Kenneth C. Hardy
COLANTUONO & LEVIN, PC
555 West 5 <sup>th</sup> Street, 31st Floor
Los Angeles, California 90013
Telephone: (213) 533-4206
Facsimile: (213) 533-4191
khardy@cllaw.us

OFFICE OF CLERK BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Investigator/Petitioner

28

# BEFORE THE CAMPAIGN FINANCE ETHICS COMMISSION **COUNTY OF VENTURA**

In the Matter of:

FRIENDS OF STEVE BENNETT,

Respondent.

CASE NO. 2007-02

NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO DISMISS COMPLAINT; MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES; PROPOSED DECISION AND ORDER

#### TO ALL PARTIES AND TO THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD HEREIN:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Ventura County Campaign Finance Ethics Commission (the "Commission"), which meeting shall take place at the County Government Center, Hall of Administration, Board of Supervisors Hearing Room, 800 South Victoria Avenue, California 93009, Petitioner will move the Commission to dismiss Complaint No. 2007-02 in its entirety. Petitioner files this motion pursuant to Section 13.03 of the Ventura County Campaign Finance Ethics Commission Operating Policies (the "Operating Policies"), revised and adopted July 11, 2007.

The motion to dismiss is based on the memorandum of points and authorities filed concurrently herewith and any oral argument and additional material presented to the Commission at the hearing on the matter.

DATED: August 22, 2007

COLANTUONO & LEVIN, PC

KENNETH C. HARDY

Investigator & Petitioner

#### **MEMORANDUM OF**

#### POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

I.

#### **FACTS**

Respondent Steve Bennett<sup>1</sup> is a member of the Ventura County Board of Supervisors. On June 4, 2007, Respondent filed with Ventura County a Form 501 "Candidate Intention Statement," indicating his intent to seek reelection to the Board. A direct primary election is scheduled for June 3, 2008. On August 2, 2007, Carroll Dean Williams filed a complaint with the Ventura County Campaign Finance Commission containing a number of charges, discussed below.

II.

#### **ANALYSIS**

Charge No. 1. Respondent currently holds office as a Ventura County Supervisor but is not currently a "County candidate" as that term is defined by Section 1264(a) of the Ventura County Campaign Finance Reform Ordinance (the "Ordinance"), because nominations do not begin until February 11, 2008.

Analysis. Neither Section 1264(a) nor any other section of the Ordinance requires a person to be nominated before being considered a candidate. Section 1264(a) simply provides that a "'County candidate' means any individual who is a candidate for Supervisor, Sheriff," etc. Section 1264(a) also provides that Government Code section 82007 also applies to such individuals. Section 82007 defines a candidate as, among other things, an individual "who receives a contribution or makes an expenditure or gives his or her consent for any other person to receive a contribution or make an expenditure with a view to bringing about his or her nomination or election to any elective office, whether or not the specific elective office for which he or she will seek nomination or election is known at the time the contribution is received or the expenditure is made and whether or not he or she has announced his or her candidacy or filed a declaration of candidacy at such time." Thus, Respondent does not need to be nominated to be considered a candidate for purposes of the Ordinance.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Respondent means Steve Bennett and/or the Friends of Şteve Bennett (a controlled committee of Mr. Bennett).

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

26

27

28

Charge No. 2. Respondent has violated Section 1268 of the Ordinance, which pertains to making and receiving contributions, because Respondent is not a county candidate.

Analysis. Respondent is a county candidate. See analysis to Charge No. 1. Respondent has therefore not violated Section 1268.

Charge No. 3: Respondent has violated Section 1281 of the Ordinance, which pertains to a county candidate's return of contributions, because Respondent is not a county candidate.

Analysis. Respondent is a county candidate. See analysis to Charge No. 1. Respondent has therefore not violated Section 1281.

Charge No. 4: Respondent has violated Section 1279 of the Ordinance, which pertains to a when a county candidate may collect contributions, because Respondent is not a county candidate.

Analysis. Respondent is a county candidate. See analysis to Charge No. 1. Section 1279 does not require a candidate to be on a ballot to be able to lawfully receive contributions, but rather, subjects those candidates who are eventually on the ballot to the one year rule. In other words, Section 1279 tells serious candidates that intend to be placed on the ballot that they cannot raise funds more than one year ahead of the election date. Complainant's interpretation of Section 1279 is thus not supported by the text. It is also illogical in that it would, given the late date of nominations, negate the very one-year fundraising period established by Section 1279. Respondent has therefore not violated Section 1279.

Charge No. 5: "Stephen Bennett is named County Supervisor County of Ventura NOT Steve Bennett."

Analysis. Complainant does not identify what section of the Ordinance this violates.

III.

### ADDITIONAL ISSUE

The complaint states: "William Peck \$600 to Friends of Steve Bennett." The complaint also includes a copy of a Form 460 for the period January 1, 2007, through June 30, 2007, that indicates that a person by the name of William Peck contributed \$600 to Respondent. The complaint also lists a number of section and article titles of the Ventura County Campaign Finance Ethics Commission Operating Policies (the "Operating Policies"), revised and adopted July 11, 2007, including Article

1	XIV, which discusses disqualification standards and procedures for members of the Ventura County											
2	Campaign Finance Ethics Commission (the "Commission"). Complainant does not describe what he											
3	intends to do with this information. If complainant wishes to make a request or seek action under											
4	Article XIV, he may of course do so. Petitioner does not seek any action under Article XIV.											
5	IV.											
6	CONCLUSION											
7	Based on the foregoing, we respectfully request that the Campaign Finance Ethics											
8	Commission dismiss Case No. 2007-02 in its entirety.											
9	DATED: August 22, 2007 COLANTUONO & LEVIN, PC											
10	$A_{k}$											
11	KENNETH C. HARDY											
12	Investigator & Petitioner											
13												
14												
15	*											
16												
17												
18												
19	*											
20												
21	= 8											
22												
23												
24												
25												
26												
27												

# Colantuono & Levin, PC 555 West 5th Street, 31st Floor Los Angeles, CA 90013

## DECISION AND ORDER

ordered tha	all comp				the i	Motion for					
		laints and	l charges	s in Case	No.	2007-02 aı	e dismis	sed.			
DATE:							******				
							Honorable William L. Peck Chair, Campaign Finance Ethics Commission				
										6	
-											
			0								
					1		12				

## PROOF OF SERVICE In the Matter of: Friends of Steve Bennett Case No. 2007-02

2

1

3

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

Colantuono & Levin, PC 555 West 5th Street, 31st Floor Los Angeles, CA 90013

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

I am employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action. My business address is 555 West 5th Street, 30th Floor, Los Angeles, California 90013. On August 22, 2007, I served the document(s) described as NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO DISMISS COMPLAINT; MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES; PROPOSED DECISION AND ORDER on the interested parties in this action as follows:

■ By placing □ the original ■ a true copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope addressed as follows:

Carroll Dean Williams 2851 Apache Avenue Ventura, CA 93001

I, Paul A. McConnell, declare:

- BY MAIL: The envelope was mailed with postage thereon fully prepaid. I am "readily × familiar" with the firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. Under that practice it would be deposited with the U.S. postal service on that same day with postage thereon fully prepaid at Los Angeles, California in the ordinary course of business. I am aware that on motion of the party served, service is presumed invalid if the postal cancellation date or postage meter date is more than one day after service of deposit for mailing in affidavit.
- OVERNIGHT DELIVERY: I deposited such envelope in a facility regularly maintained by ☐ FEDERAL EXPRESS ☐ UPS ☐ Overnight Delivery [specify name of service: with delivery fees fully provided for or delivered the envelope to a courier or driver of \square FEDERAL EXPRESS 

  UPS 

  OVERNIGHT DELIVERY [specify name of service: ] authorized to receive documents at 555 West 5<sup>th</sup> Street, 30<sup>th</sup> Floor, Los Angeles, California 90013 with delivery fees fully provided for.
- BY FACSIMILE: The foregoing document was transmitted to the above-named persons by facsimile transmission from (213) 533-4191 before 5:00 p.m. on said date and the transmission was reported as complete and without error.
- I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the × [State] above is true and correct.
- I declare that I am employed in the offices of a member of the State Bar of this [Federal] Court at whose direction the service was made. I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the above is true and correct.

Executed on August 22, 2007, at Los Angeles, California.

Paul A. McConnell