

**Peter J. Gleason, CD #1 (2009)**

**1. Filing a disclosure statement late**

**\$750**

Campaigns are required to file disclosure statements on scheduled dates as soon as they first raise or spend funds. *See* Admin. Code §§ 3-703(6), 3-708(8) and Board Rules 1-09(a), 3-02(a)(1), (2).

The Campaign accepted its first contribution on October 9, 2008, and made its first expenditure on November 5, 2008. Therefore, the Campaign was required to file Disclosure Statement No. 6 on January 15, 2009 (covering the reporting period July 12, 2008, through January 11, 2009). The Campaign filed the statement on February 27, 2009, 43 days late.

The Board assessed a penalty of \$750 for this violation.

**2. Accepting three corporate contributions**

**\$300**

Campaigns are prohibited from accepting contributions from corporations. *See* Admin. Code § 3-703(1)(l) and Board Rule 1-04(e). If a candidate accepts a prohibited contribution, the candidate must promptly refund the contribution. *See* Board Rule 1-04(c)(1).

The Campaign accepted three corporate contributions:

(i) Law Offices of Steven E. Rosenfeld, PC

The Campaign reported a \$200 contribution from Steven E. Rosenfeld, but the documentation indicated that the contribution was from the Law Offices of Steven E. Rosenfeld, PC, a professional corporation. CFB staff informed the Campaign that it must refund the prohibited contribution by August 28, 2009. The Campaign refunded the contribution on September 8, 2009.

The Board assessed a penalty of \$125 for this violation.

(ii) Carmine Restaurant, Inc.

The Campaign reported a \$250 contribution from Sal Esposito, but the contribution check indicated that the contribution was from Carmine Restaurant, a corporation. The contribution was refunded promptly following notification by the CFB.

The Board assessed a penalty of \$125 for this violation.

(iii) West Walk Productions, Ltd.

The Campaign reported a \$50 contribution from Susan Needles, but the contribution check indicated that the contribution was from West Walk Productions Ltd., a corporation. The contribution was refunded promptly following notification by the CFB.

The Board assessed a penalty of \$50 for this violation.

**3. Failing to demonstrate that spending was in furtherance of the campaign \$100**

Campaigns may only spend campaign funds for items that further the candidate's election. Expenditures for purposes other than the candidate's election are considered "non-campaign related." The Act enumerates types of expenditures that are presumed to be campaign related and non-campaign related. *See* Admin. Code § 3-702(21). Among the factors the CFB considers relevant to determining the campaign-relatedness of expenditures are: the quality of the documentation submitted; the timing and necessity of the expenditure; the amount of the expenditure and/or all expenditures of a specific type in relation to the Campaign's total expenditures; and whether the expenditure is duplicative of other spending. *See* Admin. Code §§ 3-702(21), 3-703(1)(d), (g), 3-710(2)(c), Board Rules 1-03(a), 4-01, 5-03(e), and Advisory Opinion No. 2007-3 (March 7, 2007).

The Campaign reported an expenditure of \$259 for an Amtrak ticket to Washington, D.C. The Campaign stated that the expenditure was made for the purpose of fundraising. However, the Campaign did not report receiving any contributions from anyone in the Washington, D.C. metropolitan area. Therefore, the Campaign did not document the campaign-related purpose of this expenditure.

The Board assessed a penalty of \$100 for this violation.