Wiley Rein LLP

ELECTION LAW *NEWS*

Developments in All Aspects of Political Law | July 2017

State Party's Weekly Bingo Games Result in Numerous FEC Violations, $500,000 Civil Penalty

By Michael E. Toner and Brandis L. Zehr

Political committees are increasingly turning to contests, sweepstakes, bingo, auctions, and other entertaining ways to raise funds, but—as a state party recently learned the hard way—these fundraising devices present complex compliance and accounting issues and can be a costly trap for the unwary.

In a Federal Election Commission (FEC) enforcement matter recently made public, the Michigan Democratic State Central Committee agreed to pay a $500,000 civil penalty—the 11th largest civil penalty in the FEC's history and the largest civil penalty imposed since 2007—for violating multiple provisions of federal campaign finance law in connection with the state party's weekly bingo games. Although the weekly bingo games appeared to comply with state gambling laws, the state party seemed to have overlooked federal campaign finance regulation of these activities.

The root of the Michigan Democratic State Central Committee's recent compliance issues stemmed from its decision to operate the weekly bingo games on a cash basis for over a

continued on page 7

ALSO IN THIS ISSUE

Vermont Enacts Government Ethics Reforms, Creates State's First Ethics Commission

By D. Mark Renaud and Louisa Brooks

In mid-June, Vermont Governor Phil Scott signed into law a government ethics reform package that, among other things, creates the state's first ethics commission and bans contributions by certain state contractors.

Previously, Vermont was one of the few states without a governmental ethics agency, and the state had received negative attention from a public integrity watchdog group that awarded the state a grade of "F" for ethics enforcement.

continued on page 6

France Institutes Mandatory Lobbyist Registration

By Jan Witold Baran and Louisa Brooks

As of July 1, 2017, France has instituted mandatory lobbyist registration for qualifying individuals, companies, and other organizations who communicate with government officials to influence public decision-making. France adopted the new lobbying law as part of an anti-corruption reform package in late 2016, and registration is now available through the High Authority for the Transparency of Public Life (HATVP).

Under the new law, a person must register as an "interest representative" (i.e., lobbyist) if the person's main or regular duties include communicating with one or more designated public officials for the purpose of influencing public decisions – including qualifying public contracts. A person "mainly" conducts lobbying activities if the activity constitutes more than half of that person's time during the last six months; a person "regularly" engages in lobbying communications if he or she conducted such activities at least ten times in the last 12 months. A company or organization is required to register if one of its officers, employees, or members either mainly or regularly acts as an interest representative.

Once registered, lobbyists will be required to file annual activity reports disclosing their expenditures, the categories of public officials contacted, and the matters on which they lobbied. Additional guidelines will be released this fall, specifying the content to be included in the annual reports.

Although the law provides criminal penalties for persons who fail to comply with their obligations, HATVP has designated the rest of calendar year 2017 as a ramp-up period for the new law. Interest representatives may register until December 31, 2017, and the first activity reports to be made public in April 2018 will not be subject to any penalties for non-compliance.

We are monitoring the rollout of this new lobbying regime and are available to answer any questions about how the lobbying law may affect your organization. ■

For more information, please contact:

Jan Witold Baran
202.719.7330
jbaran@wileyrein.com

Louisa Brooks
202.719.4187
lbrooks@wileyrein.com

Foreign Agents Registration Act (FARA) in the Spotlight

By Tessa Capeloto

In recent months, several high-profile registrations, together with an unflattering audit by the U.S. Department of Justice's (DOJ) Inspector General, have thrown a little-known statute called the Foreign Agents Registration Act (FARA) into the spotlight.

- Just last month, Paul Manafort, President Trump's former campaign manager, filed as a foreign agent for consulting work performed on behalf of a pro-Russia political party in Ukraine between 2012 and 2014. His retroactive FARA filing came after press reports emerged revealing his work for the political party.
- Also last month, lobbyist Jack Abramoff retroactively registered under FARA

continued on page 3

for his attempts to arrange a meeting between the Republic of Congo and President Trump.

- And, earlier this year, President Trump's former national security adviser, Michael Flynn, registered under FARA for lobbying work performed on behalf of the Turkish government.

Notably, these registrations fall closely on the heels of a DOJ Inspector General report issued last September, faulting the agency's National Security Division (NSD) for its lax enforcement of the statute. Since then, the DOJ has become more aggressive in ensuring that foreign agents register their activities.

FARA, enacted in 1938 and administered by the FARA Registration Unit of the Counterespionage Section in the NSD, requires that all persons acting as an "agent of a foreign principal" must register with the DOJ, unless an exception applies. The scope of FARA is far-reaching, rendering many unsuspecting political consultants, lobbyists, public relations counsel, etc., subject to registration. The statute defines a "foreign principal" to include not only foreign governments and foreign political parties, but also foreign persons and corporations. Moreover, the statute defines an "agent of a foreign principal" to include any person who has an agency relationship with the foreign entity and engages in public relations, image-making, or political activities for or on behalf of that foreign entity. The statute broadly defines "political activities" to include "any" activity that the agent believes will, or intends to, in "any way" influence the U.S. government or public with respect to formulating, adopting, or changing U.S. domestic or foreign policy, capturing a significant amount of activity. The penalties for noncompliance can be significant. Criminal penalties can and have been imposed on agents who intentionally and willfully violate the statute. Moreover, unintentional or negligent violations can be met with fines, remedial action, and negative press, which is often the most harmful to an agent action.

Given the broad scope of the statute, the potential consequences of noncompliance, and the DOJ's heightened focus on FARA enforcement, it is important that individuals and companies representing foreign individuals, governments, or companies in the U.S. in a political or quasi-political capacity carefully evaluate whether their activities may trigger registration under FARA and consult counsel when in doubt. Although registration and compliance can be burdensome, it is a manageable affair. Moreover, when representing foreign corporations, agents can often comply through the Lobbying Disclosure Act (LDA) regime. Knowledgeable counsel, such as those at Wiley Rein, can provide the best and most efficient path forward. ■

For more information, please contact:

Tessa Capeloto
202.719.7586
tcapeloto@wileyrein.com

Tessa is special counsel in Wiley Rein's International Trade Practice Group. She represents clients in a variety of international trade matters, including antidumping and countervailing duty proceedings, economic sanctions administered by OFAC and on FARA, anti-money laundering, and compliance matters.

FEC Settles Urologist Associations' Messy Fight Over PAC Affiliation

By Caleb P. Burns and Eric Wang

Requests for the Federal Election Commission (FEC) to rule on whether organizations and their PACs are affiliated typically are as unexciting as a urologists' conference. But a recent disaffiliation request by the American Urological Association (AUA) became surprisingly messy. The AUA's offshoot, the American Association of Clinical Urologists (AACU), responded to the AUA's request with its own opposing request for a determination that the groups are affiliated. The two organizations also filed competing comments refuting each other's requests.

After three months of agency deliberation, and what the AACU dolefully characterized as the "heartfelt debate" with its erstwhile partner entity, the FEC finally weighed in favor of the AUA late last month. With the FEC's finding that AUA and AACU are now disaffiliated, the AACU's PAC, UROPAC, may no longer solicit AUA's members for contributions (unless those members are also AACU members). The upshot is that AUA may now form its own PAC without having to share contribution limits with UROPAC. More generally, the urologists' FEC drama illustrates not only an arcane but important area of PAC law, but also the evolution over the past 50 to 60 years of the regulation of membership organizations' political activities under the non-profit laws.

To better understand the urologist associations' fight over their PAC, some historical context may be helpful. According to the AUA website and the competing FEC submissions, the AUA was first formally incorporated as a 501(c)(3) charitable organization in 1958. At that time, a 501(c)(3) entity could not devote any "substantial part" of its activities to lobbying, and this remains the default rule today. Thus, according to the AACU's submission, in 1969 "the AACU was founded by the AUA as a related organization permitted to lobby on behalf of AUA members." (In the 1970s, the tax code was amended to permit 501(c)(3) entities to devote a not-insignificant part of their expenditures to lobbying if they filed an advance notification with the IRS. Had this law been enacted a few years earlier, it may have obviated the need to create the AACU.)

The AUA's submission recounted events slightly differently regarding the organization's role in forming the AACU. Per the AUA, "[s]everal AUA officers and members in their individual capacities may have been involved in the formation of AACU," but "[t]he two entities have always been entirely legally and organizationally separate."

In 1992, the AACU, which was formed as a 501(c)(6) trade association, created UROPAC, a federal "connected PAC." UROPAC served to enhance AACU members' political clout by pooling their contributions to disburse to candidates – something the AUA again was not permitted to do as a 501(c)(3) entity. In 2000, the AUA reorganized by also forming a 501(c)(6) trade association (known as the AUA) and a related 501(c)(3) entity (known as AUA Education and Research).

Given the significant ties between AUA and AACU at the time, the FEC confirmed in a 2003 advisory opinion that the two organizations were affiliated under the campaign finance laws. This significantly expanded UROPAC's donor base by allowing it to solicit and accept contributions not only from AACU members, but also from AUA members.

continued on page 5

continued from page 4

The AUA apparently began growing apart from AACU and the AUA stopped contributing to UROPAC's administrative expenses. In addition, the AUA declined to renew its affiliation agreements with the AACU, under which the organizations conducted many joint activities. The latest severing of ties was the AUA's request to the FEC to confirm the two organizations were disaffiliated. As the AACU's submission to the FEC surmised, "the only legally significant purpose of [AUA's] request" was "AUA's desire to be allowed to start its own [PAC] with limits separate from those of UROPAC."

Notwithstanding AACU's self-described "heartfelt" objections, the FEC coldly applied its ten-factor affiliation rules in favor of AUA in a way that wasn't even close. The only factor that gave the agency some pause was the organizations' overlapping membership, with 98 percent of AACU's approximately 4,000 members choosing also to be AUA members. However, only approximately 18 percent of AUA's more than 22,000 members are also AACU members, and this led the FEC to conclude that the partially overlapping memberships "is only slightly suggestive of continued affiliation."

The FEC also found the fact that AUA's officers had formed AACU was merely a "neutral" factor under the agency's affiliation test. All of the other eight factors (such as lack of common governance, lack of common hiring authority, lack of common officers and employees, etc.) weighed against affiliation.

Affiliation is a concern for membership organizations and trade associations that have PACs, but also for business corporations with subsidiaries or affiliated entities if they have PACs. The same principles, solicitation restrictions, and shared contribution limits discussed above apply in both contexts. Relatedly, in states where direct corporate contributions are permitted, some jurisdictions may have "aggregation rules," under which corporate entities and related persons may be subject to a single aggregate contribution limit with respect to any particular recipient. This is especially common in the context of "pay-to-play" laws that impose special restrictions on government contractors.

Wiley Rein's Election Law practice group routinely advises corporate and trade association clients on affiliation rules, and has represented many clients in FEC advisory opinion requests regarding this issue. ■

For more information, please contact:

Caleb P. Burns
202.719.7451
cburns@wileyrein.com

Eric Wang
202.719.7485
ewang@wileyrein.com

The new law establishes a State Ethics Commission (Commission) effective January 1, 2018. Comprised of five appointed members, the Commission will not have investigative or enforcement power of its own but will appoint an executive director who will review complaints and refer them to other state authorities, such as the attorney general's office. The Commission will also establish a state code of ethics, conduct trainings on governmental ethics, and have the authority to issue guidance and advisory opinions providing interpretations on any issue related to government ethics.

The law also institutes new pay-to-play provisions, restricting political contributions by state contractors for sole source (i.e., no bid) contracts. Specifically, a person who makes a political contribution to a state officer or candidate for state office is prohibited from negotiating or entering into a sole source contract with a value of $50,000 or more, or multiple sole source contracts with an aggregate value of $100,000 or more, with that state officer or the state on behalf of that office for a period of one year following either the date of the contribution or the date a non-incumbent candidate takes office. Correspondingly, a person who has already entered into one or more sole source contracts exceeding the above amounts may not make a contribution to the relevant state officer or candidate for that state office during the term of the contract. In both cases, the contribution ban also extends to contributions made by the contractor's spouse or principal. The pay-to-play restrictions do not go into effect until December 16, 2018. ■

For more information, please contact:

D. Mark Renaud
202.719.7405
mrenaud@wileyrein.com

Louisa Brooks
202.719.4187
lbrooks@wileyrein.com

Super PAC Opponents Move Ahead with Legal Challenges But Face Longer Odds in 2017

By Carol A. Laham and Andrew G. Woodson

Opponents of independent expenditure-only committees, more commonly referred to as super PACs, continue to forge ahead with legal challenges designed to undermine one of the most important political speech decisions in the last decade: the D.C. Circuit's decision in *SpeechNow.org v. FEC*, which recognized super PACs. These challenges, however, were brought at a time when many prognosticators expected Hillary Clinton to reverse a 5-4 pro-First Amendment majority on the United States Supreme Court by nominating a liberal justice to replace the late Antonin Scalia. Now, with Justice Neil Gorsuch on the Supreme Court, the likelihood of success for super PAC opponents appears to have diminished significantly. But this has not stopped super PAC opponents from continuing to pursue their legal challenges before the Federal Election Commission (FEC) and in one Florida municipality, with several important developments having happened on these fronts in recent weeks.

Last summer, Oregon Democratic Senator Jeff Merkley, an organization called Free Speech for People (FSFP), and others filed

continued on page 8

decade. Players bought bingo cards in cash; the collected cash was used to pay for prizes, jackpots, and other overhead costs of the bingo games; and only the remaining cash was deposited into the committee's federal account and ultimately reported to the FEC. Because the state party failed to keep adequate records of these cash transactions, the committee grossly underreported its receipts and disbursements on FEC disclosure reports by approximately $4.37 million and $3.94 million, respectively. Without adequate records, the state party was unable to track contributor information and had no way of knowing whether the bingo receipts—which were "contributions" under the law and subject to the same prohibitions, limits, and reporting requirements as other contributions—came from permissible sources or exceeded contribution limits. For over a decade, the state party filed reports that not only omitted contributions, but also inaccurately disclosed information about the contributions that were reported. On certain occasions, committee staff purportedly fabricated contributor information for FEC reports. On top of these serious violations, the weekly bingo games also violated the FEC prohibition against accepting cash contributions in excess of $100 and anonymous contributions in excess of $50.

While the Michigan Democratic State Central Committee's case demonstrates the potential federal campaign finance compliance issues associated with entertainment-based fundraising, state regulation of these activities—which vary by jurisdiction—can also catch political committees off-guard. For example, most states consider raffles—whereby an individual provides consideration for a chance to win a prize—as a form of illegal gambling. These states, however, generally permit sweepstakes and contests under certain conditions. Sweepstakes remove the consideration element by allowing participants to enter through an alternative free method of entry instead of purchasing a ticket. Contests, on the other hand, remove the chance element by selecting winners based on skill instead of at random. Some states allow certain non-profit organizations to operate raffles or bingos, but the ability to do so often comes with licensing and/or bonding requirements and additional accounting, reporting, and compliance obligations. Additionally, several states regulate live and/or silent auctions, oftentimes requiring the involvement of a professionally licensed auctioneer. Navigating these issues in one jurisdiction is difficult, but can become overwhelming when conducting a sweepstakes, contest, or virtual silent auction on a national scale.

continued on page 12

LD-203 Notice

Remember Lobbying Disclosure Act (LDA) Form LD-203 for the first half of 2017 is due July 31. If your company made any donations to the Trump Inaugural in early 2017, then such a donation, among other federal-politician-related expenses, is reportable.

For more information, please contact:
Mark Renaud at 202.719.7405 or **mrenaud@wileyrein.com**.

a complaint with the FEC alleging that a bipartisan group of ten super PACs had violated the federal law limiting the amount of contributions that any one political committee may receive. (Because they act independent of candidates, super PACs are generally allowed to accept unlimited funds from corporations and individuals.) The complaint acknowledged that the *SpeechNow.org* case – which was grounded in constitutional (rather the statutory) principles – as well as existing appellate precedent and an earlier FEC advisory opinion, might lead the FEC to dismiss the complaint. However, FSFP and its allies argued that the FEC could reject a binding court of appeals ruling provided it did so to secure "a reasonably prompt national resolution of the question in dispute" – e.g., Supreme Court review of the lower court precedent. The FEC commissioners did not buy this argument, however, as the complaint was dismissed unanimously. On June 22, those responsible for filing the original FEC complaint nevertheless filed a lawsuit in federal court seeking review of the FEC's decision. FSFP makes clear the goal of the lawsuit on its website: "abolishing super PACs in US elections."

The same group behind the FEC complaint has also pushed the St. Petersburg City Council to the brink of enacting a local ordinance abolishing super PACs in their municipal elections. On June 22, the St. Petersburg City Council voted 5-3 to advance the proposed ordinance toward a final vote in July. Proponents recognized that the ordinance will be subject to an almost immediate court challenge, but they are hopeful that since the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit - whose jurisdiction includes Florida - and the U.S. Supreme Court have never directly ruled on super PACs, the local ordinance has a chance of being upheld as constitutional. The City Council's own lawyer was very skeptical of this analysis, however, and portions of the Council meeting focused on just how much the city's attorneys' fees bill would be if the city lost the case.

Ultimate resolution of these cases will likely be a year or two down the line but should occur before the 2020 presidential elections. Again, however, given Judge Gorsuch's appointment, the most likely outcome would appear to be one that favors those who have embraced the constitutionality of super PACs. ■

For more information, please contact:

Carol A. Laham
202.719.7301
claham@wileyrein.com

Andrew G. Woodson
202.719.4638
awoodson@wileyrein.com

Recent Developments in State Lobbying and Gift Laws

By Carol A. Laham and Stephen J. Kenny

Kentucky

Last month, U.S. District Judge William Bertelsman struck down several provisions of Kentucky's campaign finance and ethics laws as unconstitutional. Among the most consequential aspects of the decision, the court held that the ban on gifts from legislative lobbyists and lobbyist employers unconstitutionally infringes the First Amendment. The court concluded that the gift ban constitutes a content-based restriction on speech without being narrowly tailored to combat quid pro quo corruption.

The court also held that the state's total ban on campaign contributions from legislative lobbyists was similarly unconstitutional. The court upheld, however, the ban on campaign contributions from lobbyist employers during a legislative session.

The Kentucky Legislative Ethics Commission has voted to appeal the decision to the Sixth Circuit, and the law is currently being enforced pending post-judgment motions and a final order. If the Sixth Circuit upholds the district court decision, it could have far-reaching implications for gift laws in other states.

Hawaii

Hawaii recently made several changes to its lobbying laws. The state clarified its definitions of "lobbying" to exclude certain communications related to grant applications and "expenditure" to exclude some expenses related to intrastate travel. The legislation also added some additional registration thresholds, such as a $1,000 compensation threshold and a ten-hour lobbying threshold measured over a calendar year. Additionally, the law narrowed the reporting requirements that apply to lobbying reports filed after a special session of the legislature.

Oklahoma

A number of changes to the Oklahoma ethics rules recently went into effect. Among the changes are new deadlines for lobbying registration and reporting. The deadline for new and renewed registrations is now January 15, rather than December 31. Deadlines for legislative lobbyist reports for January and July are now the fifteenth of the month. (The deadline for reports submitted in February, March, April, May, and June remains the fifth of the month.) Executive lobbyists now have until the fifteenth of each month to file their quarterly reports.

Oklahoma has also strengthened its lobbyist gift rules. For gifts that involve meals or attendance at an event, it is now required that lobbyists attend the meal or event. For gifts that fit into the exception for "infrequently occurring occasions of personal significance," it is now required that the gift be given and received contemporaneously with the occasion or at times when such gifts are traditionally given. Further, the price limit on such gifts has been reduced to $100 in the aggregate in a calendar year, and such gifts must be reported to the Ethics Commission. These new gift laws go into effect on January 1, 2018. ■

For more information, please contact:

Carol A. Laham
202.719.7301
claham@wileyrein.com

Stephen J. Kenny
202.719.7532
skenny@wileyrein.com

Second Circuit Vacates Sheldon Silver Corruption Convictions

By Robert L. Walker

On July 13, 2017, a three-judge panel of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit – applying the circumscribed definition of "official act" adopted by the Supreme Court in its June 2016 *McDonnell* decision – unanimously vacated the conviction of former New York State Assembly Speaker Sheldon Silver on multiple public corruption counts. The case was remanded to the District Court for further appropriate action. Almost immediately after the Court of Appeals issued its decision, the Acting U.S. Attorney for the Southern District of New York, Joon H. Kim, announced that he and his office "look forward to retrying the case."

Following a jury trial, Silver was found guilty in November 2015 of four counts of honest services fraud (18 U.S.C. §§ 1341, 1343, 1346), two counts of Hobbs Act extortion (18 U.S.C. § 1951), and one count of money laundering (18 U.S.C. § 1957). In its opinion vacating these guilty verdicts, the Court summarized the government's charges against former Speaker Silver:

> The Government's charges against Silver involve his part-time work as a practicing lawyer. The Government sought to prove that Silver orchestrated two criminal schemes that abused his official positions for unlawful personal gain. Each of these alleged schemes had the same premise: in exchange for official actions, Silver received bribes and kickbacks in the form of referral fees from third-party law firms. In one scheme, Silver performed favors for a doctor in exchange for the doctor's referral of mesothelioma patients to Silver's law firm . . . In the other, Silver performed favors for two real estate developers who had hired, at Silver's request, a law firm that was paying referral fees to Silver . . . Jointly, these alleged schemes produced roughly $4 million in referral fees for Silver. The Government also charged that Silver engaged in money laundering by investing the proceeds of the Mesothelioma and Real Estate Schemes into various private investment vehicles . . .

Proof by the government that a public official committed either honest services fraud or Hobbs Act extortion requires proof of a quid pro quo arrangement, that is, proof that the public official performed (or promised to perform) an "official act" (or "official action") in exchange for something of value (or the promise of something of value). The scope and meaning of "official act" in federal public corruption cases is now controlled by the Court's decision in *McDonnell*. As we wrote at the time of that landmark decision:

> In rejecting the government's broad interpretation of "official act," the Court embraced a more "bounded interpretation" of the term encompassing only "a decision or action on a question, matter, cause, suit, proceeding or controversy" involving a formal exercise of governmental power that is similar in nature to a lawsuit before a court, a determination before an agency, or a hearing before a committee. An official act is "something specific and focused that is 'pending' or 'may be brought before a public official." The definition of "official act," the Court ruled, does not include an official's setting up meetings, calling other officials, or hosting an event, "without more" – even if that "more" is limited to exerting pressure on another official to perform an "official act."
>
> *Election Law News*, June 29, 2016.

The linchpin of Sheldon Silver's appeal of his

continued on page 11

continued from page 10

conviction was that the definition of "official action" with which the District Court charged the jury was overly expansive and inclusive and, therefore, erroneous. In charging the jury, the District Court had essentially adopted the government's proposed definition that an "official action" "includes any action taken under color of official authority." (Silver's defense team had argued for use of a much narrower definition of "official act.") As the Court of Appeals notes in its opinion, this jury charge – given in November 2015, prior to the Supreme Court's decision in *McDonnell* – was consistent with the Second Circuit's precedent at the time. But, by the time the District Court decided Silver's post-conviction motion for bail pending appeal – in August 2016, post-*McDonnell* – the likely success of Silver's argument that the trial jury was erroneously charged on the definition of "official action" was clear, including to the trial judge. In granting Silver's motion for bail pending appeal, Judge Valerie E. Caproni wrote:

> Silver's case is factually almost nothing like *McDonnell*; there is no question that Silver took a number of official acts — most obviously, passing legislation and approving state grants and tax-exempt financing — as part of a *quid pro quo* in the Mesothelioma and Real Estate Schemes. Nevertheless, there is a substantial question whether, in light of *McDonnell*, the charge was in error and, if so, whether the error was harmless.
>
> *United States v. Silver*, 203 F. Supp. 3d 370, 380 (S.D.N.Y.2016).

In vacating Silver's convictions, the Court of Appeals did not determine that – assuming a correctly charged jury – the former Assembly Speaker *could not* be convicted properly based on the actions alleged by the government (or, at least based on some of the actions alleged by the government). Rather, the Court of Appeals held that the District Court's error in charging the jury on the meaning of "official action" "was not harmless because it is not clear beyond a reasonable doubt that a rational jury would have reached the same conclusion if properly instructed, as is required by law for the verdict to stand."

In his statement following announcement of the Court of Appeals' decision, Acting U.S. Attorney Kim expressed optimism about the outcome of a retrial of the Silver case:

> Although this decision puts on hold the justice that New Yorkers got upon Silver's conviction, we look forward to presenting to another jury the evidence of decades-long corruption by one of the most powerful politicians in New York State history. Although it will be delayed, we do not expect justice to be denied.

Kim may be right about the eventual outcome of the Sheldon Silver case. But the *Silver* decision makes clear that – even in public corruption cases where there is evidence of "official actions" by a government official-defendant under the new, narrowed legal standard – *McDonnell* will continue to complicate the government's burden at both the charging and trial stages, and it will continue to provide the basis for legal challenges which defense counsel must explore and exploit. ■

For more information, please contact:

Robert L. Walker
202.719.7585
rlwalker@wileyrein.com

State Party's Weekly Bingo Games Result in Numerous FEC Violations, $500,000 Civil Penalty *continued from page 7*

Contests, sweepstakes, bingo, and auctions offer a way to raise funds while engaging with supporters, but present complex legal compliance issues under both federal and state law. Political committees are strongly encouraged to seek legal advice before undertaking any of these activities. Wiley Rein's Election Law and Government Ethics practice regularly advises clients on federal campaign fundraising rules, as well as state regulation of raffles, bingo, sweepstakes, contests, and auctions. ■

For more information, please contact:

Michael E. Toner
202.719.7545
mtoner@wileyrein.com

Brandis L. Zehr
202.719.7210
bzehr@wileyrein.com

Uber Agrees to $98,000 Fine for NY Lobbying Reporting Violations

By Andrew G. Woodson and Karen E. Trainer

In June, Uber Technologies Inc. and the New York State Joint Commission on Public Ethics (JCOPE) reached an agreement to settle allegations that Uber's New York lobbying reports covering 2015-2016 were inaccurate. As part of the settlement agreement, Uber will pay a $98,000 fine. The settlement agreement also requires Uber to provide JCOPE with any requested records regarding its 2017-2018 reports so that JCOPE can confirm the accuracy of Uber's 2017-2018 filings.

JCOPE notified Uber after identifying a number of apparent discrepancies on Uber's reports covering 2015 and 2016. Uber determined that it had failed to disclose $6.3 million in lobbying compensation and expenses in 2015 and 2016 and amended its reports. According to the settlement agreement, the discrepancies were a result of errors by both Uber and an outside firm that Uber hired to prepare and file reports. ■

For more information, please contact:

Andrew G. Woodson
202.719.4638
awoodson@wileyrein.com

Karen E. Trainer
202.719.4078
ktrainer@wileyrein.com

Events & Speeches

Legal Considerations When Running for Office

Eric Wang, Speaker

Republican National Lawyers Association Election Law Seminar

August 4, 2017 | Grand Rapids, MI

Corporate Political Activities 2017: Complying with Campaign Finance, Lobbying and Ethics Laws

Jan Witold Baran, Co-Chair
Caleb P. Burns, Speaker

Practising Law Institute

September 7-8, 2017 | Washington, DC

*Wiley Rein clients are eligible for a discount. Please email **Camille Dillio** for more info.

Election Law Professionals

Jan Witold Baran	202.719.7330	jbaran@wileyrein.com
Michael E. Toner	202.719.7545	mtoner@wileyrein.com
Carol A. Laham	202.719.7301	claham@wileyrein.com
Thomas W. Kirby	202.719.7062	tkirby@wileyrein.com
D. Mark Renaud	202.719.7405	mrenaud@wileyrein.com
Caleb P. Burns	202.719.7451	cburns@wileyrein.com
Andrew G. Woodson	202.719.4683	awoodson@wileyrein.com
Robert D. Benton	202.719.7142	rbenton@wileyrein.com
Claire J. Evans	202.719.7022	cevans@wileyrein.com
Robert L. Walker	202.719.7585	rlwalker@wileyrein.com
Ralph J. Caccia	202.719.7242	rcaccia@wileyrein.com
Roderick L. Thomas	202.719.7035	rthomas@wileyrein.com
Bruce L. McDonald	202.719.7014	bmcdonald@wileyrein.com
Jason P. Cronic	202.719.7175	jcronic@wileyrein.com
Thomas W. Antonucci	202.719.7558	tantonucci@wileyrein.com
Daniel B. Pickard	202.719.7285	dpickard@wileyrein.com
Eric Wang	202.719.4185	ewang@wileyrein.com
Brandis L. Zehr	202.719.7210	bzehr@wileyrein.com
Stephen J. Kenny	202.719.7532	skenny@wileyrein.com
Louisa Brooks	202.719.4187	lbrooks@wileyrein.com
Karen E. Trainer, Senior Reporting Specialist	202.719.4078	ktrainer@wileyrein.com