

**Memorandum**  
**Fair Political Practices Commission**

**To:** FPPC Chair Ravel, and Commissioners Garrett, Eskovitz, Montgomery and Rotunda

**From:** Zackery P. Morazzini, General Counsel  
Lawrence T. Woodlock, Senior Commission Counsel

**Subject:** Pending Litigation

**Date:** June 27, 2012

---

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

This action was filed on January 9, 2009 in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California by plaintiffs ProtectMarriage.com - Yes on 8, a Project of California Renewal and National Organization for Marriage California - Yes on 8, Sponsored by National Organization for Marriage. It is a “defendants class action” lawsuit against defendants responsible either for enforcement of the Act, or maintenance and publication of the campaign reports at issue in this case (including the Commission, Attorney General, Secretary of State and various district and city attorneys). The Commission defendants were formally served on January 14, 2009.

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

Plaintiffs moved for a preliminary injunction on shortened time, which was heard on January 29, 2009 before District Judge Morrison C. England, Jr. The court denied plaintiffs’ motion from the bench, concluding that plaintiffs had failed to demonstrate the probability of success on the merits or the likelihood of irreparable injury necessary to support a preliminary injunction. The court issued a written order to this effect on January 30. On February 3, 2009 the Commission defendants timely filed their Answer to Plaintiffs’ Second Amended Complaint. On May 15, 2009 the court issued the Scheduling Order to set the timing of further proceedings and on May 27, 2009 the court issued another order granting Plaintiffs’ motion, not opposed by Defendants, to file a Third Amended Complaint adding the National Organization for Marriage

California PAC to the list of Plaintiffs. The Answer to this Complaint was filed on June 5, 2009.

On June 3, 2009 Plaintiffs filed a Motion for Class Certification and a Motion for Summary Judgment, together with supporting documents. Defendants filed Notices of Non-Opposition to the Class Certification Motion, and on June 10, 2009 filed a Motion seeking denial of Plaintiffs' Motion for Summary Judgment or, in the alternative, continuance of the hearing date under Rule 56. On June 24, 2009 the Court issued an Order denying Plaintiffs' Motion for Summary Judgment, and on August 6, 2009 advised that it would decide class certification without oral argument. The parties reached agreement on class certification and, on November 9, 2009 filed a Stipulation and Proposed Order, entered by the Court on November 25, 2009.

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

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

#### ***Fair Political Practices Commission v. United States Postal Service***

On January 12, 2012, the Commission staff filed a complaint in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California against the USPS under the Freedom of Information Act. The matter arises out of the Enforcement Division's attempt to obtain records from the USPS that are pertinent to an investigation regarding an alleged violation of the mass-mailing provisions of the Act.

As part of our investigation, we issued a subpoena to USPS, requesting the number of pieces of mail sent out under a bulk mail permit held by Mr. Eisen, a candidate subject to a recall election. The USPS refused to comply with the subpoena, but treated it like a FOIA request. Ultimately, the USPS denied our request for records, asserting such information is exempt under various FOIA exemptions. We pursued the administrative appeal procedures, to no avail.

In January, Mr. Eisen sought to intervene in the case, but the court denied his motion. He has filed an interlocutory appeal, which is pending. The parties are moving forward with cross motions for summary judgment, and the briefs will be filed in August and September, with a hearing in October.

#### ***Shong-Ching Tong v. Fair Political Practices Commission***

On February 10, 2012, Shong-Ching Tong ("Tong") filed a Petition for Writ of Administrative Mandamus against the Fair Political Practices Commission ("Commission"), seeking relief from the Commission's Decision and Order in Case No. 10/449. On May 14,

2012, the Court dismissed the Petition for Writ of Administrative Mandamus, determining that Tong was a vexatious litigant.

***Tony Dane v. Fair Political Practices Commission***

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