



1 personally appear at any administrative hearing held in this matter, to be represented by an attorney at  
2 Respondents' own expense, to confront and cross-examine all witnesses testifying at the hearing, to  
3 subpoena witnesses to testify at the hearing, to have an impartial administrative law judge preside over  
4 the hearing as a hearing officer, and to have the matter judicially reviewed.

5 It is further stipulated and agreed that Respondents violated the Political Reform Act by failing  
6 to disclose information regarding contributions received and expenditures made of \$100 or more in  
7 campaign statements for reporting periods during calendar years 2010, 2012 and 2013, in violation of  
8 Government Code Section 84211, subdivisions (a), (b), (f), and (k) (2 counts); receiving two  
9 contributions of \$100 or more in cash, in violation of Government Code Section 84300, subdivision (a)  
10 (1 count); and failing to maintain the detailed accounts, records, bills, and receipts necessary to prepare  
11 campaign statements, to establish that campaign statements were properly filed, and to comply with the  
12 campaign reporting provisions of the Act, in calendar years 2010, 2011, 2012, and 2013, in violation of  
13 Government Code Section 84104 (1 count), as described in Exhibit 1. Exhibit 1 is attached hereto and  
14 incorporated by reference as though fully set forth herein. Exhibit 1 is a true and accurate summary of  
15 the facts in this matter.

16 Respondents agree to the issuance of the Decision and Order, which is attached hereto.  
17 Respondents also agree to the Commission imposing an administrative penalty in the total amount of  
18 Eight Thousand Five Hundred Dollars (\$8,500). A cashier's check from Respondents in said amount,  
19 made payable to the "General Fund of the State of California," is submitted with this Stipulation as full  
20 payment of the administrative penalty, and shall be held by the State of California until the Commission  
21 issues its Decision and Order regarding this matter. The parties agree that in the event the Commission  
22 refuses to accept this Stipulation, it shall become null and void, and within fifteen (15) business days  
23 after the Commission meeting at which the Stipulation is rejected, all payments tendered by  
24 Respondents in connection with this Stipulation shall be reimbursed to Respondents. Respondents  
25 further stipulate and agree that in the event the Commission rejects the Stipulation, and a full  
26 evidentiary hearing before the Commission becomes necessary, neither any member of the  
27 Commission, nor the Executive Director, shall be disqualified because of prior consideration of this  
28 Stipulation.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Gary S. Winuk, on Behalf of the Enforcement Division  
Fair Political Practices Commission

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Arthur "Art" C. Brown, Respondent, individually, and on behalf  
of Art Brown for Orange County 4<sup>th</sup> District Supervisor 2010,  
Respondent, and Art Brown for City Council 2012, Respondent

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Christie "Chris" L. Brown, Respondent

**DECISION AND ORDER**

The foregoing Stipulation of the parties "In the Matter of Arthur "Art" C. Brown, Art Brown for Orange County 4<sup>th</sup> District Supervisor 2010, Art Brown for City Council 2012, and Christie "Chris" L. Brown," FPPC Case No. 12/224, including all attached exhibits, 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.

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Joann Remke, Chair  
Fair Political Practices Commission

## **EXHIBIT 1**

### **INTRODUCTION**

Respondent Arthur “Art” C. Brown (Respondent Brown) was an unsuccessful candidate for the Orange County Board of Supervisors in the June 8, 2010 election, and was a successful incumbent candidate for Buena Park City Council, located in Buena Park, CA, in the November 6, 2012 election.

Respondent Art Brown for Orange County 4<sup>th</sup> District Supervisor 2010 (Respondent Supervisor Committee) was Respondent Brown’s controlled committee related to his campaign for Orange County 4<sup>th</sup> District Supervisor in the June 8, 2010, election, and was formed in March 2010.

Respondent Art Brown for City Council 2012 (Respondent City Council Committee) was Respondent Brown’s controlled committee related to his campaign for Buena Park City Council in the November 6, 2012 election, and was formed in March 2012.

At all relevant times, Respondent Brown’s wife, Respondent Christie “Chris” L. Brown (Respondent Treasurer), was the treasurer for Respondent Supervisor Committee and Respondent City Council Committee.

This matter initially arose out of an Audit Report by the Political Reform Audit Program of the Franchise Tax Board (FTB) for the period of January 1, 2010, through June 30, 2010. FTB could not perform an audit of Respondent Supervisor Committee’s campaign activity due to a lack of records provided. The Audit Report was submitted to the Enforcement Division on April 30, 2012, stating that the audit could not be performed since no records were provided.

After the referral from FTB, the Commission opened an investigation into all open committees controlled by Respondent Brown, which included Respondent Supervisor Committee and Respondent City Council Committee. During calendar year 2010, Respondent Supervisor Committee received total contributions of approximately \$18,488, and made total expenditures of approximately \$15,881. During calendar years 2012, 2013, and 2014, Respondent City Council Committee received total contributions of approximately \$29,952, and made total expenditures of approximately \$29,131.

Under the Political Reform Act (the “Act”),<sup>1</sup> Respondents had a duty to disclose particular information regarding contributions and expenditures. Respondents also had a duty to timely file required campaign statements. Additionally, Respondents were prohibited from accepting cash contributions of \$100 or more, and Respondents were required to maintain adequate campaign records.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Political Reform Act is contained in Government Code Sections 81000 through 91014. All statutory references are to the Government Code, unless otherwise indicated. 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 Title 2, Division 6 of the California Code of Regulations, unless otherwise indicated.

In this matter, Respondents violated the Act by 1) underreporting contributions received and expenditures made; 2) receiving cash contributions; and 3) failing to maintain sufficient campaign records.

For the purposes of this Stipulation, Respondents' violations are as follows:

**RESPONDENTS ARTHUR "ART" C. BROWN, ART BROWN FOR ORANGE COUNTY 4<sup>TH</sup> DISTRICT SUPERVISOR 2010, AND CHRISTIE "CHRIS" L. BROWN**

**COUNT 1:** Respondents Arthur "Art" C. Brown, Art Brown for Orange County 4<sup>th</sup> District Supervisor 2010 and Christie "Chris" L. Brown, failed to disclose information regarding contributions received and expenditures made of \$100 or more in campaign statements for reporting periods during calendar year 2010, in violation of Government Code Section 84211, subdivisions (a), (b), (f), and (k).

**RESPONDENTS ARTHUR "ART" C. BROWN, ART BROWN FOR CITY COUNCIL 2012, AND CHRISTIE "CHRIS" L. BROWN**

**COUNT 2:** Respondents Arthur "Art" C. Brown, Art Brown for City Council 2012 and Christie "Chris" L. Brown, failed to disclose information regarding contributions received and expenditures made of \$100 or more on campaign statements for reporting periods during calendar years 2012 and 2013, in violation of Government Code Section 84211, subdivisions (a), (b), (f), and (k).

**COUNT 3:** Respondents Arthur "Art" C. Brown, Art Brown for City Council 2012 and Christie "Chris" L. Brown, on August 24, 2012, received two contributions of \$100 or more in cash, in violation of Government Code Section 84300, subdivision (a).

**ALL RESPONDENTS**

**COUNT 4:** Respondents Arthur "Art" C. Brown, Art Brown for Orange County 4<sup>th</sup> District Supervisor 2010, Art Brown for City Council 2012 and Christie "Chris" L. Brown, failed to maintain the detailed accounts, records, bills, and receipts necessary to prepare campaign statements, to establish that campaign statements were properly filed, and to comply with the campaign reporting provisions of the Act, in calendar years 2010, 2011, 2012, and 2013, in violation of Government Code Section 84104.

///

## **SUMMARY OF THE LAW**

All statutory references and discussions of law pertain to the Act's provisions as they existed at the time of the violations in question.

An express purpose of the Act, as set forth in Section 81002, subdivision (a), is to ensure that the contributions and expenditures affecting election campaigns are fully and truthfully disclosed to the public, so that voters may be better informed, and improper practices may be inhibited. To that end, the Act sets forth a comprehensive campaign reporting system designed to accomplish this purpose.

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

When the Political Reform Act was enacted, the people of the state of California found and declared that previous laws regulating political practices suffered from inadequate enforcement by state and local authorities. (Section 81001, subd. (h).) To that end, Section 81003 requires that the Act be liberally construed to achieve its purposes. Another purpose of the Act is to provide adequate enforcement mechanisms so that the Act will be "vigorously enforced." (Section 81002, subd. (f).)

### **Definition of Candidate Controlled Committees**

Section 82013, subdivision (a) of the Act includes within the definition of "committee" any person or combination of persons who receives contributions of \$1,000 or more during a calendar year. This type of committee is commonly referred to as a "recipient committee."

Under Section 82016, a recipient committee which is controlled directly or indirectly by a candidate, or which acts jointly with a candidate in connection with the making of expenditures, is a "controlled committee." A candidate controls a committee if he or she, his or her agent, or any other committee he or she controls has a significant influence on the actions or decisions of the committee. (Section 82016, subd. (a).)

### **Duty to Disclose Contributions Received**

Section 82015 defines a contribution as a payment made for political purposes. Section 84211, subdivision (a), requires committees to disclose the total amount of contributions received during the period covered by the campaign statement. Additionally, Section 84211, subdivision (f), requires a committee to disclose on each of its campaign statements the following information about a person if the cumulative amount of contributions received from that person is \$100 or more during the reporting period covered by the campaign statement: (1) the contributor's full name; (2) the contributor's street address; (3) the contributor's occupation; (4) the name of the contributor's employer, or if self-employed, the name of the contributor's business; (5) the date and amount of each contribution received from the contributor during the reporting period; and (6) the cumulative amount of contributions received from the contributor. (Section 84211, subdivisions (a), (c), (d), and (f).) "Cumulative amount" means the amount of contributions received in the calendar year. (Section 82018, subd. (a).)

A “contribution” includes any payment made for political purposes for which full and adequate consideration is not made to the donor. (Section 82015; Regulation 18215.) A contribution can be monetary or non-monetary. All contributions received by a person acting as an agent of a committee are required to be reported to and disclosed by the committee’s treasurer no later than the closing date of the next campaign statement the committee is required to file. (Regulation 18421.1, subd. (c).) A monetary contribution is “received” on the date the committee, or the agent of the committee, obtains possession or control of the check or other negotiable instrument by which the contribution is made. (Regulation 18421.1, subd. (c).)

### **Duty to Disclose Expenditures Made**

Section 82025 defines “expenditure” as a payment, 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 can be either a monetary or nonmonetary payment made for political purposes. (Section 82025, subd. (a); Regulation 18225, subd. (a).)

Section 84211, subdivision (b), requires committees to disclose the total amount of expenditures made during the period covered by the campaign statement. Additionally, Section 84211, subdivisions (i) and (k), require a committee to disclose on each of its campaign statements the total amount of expenditures made during the reporting period to persons who have received \$100 or more as well as: (1) the recipient’s full name; (2) the recipient’s street address; (3) the amount of each expenditure; (4) the description of the consideration for which each expenditure was made. (Section 84211, subdivisions (i), and (k).) “Expenditure” includes any individual payment or accrued expense (i.e., an unpaid bill). (Sections 82025, 84211, subd. (k)(6).) Further, an expenditure is “made” on the date the payment is made or on the date consideration, if any, is received, whichever is earlier. (Section 82025.) “Cumulative amount” means the amount of expenditures made in the calendar year. (Section 82018, subd. (a).)

### **Prohibited Cash Contributions**

Section 84300, subdivision (a), prohibits a candidate from receiving a campaign contribution of \$100 or more in cash.

### **Duty to Maintain and Retain Campaign Records**

To ensure accurate campaign reporting, Section 84104 imposes a mandatory duty on each candidate, treasurer, and elected officer to maintain detailed accounts, records, bills and receipts that are necessary to prepare campaign statements, to establish that campaign statements were properly filed and to comply with the campaign reporting provisions of the Act. This requirement, as further stated by Regulation 18401, includes a duty to maintain detailed information and original source documentation for all contributions and expenditures. Regulation 18401, subdivision (b)(2), requires the filer of the committee campaign statements to retain the above described campaign records for four years following the date that the campaign statement to which they relate is filed.

///

## **Candidate and Treasurer Liability**

As provided in Section 84100, every committee shall have a treasurer. Under Section 84100 and Regulation 18427, subdivision (a), it is the duty of a committee's candidate and treasurer to ensure that the committee complies with all of the requirements of the Act concerning the receipt and expenditure of funds and the reporting of such funds. A committee's candidate and treasurer may be held jointly and severally liable, along with the committee, for any reporting violations committed by the committee. (Sections 83116.5 and 91006; Regulation 18316.6.)

### **SUMMARY OF THE FACTS**

Respondent Arthur "Art" C. Brown (Respondent Brown) was an unsuccessful candidate for the Orange County Board of Supervisors in the June 8, 2010 election, and is currently a member of the Buena Park City Council, located in Buena Park, CA. Respondent Brown was most recently elected to the Buena Park City Council in the November 6, 2012 election, he has been a Buena Park City Council Member, Mayor or Mayor Pro Tem since at least 1990, and he has been involved in various boards and committees since the 1980's.

Respondent Art Brown for Orange County 4th District Supervisor 2010 (Respondent Supervisor Committee) was Respondent Brown's controlled committee related to his campaign for Orange County 4th District Supervisor in the June 8, 2010, election.

Respondent Brown filed his candidate intention statement to run for Orange County 4<sup>th</sup> District Supervisor on March 4, 2010. During calendar year 2010, Respondent Supervisor Committee received total contributions of approximately \$18,488, and made total expenditures of approximately \$15,881.

Respondent Art Brown for City Council 2012 (Respondent City Council Committee) was Respondent Brown's controlled committee related to his campaign for Buena Park City Council in the November 6, 2012 election.

Respondent Brown filed his candidate intention statement to run for Buena Park City Council on January 4, 2012, for the November 6, 2012 election. During calendar years 2012, 2013, and 2014, Respondent City Council Committee received total contributions of approximately \$29,952, and made total expenditures of approximately \$29,131.

At all relevant times, Respondent Brown's wife, Respondent Christie "Chris" L. Brown (Respondent Treasurer), was the treasurer for Respondent Supervisor Committee and Respondent City Council Committee.

### **VIOLATIONS**

The evidence obtained during the audit and investigation of this matter shows that Respondents committed five violations of the Act, as follows:

**RESPONDENTS ARTHUR "ART" C. BROWN, ART BROWN FOR ORANGE COUNTY 4<sup>TH</sup> DISTRICT SUPERVISOR 2010, AND CHRISTIE "CHRIS" L. BROWN**

**Count 1**

(Failure to Disclose Contributions Received and Expenditures Made)

Respondents filed campaign statements for Respondent Supervisor Committee for reporting periods during calendar years 2010 – 2014. The evidence obtained by the Enforcement Division shows that in several of the campaign statements filed in calendar year 2010, Respondents failed to disclose contributions received as required by the Act, as follows:

<b>Reporting Period</b>	<b>Date Contribution Received per Bank Records</b>	<b>Contributions Not Disclosed in Campaign Statement</b>	<b>Total Contributions Received for Reporting Period</b>
01/01 – 03/17/2010	03/08/2010	\$616.95	\$8,566.95
03/18 – 05/22/2010	05/03/2010	\$500.00	\$2,050.00
	05/12/2010	\$600.00	
	05/17/2010	\$950.00	
05/23 – 06/30/2010	06/04/2010	\$100.00	\$8,121.00
		\$392.00	
		\$1,550.00	
		\$250.00	
		<b>\$4,958.95</b>	<b>\$18,737.95</b>

As shown in the chart above, Respondents failed to disclose contributions of \$100 or more totaling nearly \$5,000, which was 26% of the total contributions received in the identified reporting periods.

Additionally, Respondents failed to disclose expenditures made as required by the Act, as follows:

<b>Reporting Period</b>	<b>Date Expenditure Made per Bank Records</b>	<b>Expenditures Not Disclosed in Campaign Statement</b>	<b>Total Expenditures Made for Reporting Period</b>
03/18 – 05/22/2010	05/03/2010	\$500.00	\$1,845.78
	05/03/2010	\$463.07	
	05/20/2010	\$578.36	
01/01 – 06/30/2011	04/19/2011	\$688.10	\$784.10
		<b>\$2,229.53</b>	<b>\$2,629.88</b>

As shown in the chart above, Respondents failed to disclose expenditures of \$100 or more totaling over \$2,000, which was 85% of the total expenditures made in the identified reporting periods.

///

By failing to disclose all contributions received and expenditures made of \$100 or more for the above named reporting periods, Respondents violated Government Code Section 84211, subdivisions (a), (b), (f), and (k).

**RESPONDENTS ARTHUR “ART” C. BROWN, ART BROWN FOR CITY COUNCIL 2012, AND CHRISTIE “CHRIS” L. BROWN**

**Count 2**

(Failure to Disclose Contributions Received and Expenditures Made)

Respondents filed campaign statements for Respondent City Council Committee for reporting periods during calendar years 2012, 2013, and 2014. The evidence obtained by the Enforcement Division shows that in several of these campaign statements, Respondents failed to disclose contributions received as required by the Act, as follows:

<b>Reporting Period</b>	<b>Contribution Received by Date (per Bank Records)</b>	<b>Contributions Not Disclosed in Campaign Statement</b>	<b>Total Contributions Received for Reporting Period</b>
07/01 – 09/30/2012	08/08/2012	\$500.00	\$17,660.00
	08/24/2014	\$200.00	
10/01 – 10/20/2012	10/10/2012	\$500.00	\$6,025.80
	10/10/2012	\$200.00	
10/21 – 12/31/2012	11/13/2012	\$250.03	\$3,466.03
	12/14/2012	\$166.00	
		<b>\$1,816.03</b>	<b>\$27,151.83</b>

As shown in the chart above, Respondents failed to disclose contributions of \$100 or more totaling nearly \$2,000, which was 7% of the total contributions received in the identified reporting periods.

Additionally, Respondents failed to disclose expenditures made, as follows:

<b>Reporting Period</b>	<b>Date Expenditure Made per Bank Records</b>	<b>Expenditures Not Disclosed in Campaign Statement</b>	<b>Total Expenditures Made for Reporting Period</b>
07/01 – 09/30/2012	08/27/2012	\$100.00	\$6,995.82
	09/05/2012	\$1,171.00	
10/01 – 10/20/2012	10/15/2012	\$896.00	\$10,815.62
10/21 – 12/31/2012	10/25/2012	\$4,004.57	\$8,875.08
	11/26/2012	\$107.15	
01/01 – 06/30/2013	01/04/2013	\$670.73	\$670.73
		<b>\$6,949.45</b>	<b>\$27,357.25</b>

As shown in the chart above, Respondents failed to disclose expenditures of \$100 or more totaling nearly \$7,000, which was 25% of the total expenditures made in the identified reporting periods.

By failing to disclose all contributions received and expenditures made of \$100 or more for the above named reporting periods, Respondents violated Government Code Section 84211, subdivisions (a), (b), (f), and (k).

**Count 3**

(Receipt of Prohibited Cash Contributions)

The Act prohibits a candidate from receiving a campaign contribution of \$100 or more in cash. On or about August 24, 2012, Respondents received two contributions of \$100 or more in cash. Thus, Respondents violated Government Code Section 84300, subdivision (a). It should be noted that records were not maintained to support the source of the cash contributions (Count 4), and contributor information was not disclosed (Count 2).

**ALL RESPONDENTS**

**Count 4**

(Failure to Maintain Campaign Records)

Respondents had a duty to maintain detailed accounts, records, bills and receipts that are necessary to prepare campaign statements, to establish that campaign statements were properly filed, and to comply with the campaign reporting provisions of the Act. During the FTB audit, FTB staff requested all campaign records for the audit period. Respondents failed to provide any records to FTB staff, however, Respondent Brown contends that he does not recall FTB contacting him in this regard. Upon referral to the Commission, Enforcement Division staff requested all of Respondents' campaign records. Respondents ultimately provided some records, and some records were obtained via subpoena. However, some detailed records were missing, such as invoices/receipts and records for funds transferred to and from the Respondent Brown's personal bank accounts totaling \$688 and \$1,200, respectively, and detailed invoices/receipts to confirm subvendor information. Additionally, no campaign records supported the source of the two cash contributions noted in Count 3 above. The lack of records precluded a determination of whether additional reports were required to be filed, whether limits were exceeded, or whether other violations were committed. By failing to maintain campaign records, Respondents violated Government Code Section 84104.

**CONCLUSION**

This matter consists of four counts of violating the Act, which carry a maximum administrative penalty of Five Thousand Dollars (\$5,000) per count for a total of Twenty Thousand Dollars (\$20,000).

In determining the appropriate penalty for a particular violation of the Act, the Enforcement Division considers the typical treatment of a violation in the overall statutory scheme of the Act, with an emphasis on serving the purposes and intent of the Act. Additionally, the Enforcement Division considers the facts and circumstances of the violation in context of the factors set forth in Regulation 18361.5, subdivision (d)(1)-(6):

1. The seriousness of the violations;
2. The presence or lack of intent to deceive the voting public;
3. Whether the violation was deliberate, negligent, or inadvertent;
4. Whether the Respondent demonstrated good faith in consulting with Commission staff;
5. Whether there was a pattern of violations; and
6. Whether, upon learning of the violation, the violator voluntarily provided amendments to provide full disclosure.

The public harm inherent in campaign reporting violations (Counts 1 – 2) is that the public is deprived of important information regarding the sources and amounts of contributions and expenditures made in support of a candidate. Contributions made in cash (Count 3) are difficult to track, which makes it difficult to ensure compliance with campaign reporting requirements and contribution limits. Additionally, failure to maintain campaign records (Count 4) is a serious violation because it impedes the Commission's ability to inhibit improper practices and ensure full disclosure of receipts and expenditures, making it difficult (and in some instances, impossible) to ascertain the accuracy of the campaign statements.

In this matter, Respondents failed to disclose contributions received and expenditures made, which repeatedly deprived the public of accurate information regarding the Respondents' campaign finances. Additionally, Respondents failed to maintain required records, making it difficult to impossible to determine whether Respondents further violated the Act's requirements. The public harm is particularly high regarding Respondent City Council Committee because two of the transactions made were of a nature that cannot be traced with bank records alone. Specifically, Respondents Brown, City Council Committee and Treasurer received and failed to disclose two cash contributions during the applicable first pre-election reporting period, and no other campaign records were maintained supporting these contributions.

Respondents did not cooperate at all with the FTB audit, however, Respondent Brown contends that he does not recall FTB contacting him in this regard. Additionally, Respondents' cooperation with Enforcement Division staff during the investigation was sporadic. Lastly, Respondent Brown has many years of experience as a candidate and elected official, and thus, he should have been very aware of Respondents' obligations under the Act.

Several of the Respondents have prior enforcement history. The Commission issued a Warning Letter against Respondents Brown, Supervisor Committee and Treasurer on August 25, 2010 (FPPC Case No. 10/207) for failure to timely file a pre-election campaign statement for the period of March 18 through May 22, 2010 by the May 27, 2010 due date. The Commission also issued a Warning Letter against Respondents Brown and Treasurer and another of Respondent Brown's controlled committees (Art Brown for Clerk Recorder 2010) on September 15, 2010 (FPPC Case No. 10/792) for failure to file the semi-annual campaign statement for the period January 1 through June 30, 2010 by the August 2, 2010 due date.

These violations and circumstances, taken as whole, show a pattern of conduct which resulted in a lack of disclosure and deprived the public of information regarding Respondents' campaign activity.

The investigation in this matter revealed no mitigating circumstances.

Recent penalties approved by the Commission concerning similar violations of the Act include:

Failure to Disclose Contributions Received and Expenditures Made:

- *In the Matter of Dan Hamburg, Dan Hamburg for Supervisor 2010, and Geoffrey Baugher*, FPPC Nos. 10/751 and 10/981. Respondents, a candidate for the Mendocino County Board of Supervisors, his candidate controlled committee, and the committee's treasurer, failed to disclose information regarding contributions received and expenditures made of \$100 or more on campaign statements for reporting periods in 2009 and 2010 in violation of Government Code Section 84211, subdivisions (a), (b), (f), and (k) (1 count). In April 2013, the Commission imposed a penalty of \$2,500 for this violation.

Receipt of Prohibited Cash Contributions:

- *In the Matter of Lela Henke-Dobroth and Friends to Elect Lela Henke-Dobroth for Judge 2010*, FPPC No. 12/418. Respondent, a candidate for Superior Court Judge in the County of Ventura, and her candidate controlled committee, received two campaign contributions of \$100 or more in cash in violation of Government Code section 84300, subdivision (a) (1 count). In April 2013, the Commission imposed a penalty of \$1,500 for this violation.

Failure to Maintain Campaign Records

- *In the Matter of Andrew Ammon and Committee to Elect Andrew Ammon to the San Gabriel School Board 2011*; FPPC No. 13/549. Respondent, a candidate for the San Gabriel School Board, and his candidate controlled committee, failed to maintain required campaign records, in violation of Government Code Section 84104 (1 count). Respondents had a prior enforcement history. In July 2014, the Commission imposed a penalty of \$2,000 for this violation.

///

**PROPOSED PENALTY**

The facts of this case, including the aggravating and mitigating factors above, justify imposition of the agreed upon penalty, as follows:

**RESPONDENTS ARTHUR “ART” C. BROWN, ART BROWN FOR ORANGE COUNTY 4<sup>TH</sup> DISTRICT SUPERVISOR 2010, AND CHRISTIE “CHRIS” L. BROWN**

<b>Count</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Penalty</b>
1	Failure to Disclose Contributions Received and Expenditures Made	\$2,500
<b>TOTAL: COUNT 1</b>		<b>\$2,500</b>

**RESPONDENTS ARTHUR “ART” C. BROWN, ART BROWN FOR CITY COUNCIL 2012, AND CHRISTIE “CHRIS” L. BROWN**

<b>Count</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Penalty</b>
2	Failure to Disclose Contributions Received and Expenditures Made	\$2,500
3	Receipt of Prohibited Cash Contributions	\$1,500
<b>TOTAL: COUNTS 2 – 3</b>		<b>\$4,000</b>

**ALL RESPONDENTS**

<b>Count</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Penalty</b>
4	Failure to Maintain Campaign Records	\$2,000
<b>TOTAL: COUNT 4</b>		<b>\$2,000</b>

<b>Total Agreed Upon Penalty All Counts</b>		<b>\$8,500</b>
---	--	----------------

A higher penalty is not being sought because Respondents cooperated with the Enforcement Division of the Fair Political Practices Commission by agreeing to an early settlement of this matter well in advance of the Probable Cause Conference that otherwise would have been held.

\* \* \* \* \*