused of is repeated in larger letters. Below this phrasing, there are three photos with a name and a
9 title below each in capital letters. The photos in the mailer featured three elected officials with their titles
10 and photos: (from left to right) William Smith, California City Councilmember; Donald Parris,
11 California City Mayor Pro Tem; and Ronald Smith, California City Councilmember. In addition, Donald
12 Parris’s photo is slightly larger than the other two and has a yellow circle around it. Donald Parris and
13 Ronald Smith were on the ballot in the November 3, 2020 General Election, and both were
14 unsuccessful.

15 In the background behind all the photos, towards the top half of the mailer, is the photo from the
16 front: two men shaking hands in black and white. At the bottom of the backside of the mailer, there is a
17 quote from the Mojave Desert News dated October 6, 2020, along with a logo of the newspaper to the
18 left of the quote. The quote appears to relate to the lawsuit the mailer is referring to when it says,
19 “COURT FILINGS,” and “The lawsuit also alleges ‘that Jones continues to bribe the Councilmen and
20 Mayor [Pro Tem] with cash payments and business/real estate transactions/purchases that no reasonable
21 person would purchase ... i.e., transactions that result in a windfall to the Councilmen and Mayor [Pro
22 Tem]...’.” Finally, on the back page, at the bottom of the mailer highlighted in yellow, it reads, “Read
23 the allegations yourself” followed by a link to the article.

24 **Independent Expenditure Committee**

25 **Qualification and Advertisement Disclosure Requirements**

26 In 2020, Gatto and Meister wanted to support new candidates running for Mayor and City
27 Council in California City. As part of this effort, the Committee was created when a vendor was hired

28 ///

1 and paid \$5,000 to send the mailer in this case. The mailer was disseminated to voters in California City
2 in advance of the November 3, 2020 General Election.

3 The mailer was an expenditure under the Act because, within 60 days prior to the November 3,
4 2020 General Election, the mailer featured two clearly identified candidates on the November 3, 2020
5 ballot, Donald Parris and Ronald Smith, and taken as a whole, the mailer unambiguously urges a vote
6 against the two candidates. The position that the mailer takes on the character of the candidates, the
7 repetition and emphasis on words such as “bribery,” “abuse of their authority,” and “blatant violations,”
8 and the color scheme of red and yellow signaling caution, show that this mailer can only be interpreted
9 as an appeal to readers to vote against the specific candidates.

10 The Enforcement Division found no evidence that the mailer was made in connection with or at
11 the behest of any candidate. Therefore, the mailer was an independent expenditure—and since the
12 mailer cost more than \$1,000, the Committee qualified as an independent expenditure committee.³⁰
13 Consequently, the mailer should have included the proper advertisement disclosures, and Gatto and
14 Meister were required to file a 24-hour Independent Expenditure Report and a semi-annual campaign
15 statement disclosing this activity.

16 VIOLATIONS

17 Count 1: Failure to Timely File a 24-hour

18 Independent Expenditure Report and a Semi-annual Campaign Statement

19 The Committee failed to timely file a 24-hour Independent Expenditure Report—and a semi-
20 annual campaign statement covering the period of January 1, 2020 through December 31, 2020 by the
21 February 1, 2021 due date.

22 In this way, Gatto and Meister violated Sections 84200 and 84204.

23 ///

24 ///

25
26 ³⁰ See Section 82047, which defines “person” to include individuals “acting in concert.” Also, see Section 82013, subd. (b),
27 which defines an independent expenditure committee to include any “combination of persons” who directly or indirectly make
28 independent expenditures totaling \$1,000 or more in a calendar year. Additionally, see Section 81003 regarding liberal
construction of the Act, which is a statutory requirement (to accomplish purposes including, but not limited to, transparency
for the public).

1 **Count 2: Failure to Include Proper Disclosure on an Advertisement**

2 The Committee failed to include proper disclosure on an advertisement, including failing to state,
3 “Paid for by,” followed by the name of the Committee, failing to include the advertisement disclosure in
4 10-point font on a solid white background and in a printed or drawn box, and failing to include the
5 required advertisement disclosure language for independent expenditure advertisements.

6 In this way, Gatto and Meister violated Sections 84502, 84504.2, and 84506.5.

7 **PROPOSED PENALTY**

8 This matter consists of two counts. The maximum penalty that may be imposed for Count 1 is
9 \$5,000.³¹ However, for Count 2, the maximum penalty that may be imposed is \$15,000 (three times the
10 cost of the advertisement).³² Thus, the maximum penalty that may be imposed for the counts charged is
11 \$20,000.

12 These types of violations are eligible for the Streamline Program. However, the Enforcement
13 Division has determined that these violations are excluded from the Streamline Program. First, the
14 expenditure for the advertisement was not disclosed on a campaign statement, and since the committee
15 was not identified on the mailer, the advertisement was likely to result in confusion regarding the identity
16 of the committee responsible for the advertisement. Additionally, the extent and gravity of the public
17 harm in the aggregate is more than minimal, given the lack of advertisement disclosure.

18 In determining the appropriate penalty for a particular violation of the Act, the Enforcement
19 Division considers the typical treatment of a violation in the overall statutory scheme of the Act, with an
20 emphasis on serving the purposes and intent of the Act. Additionally, the Enforcement Division
21 considers the facts and circumstances of the violation in the context of the following factors set forth in
22 Regulation 18361.5 subdivision (e)(1) through (8): (1) The extent and gravity of the public harm caused
23 by the specific violation; (2) The level of experience of the violator with the requirements of the Political
24 Reform Act; (3) Penalties previously imposed by the Commission in comparable cases; (4) The presence
25 or absence of any intention to conceal, deceive or mislead; (5) Whether the violation was deliberate,

26 _____
27 ³¹ Section 83116, subd. (c).

28 ³² Since Count 2 involves violation of Section 84506.5, it is subject to penalty enhancement under Section 84510, subd. (a)(1). Thus, the maximum penalty for this count is three times the cost of the ad—instead of the normal maximum of \$5,000 per violation.

negligent or inadvertent; (6) Whether the violator demonstrated good faith by consulting the Commission staff or any other governmental agency in a manner not constituting a complete defense under Government Code Section 83114(b); (7) Whether the violation was isolated or part of a pattern and whether the violator has a prior record of violations of the Political Reform Act or similar laws; and (8) Whether the violator, upon learning of a reporting violation, voluntarily filed amendments to provide full disclosure.³³

The Act seeks to protect the integrity of our electoral process by ensuring that voters know who is responsible for the political advertisements that seek to influence how they cast their ballot, and the voting public is harmed when that information is not included in campaign advertisements. The public harm inherent in campaign filing violations is that the public is deprived of important, time-sensitive information regarding campaign activity. Here, the public harm was caused by the advertisement failing to clearly identify that the mailing was a political mailing by including the required advertisement disclaimers, including that the mailer was not authorized by any candidate. Additional public harm in this case resulted from the failure to disclose information related to a political expenditure on campaign statements and reports, including the cost of the advertisement.

Meister has no prior experience with the Act. However, Gatto is a licensed attorney with the California State Bar and has prior experience with the Act. Gatto previously served as an Assembly Member representing District 43 from 2010 to 2016 and formerly had an open committee for State Senate. Gatto also currently has an open committee, with continuing filing obligations, with the Secretary of State's Office titled "Mike Gatto for Lt Governor 2026." At the time of the relevant activity in this matter, Gatto served as Meister's attorney.

Recently, the Commission considered another settlement involving comparable violations: [In the Matter of ACLU of Northern California](#); FPPC Case No. 2018-01511 (approved [Aug. 17, 2023](#)). In this comparable case, ACLU of Northern California paid for a communication that unambiguously urged a vote against clearly identified candidates in advance of the June 5, 2018 Primary Election. ACLU of Northern California failed to timely disclose reportable activity on a campaign statement and failed to

³³ Regulation 18361.5, subd. (e).

1 timely file a 24-hour Independent Expenditure Report, in violation of Government Code Sections 84211
2 and 84204; and failed to include proper disclosure statements on an advertisement, in violation of
3 Government Code Sections 84502, 84504.2, and 84506.5. The Commission approved a penalty of
4 \$3,500 for the semi-annual campaign statement and 24-hour Independent Expenditure Report—and
5 \$3,000 for the advertisement disclosure violation.

6 In both cases, *ACLU* and here, an advertisement that unambiguously urged a vote against clearly
7 identified candidates was sent to the public with no advertisement disclosure, no 24-hour Independent
8 Expenditure Report was filed, and no campaign statement was filed to disclose the expenditure.

9 As to Count 1, a similar penalty to *ACLU* is recommended. In *ACLU*, the committee spent
10 significantly more on the advertisement, \$92,500, and the advertisement in *ACLU* had a much wider
11 reach, reaching approximately 144,523 voters in Sacramento County. Here, the mailer cost \$5,000 and
12 was sent to a much smaller group of voters in California City. However, in *ACLU*, a committee was
13 formed and established, filing some of the required campaign statements, unlike here, where a
14 committee was never formed, and no campaign statements or reports were filed. Therefore, a similar
15 penalty of \$3,500 is recommended.

16 As to Count 2, a higher penalty than *ACLU* is recommended. Although both advertisements
17 failed to include disclosure, the *ACLU* advertisement prominently displayed the *ACLU* logo, indicating
18 that a reasonable reader would understand *ACLU* of Northern California was responsible for the
19 advertisement. Here, there was no similar identification regarding the sender on the mailer, so the voting
20 public could not determine who sent the mailer. Finally, in *ACLU*, a committee was formed and
21 established, unlike here, where a committee was never formed. Therefore, a higher penalty of \$4,000 is
22 recommended.

23 The evidence supports that Respondents mistakenly believed their activity did not cause them to
24 qualify as a committee under the Act. The resulting reporting and advertisement-disclosure violations
25 appear to have been negligent, rather than intentional. However, as an attorney—and as an experienced
26 former candidate and officeholder—Gatto’s prior legal and campaign experience weigh against further
27 mitigation, notwithstanding the evidence that the violations were negligent.

28 ///

These violations were isolated and not indicative of an overall pattern of violations related to advertisements and independent expenditures. Although Gatto has a history of prior violations of the Act (in 2011, 2014, and 2020), these violations did not involve independent expenditure or advertisement disclosure violations of the type at issue here.

Respondents have cooperated with the Enforcement Division by agreeing to settlement in advance of the probable cause conference that otherwise would have been held. Additionally, Gatto has agreed to this stipulation to avoid any conflicts with his former client, Meister.

After considering the factors listed in Regulation 18361.5 and penalties in prior similar cases, a penalty of \$3,500 is recommended for Count 1 and a penalty of \$4,000 is recommended for Count 2, for a total penalty of \$7,500.³⁴

CONCLUSION

Complainant, the Enforcement Division of the Fair Political Practices Commission, and Respondents Gatto and Meister, 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. 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. 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 subpoena witnesses to testify at the hearing, to have an impartial

///

³⁴ Similar to ACLU, the behavior here is not so egregious so as to pursue a penalty up to three times the cost of the ads.

1 administrative law judge preside over the hearing as a hearing officer, and to have the matter judicially
2 reviewed.

3 5. The Respondents agree to the issuance of the decision and order set forth below. Also, the
4 Respondents agree to the Commission imposing against them an administrative penalty in the amount of
5 \$7,500. One or more cashier's checks or money orders totaling said amount—to be paid to the General
6 Fund of the State of California—is/are submitted with this stipulation as full payment of the
7 administrative penalty described above, and same shall be held by the State of California until the
8 Commission issues its decision and order regarding the matter.

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

15 ///

16 ///

17 ///

18 ///

19 ///

20 ///

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

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 hard copy of a signature page transmitted via fax
3 or as a PDF email attachment is as effective and binding as the original.
4

5
6 Dated: _____

Kendall L.D. Bonebrake, Chief of Enforcement
Fair Political Practices Commission
7
8

9
10 Dated: _____

Michael Gatto, Respondent
11
12

13
14 Dated: _____

Joshua Meister, Respondent
15
16

17 The foregoing stipulation of the parties Michael Gatto and Joshua Meister, FPPC Case No. 2020-
18 00945, is hereby accepted as the final decision and order of the Fair Political Practices Commission,
19 effective upon execution below by the Chair.
20

21 IT IS SO ORDERED.
22

23 Dated: _____

Adam E. Silver, Chair
Fair Political Practices Commission
24
25
26
27
28

EXHIBIT A

Front of Mailer



Back of Mailer

COUNCILMEMBERS ACCUSED OF **BRIBERY, ABUSE OF THEIR AUTHORITY, AND BLATANT VIOLATIONS** IN COURT FILINGS...



WILLIAM SMITH
CALIFORNIA CITY
COUNCILMEMBER

DONALD PARRIS
CALIFORNIA CITY
MAYOR PRO TEM

RONALD SMITH
CALIFORNIA CITY
COUNCILMEMBER

 Mojave
Desert News
Serving the Community

"The lawsuit also alleges "that Jones continues to **bribe the Councilmen and Mayor [Pro Tem] with cash payments and business/real estate transactions/purchases** that no reasonable person would purchase ... i.e., transactions that result in a windfall to the Councilmen and Mayor [Pro Tem]...."

— MOJAVE DESERT NEWS, 10/6/2020

Read the allegations yourself at [TINYURL.COM/YYXA5A86](https://tinyurl.com/yyxa5a86)