## **United States District Court District of Columbia**

Republican National Committee, 310 First Street, SE Washington, D.C. 20003,  California Republican Party, 1201 K. Street #740 Sacramento, CA 95814,  Robert M. (Mike) Duncan, Chairman, Republican National Committee	Case No.			
310 First Street, SE Washington, D.C. 20003,  Republican Party of San Diego County, 5703 Oberlin Dr., Suite 107 San Diego, CA 92121	THREE-JUDGE COURT			
Plaintiffs,				
v.  Federal Election Commission, 999 E Street, NW Washington, DC 20463,  Defendant.				

### **Complaint for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief**

Republican National Committee ("RNC"), Robert M. (Mike) Duncan, California Republican Party, and Republican Party of San Diego County complain as follows:

#### Introduction

1. This is an as-applied challenge to the constitutionality of portions of § 101 of the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 2002 ("BCRA"), Pub. L. No. 107-155, 116 Stat. 81, 82-86, which added a new § 323 (entitled "Soft Money of Political Parties") to the Federal

Election Campaign Act ("FECA"). The challenged provisions are codified at 2 U.S.C. § 441i.

- 2. Plaintiffs challenge 2 U.S.C. § 441i's prohibition on soliciting, receiving and spending funds not subject to the source and amount limitations of FECA, as applied to their intended activities. This prohibition will herein be called the "Federal Funds Restriction" for ease of identification. Plaintiffs do not challenge 2 U.S.C. § 441i's prohibition on soliciting, recieving and spending funds not subject to the reporting requirments of FECA.
- 3. The Federal Funds Restriction bans state, local and district committees of a political party and their officials from using funds subject only to state source and amount limitations ("state funds") to engage in "federal election activity." 2 U.S.C. § 441i(b)(1). State political parties may only use funds subject to FECA's source and amount restrictions ("federal funds") for this activity. *Id.* "Federal election activity" is defined to include (1) voter registration activity in the 120 days leading up to a federal election, (2) "voter identification, get-out-the-vote activity or generic campaign activity" in connection with elections for federal office, and (3) public communications that identify and "promote," "attack," "support," or "oppose" ("PASO") a federal candidate. 2 U.S.C. § 431(20). "Generic campaign activity" is further defined as "campaign activity that promotes a political party and does not promote a candidate or non-federal candidate." 2 U.S.C. § 431(21). The "PASO" terms are undefined.
- 4. The Federal Funds Restriction bans *national* committees of a political party and their officials from soliciting or using "state funds" or any type of "non-federal funds," i.e. funds not subject to federal source and amount limitations, regardless of the purpose to which the funds will be put. National parties are restricted to soliciting and using only federal funds.

2 U.S.C. § 441i(a).

- 5. The Supreme Court requires that federal campaign finance laws be "unambiguously related to the campaign of a particular federal candidate." Buckley v. Valeo, 424 U.S. 1, 80 (1976). This threshold requirement assures that the law's "relation . . . to the purposes of [FECA]" (i.e., to regulate elections), is not "too remote," making the provision "impermissibly broad." *Id.* The sole authority that permits restriction of First Amendment activity in this area is Congress' authority to regulate federal elections. Id. at 13-14 & n.16 (citing, inter alia, U.S. Const. art. I, § 4). So all federal campaign laws must limit only those First Amendment activities that are "unambiguously [federal] campaign related," id. at 81, to assure that the laws are not too remotely related to their authority.
- 6. This threshold unambiguously-campaign-related requirement was recognized in McConnell v. FEC, in its analysis upholding the Federal Funds Restriction facially, where it required that the activity restricted by the Restriction must "benefit directly federal candidates." 540 U.S. 93, 170 (2003) (emphasis added). It was reaffirmed in FEC v. Wisconsin Right to Life, 127 S. Ct. 2652, 2667 (2007) ("WRTL II") ("an ad is the functional equivalent of express advocacy only if the ad is susceptible of no reasonable interpretation other than as an appeal to vote for or against a specific candidate"), 2672-73 (corporate-form corruption interest does not "extend[] beyond campaign speech" to issue advocacy). WRTL II also said that all doubts or ties in applying its no-other-reasonable-interpretation test must be resolved in favor of the speaker. *Id.* at 2666, 2669 n.7, 2674.
- 7. The unambiguously-campaign-related requirement has recently been recognized and applied by the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals and three district courts. See North

Carolina Right to Life v. Leake, 525 F.3d 274, 282 (4th Cir. 2008) ("Pursuant to their power to regulate elections, legislatures may establish campaign finance laws, so long as those laws are addressed to communications that are unambiguously campaign related"); Nat'l Right to Work Legal Def. and Educ. Found., Inc. v. Herbert, No. 2:07-cv-809, 2008 WL 4181336, \*10 (D. Utah Sept. 8, 2008) ("[T]he government possesses a substantial interest in the regulation of political speech only when that political speech is unambiguously campaign related"); Center for Individual Freedom v. Ireland, Nos. 08-190 & 08-1133, 2008 WL 4642268 (S.D. W. Va. Oct. 17, 2008) (same); Broward Coalition of Condos., Homeowners Ass'ns and Cmty. Orgs. v. Browning, No. 08-445, slip op. (N.D. Fla. Oct. 29, 2008) (same).

8. Plaintiffs plan to use state funds and non-federal funds to engage in First Amendment activities that are not "unambiguously related to the campaign of a particular federal candidate," *Buckley*, 424 U.S. at 80, but they are prohibited by the Federal Funds Restriction. Plaintiffs will not proceed as planned without the relief herein requested. The Federal Funds Restriction is unconstitutional as applied to these activities.

#### Jurisdiction and Venue

- 9. This Court has jurisdiction over this case pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 2201, as well as BCRA § 403, 116 Stat. at 113-14, because Plaintiffs "elect[] such provisions to apply to this action." BCRA § 403(d)(2), 116 Stat. at 114.
- 10. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e) and BCRA § 403, 116 Stat. at 113-14.

#### **Parties**

11. Plaintiff Republican National Committee "ha[s] the general management of the

Republican Party, subject to direction from the national convention." Rule 1, Rules of the Republican Party (2004). It is "[a] national committee of a political party" under 2 U.S.C. § 441i(a).

- 12. Plaintiff California Republican Party is the state Republican Party of California. It is "a State . . . committee of a political party" under 2 U.S.C. § 441i(b)(1).
- 13. Plaintiff Republican Party of San Diego County is a "local committee of a political party" under 2 U.S.C. § 441i(b)(1).
- 14. Plaintiff Robert M. (Mike) Duncan is the National Committeeman of the Kentucky Republican Party and the RNC Chairman, in which capacity he is RNC's chief executive officer.
- 15. Defendant Federal Election Commission ("FEC") is the government agency with enforcement authority over FECA.

#### **Facts**

16. RNC intends to (a) create a **New Jersey Account** for state funds subject to New Jersey state law, (b) solicit funds into the account under New Jersey state law, and (c) use those state funds to support state Republican candidates in the November 10, 2009 election. There are no federal candidates on the 2009 ballot in New Jersey. RNC intends to support the Republican gubernatorial candidate as well as Republican candidates for the State Assembly and Senate. This support would include, among other activities, communications expressly advocating the election and defeat of state candidates, contributions to the campaigns of state candidates, and contributions to the political parties involved. RNC is ready and able to do this activity, and it would do this activity but for the fact that the Federal Funds Restriction

makes it a crime. This activity, however, is not "unambiguously related to the campaign of a particular federal candidate." Buckley, 424 U.S. at 80. Unless RNC is able to obtain the timely judicial relief requested herein, it will not do this activity. RNC intends to solicit and use state funds in materially similar situations in the future, if permitted.

17. RNC intends to (a) create a Virginia Account, for state funds subject to Virginia state law, (b) solicit funds into the account under Virginia state law, and (c) use those state funds to support Republican candidates for the November 10, 2009 election. There are no federal candidates on the 2009 ballot in Virginia. RNC intends to support the Republican gubernatorial candidate as well as Republican candidates for the State Assembly. This support would include, among other activities, communications expressly advocating the election and defeat of state candidates, contributions to the campaigns of state candidates, and and contributions to the political parties involved. RNC is ready and able to do this activity, and it would do this activity but for the fact that the Federal Funds Restriction makes it a crime. This activity, however, is not "unambiguously related to the campaign of a particular federal candidate." Buckley, 424 U.S. at 80. Unless RNC is able to obtain the timely judicial relief requested herein, it will not do this activity. RNC intends to solicit and use state funds in materially similar situations in the future, if permitted.

18. RNC intends to (a) create a **Redistricting Account**, for non-federal funds and state funds subject to state law, (b) solicit funds into the account under applicable state laws, and (c) use those state funds to support the redistricting efforts of various states Republican parties following the 2010 census. RNC intends to provide logistical support to the parties and state legislators involved in redistricting, e.g., computer redistricting software, litigation

support, as well as direct support or opposition to related state initiatives and litigation support, if necessary. This activity is not "unambiguously related to the campaign of a particular federal candidate." *Buckley*, 424 U.S. at 80. RNC is ready and able to do this activity, and it would do this activity but for the fact that the Federal Funds Restriction makes it a crime. Unless RNC is able to obtain the timely judicial relief requested herein, it will not do this activity. RNC intends to solicit and use non-federal funds and state funds in materially similar situations in the future, if permitted.

19. RNC intends to (a) create a **Grassroots Lobbying Account**, for non-federal funds, (b) solicit non-federal funds into the account and (c) use those funds to support grassroots lobbying efforts for federal legislation and issues important to the Republican Party's platform. This activity is not "unambiguously related to the campaign of a particular federal candidate." *Buckley*, 424 U.S. at 80. RNC is ready and able to do this activity, and it would do this activity but for the fact that the Federal Funds Restriction makes it a crime. Unless RNC is able to obtain the timely judicial relief requested herein, it will not do this activity. RNC intends to solicit and use non-federal funds in materially similar situations in the future, if permitted.

20. RNC intends to (a) create several **State Elections Accounts,** for state funds, (b) solicit state funds into the account and (c) use those funds exclusively to support state candidates in various states. The funds would be solicited and spent in accordance with the any applicable state law. Support for state candidates from the Fund would include, among other activities, communications expressly advocating the election and defeat of state candidates, contributions to the campaigns of state candidates, and contributions to the state

and local political parties involved. RNC intends to support state candidates from this Fund in elections where only state candidates appear on the ballot and in elections where both federal and state candidates appear on the ballot. This activity is not "unambiguously related to the campaign of a particular federal candidate." *Buckley*, 424 U.S. at 80. RNC is ready and able to do this activity, and it would do this activity but for the fact that the Federal Funds Restriction makes it a crime. Unless RNC is able to obtain the timely judicial relief requested herein, it will not do this activity. RNC intends to solicit and use non-federal funds in materially similar situations in the future, if permitted.

- 21. RNC intends to solicit non-federal funds to pay for the present litigation, which activity is not "unambiguously related to the campaign of a particular federal candidate." *Buckley*, 424 U.S. at 80. RNC wants to solicit non-federal funds into a **Litigation Account** to be used solely for paying the fees and expenses attributable to this case. RNC is ready and able to do this activity, and it would do this activity but for the fact that the Federal Funds Restriction makes it a crime. Unless RNC is able to obtain the timely judicial relief requested herein, it will not do this activity. RNC intends to solicit and use non-federal funds in materially similar situations in the future, if permitted.
- 22. RNC Chairman Duncan intends to (1) solicit people to contribute state funds and non-federal funds to RNC's New Jersey Account, Virginia Account, Redistricting Account, Grassroots Lobbying Account, State Elections Accounts and Litigation Account, (2) solicit people to contribute state funds to the California Republican Party, and (3) solicit people to contribute state funds to the campaigns of Republican candidates for state office appearing on the November 2009 ballot in New Jersey and Virginia. Chairman Duncan intends to make the

described solicitations in his official capacity as RNC Chairman on behalf of RNC, i.e., as an "officer or agent acting on behalf of such a national committee." 2 U.S.C. § 441i(a)(2). Mr. Duncan's solicitation of funds for the RNC accounts described above, state parties, and state candidates' campaigns is not "unambiguously related to the campaign of a particular federal candidate." Buckley, 424 U.S. at 80 (emphasis added). He is ready and able to do this activity, and he would do this activity but for the fact that the Federal Funds Restriction makes it a crime. Unless he is able to obtain the timely judicial relief requested herein, he will not do this activity. Chairman Duncan intends to solicit state funds and non-federal funds in materially similar situations in the future, if permitted.

- 23. California Republican Party and Republican Party of San Diego County (collectively "CRP") intend to use state funds for public communications, 2 U.S.C. § 431(22) ("public communication" definition), to support or oppose the passage of California ballot initiatives appearing on the June 8, 2010 ballot, which involve the issues of property taxes, budget reform, and campaign finance.
- 24. In past ballot initiative campaigns in California candidates for federal office have publically supported or opposed ballot initiatives. CRP expects this to happen again and intends to mention such federal candidates in its public communications. Although "attack" and "oppose" are undefined in the definition of "federal election activity," 2 U.S.C. § 431(20)(A)(iii), CRP believes that its public communications will "attack" or "oppose" federal candidates, as these terms are used in the definition of "federal election activity," and so its communications must be funded with federal funds. 2 U.S.C. § 441i(b)(1). However, CRP's public communications supporting or opposing state ballot initiatives are not

"unambiguously related to the campaign of a particular federal candidate." *Buckley*, 424 U.S. at 80. CRP is ready and able to do this activity, and it would do so but for the fact that the Federal Funds Restriction makes it a crime. CRP intends to use state funds in materially similar situations in the future, if permitted.

- 25. CRP also intends to use state funds for voter registration, voter identification, and get-out-the-vote activities, as well as "generic campaign activity," 2 U.S.C. § 431(21), in future elections where both state and federal candidates appear on the ballot. None of these activities will be targeted to any federal race or federal candidate. Thus, these activities are not "unambiguously related to the campaign of a particular federal candidate." *Buckley*, 424 U.S. at 80. CRP is ready and able to do these activities, and it would do so but for the fact that the Federal Funds Restriction makes them a crime because they qualify as "Federal election activity" under 2 U.S.C. § 441i(b)(1). Unless it is able to obtain the judicial relief requested herein, CRP will not do these activities. CRP intends to use state funds in materially similar situations in the future, if permitted.
- 26. In accordance with 2 U.S.C. § 441i(e) no federal candidate or officeholder will solicit, receive, or spend funds in connection with any of the Plaintiffs' activities described above.
- 27. As noted after the descriptions of each planned activity, Plaintiffs intend to solicit and use state funds and non-federal funds in materially similar situations in the future, if permitted. There is a strong likelihood that similar situations will recur, given the facts that Plaintiffs have engaged in similar activity in the past and that such activity relating to state candidate elections, ballot initiatives, redistricting, grassroots lobbying and litigation is

common, and regularly recurring.

28. If Plaintiffs do not obtain the requested injunctive relief, they will not proceed with their planned activities. In such an event, they will be deprived of their constitutional rights under the First Amendment to the United State Constitution and will suffer irreparable harm. There is no adequate remedy at law.

#### Count 1

#### RNC & Duncan—New Jersey Account

- 29. Plaintiffs RNC and Duncan reallege and incorporate by reference all of the allegations contained in all of the preceding paragraphs.
- 30. As applied to the activities that RNC and Chairman Duncan intend to do in connection with the "New Jersey Account," supra, the Federal Funds Restriction is unconstitutional because the activity is not "unambiguously related to the campaign of a particular federal candidate." Buckley, 424 U.S. at 80. Failing this threshold requirement, the Federal Funds Restriction does not come within congressional authority to regulate elections and is overbroad for sweeping in First Amendment activity without authority.
- 31. As applied to the proposed activities, the Federal Funds Restriction is unconstitutional under the First Amendment guarantees of free speech and association.

#### Count 2

#### RNC & Duncan—Virginia Account

- 32. Plaintiffs RNC and Duncan reallege and incorporate by reference all of the allegations contained in all of the preceding paragraphs.
- 33. As applied to the activities that RNC and Chairman Duncan intend to do in connection with the "Virginia Account," supra, the Federal Funding Restriction is unconsti-

tutional because the activity is not "unambiguously related to the campaign of a particular federal candidate." Buckley, 424 U.S. at 80. Failing this threshold requirement, the Federal Funds Restriction does not come within congressional authority to regulate elections and is overbroad for sweeping in First Amendment activity without constitutional authority.

34. As applied to the proposed activities, the Federal Funds Restriction is unconstitutional under the First Amendment guarantees of free speech and association.

#### Count 3

#### RNC & Duncan—Redistricting Account

- 35. Plaintiffs RNC and Duncan reallege and incorporate by reference all of the allegations contained in all of the preceding paragraphs.
- 36. As applied to the activities that RNC and Chairman Duncan intend to do in connection with the "Redistricting Account," supra, the prohibition on soliciting and using state funds is unconstitutional because the activity is not "unambiguously related to the campaign of a particular federal candidate." Buckley, 424 U.S. at 80. Failing this threshold requirement, the Federal Funds Restriction does not come within congressional authority to regulate elections and is overbroad for sweeping in First Amendment activity without constitutional authority.
- 37. As applied to the proposed activities, the Federal Funds Restriction is unconstitutional under the First Amendment guarantees of free speech and association.

#### Count 4

#### RNC & Duncan—Grassroots Lobbying Account

38. Plaintiffs RNC and Duncan reallege and incorporate by reference all of the allegations contained in all of the preceding paragraphs.

- 39. As applied to the activities that RNC and Chairman Duncan intend to do in connection with the "Grassroots Lobbying Account," supra, the Federal Funds Restriction is unconstitutional because the activity is not "unambiguously related to the campaign of a particular federal candidate." Buckley, 424 U.S. at 80. Failing this threshold requirement, the Federal Funds Restriction does not come within congressional authority to regulate elections and is overbroad for sweeping in First Amendment activity without constitutional authority.
- 40. As applied to the proposed activities, the Federal Funds Restriction is unconstitutional under the First Amendment guarantees of free speech and association.

#### Count 5

#### **RNC & Duncan—State Elections Accounts**

- 41. As applied to the activities that RNC and Chairman Duncan intend to do in connection with the several "State Elections Accounts," *supra*, the Federal Funds Restriction is unconstitutional because the activity is not "unambiguously related to the campaign of a particular federal candidate." Buckley, 424 U.S. at 80. Failing this threshold requirement, the Federal Funds Restriction does not come within congressional authority to regulate elections and is overbroad for sweeping in First Amendment activity without constitutional authority.
- 42. As applied to the proposed activities, the Federal Funds Restriction is unconstitutional under the First Amendment guarantees of free speech and association.

#### Count 6 RNC & Duncan—Litigation Account

- 43. Plaintiffs RNC and Duncan reallege and incorporate by reference all of the allegations contained in all of the preceding paragraphs.
  - 44. As applied to the activities that RNC and Chairman Duncan intend to do in

connection with the "Litigation Account," supra, the Federal Funds Restriction is unconstitutional because the activity is not "unambiguously related to the campaign of a particular federal candidate." Buckley, 424 U.S. at 80. Failing this threshold requirement, the Federal Funds Restriction does not come within congressional authority to regulate elections and is overbroad for sweeping in First Amendment activity without constitutional authority.

45. As applied to the proposed activities, the Federal Funds Restriction is unconstitutional under the First Amendment guarantees of free speech and association.

#### Count 7

#### **Duncan—Solicitation for State Candidates and Parties**

- 46. Plaintiff Duncan realleges and incorporates by reference all of the allegations contained in all of the preceding paragraphs.
- 47. As applied to Chairman Duncan's intended solicitation of contributions to state parties and state candidates, supra, the Federal Funds Restriction is unconstitutional because the activity is not "unambiguously related to the campaign of a particular federal candidate." Buckley, 424 U.S. at 80. Failing this threshold requirement, the Federal Funds Restriction does not come within congressional authority to regulate elections and is overbroad for sweeping in First Amendment activity without constitutional authority.
- 48. As applied to the proposed activities, the Federal Funds Restriction is unconstitutional under the First Amendment guarantees of free speech and association.

#### Count 8

#### **CRP—PASO Activities for California Initiatives**

49. Plaintiff CRP realleges and incorporates by reference all of the allegations contained in all of the preceding paragraphs.

- 50. As applied to CRP's intended public communications supporting or opposing California ballot initiatives, *supra*, the Federal Funds Restriction is unconstitutional because the activity is not "unambiguously related to the campaign of a particular federal candidate." Buckley, 424 U.S. at 80. Failing this threshold requirement, the Federal Funds Restriction does not come within congressional authority to regulate elections and is overbroad for sweeping in First Amendment activity without constitutional authority.
- 51. As applied to the proposed activities, the Federal Funds Restriction is unconstitutional under the First Amendment guarantees of free speech and association.

#### Count 9

#### CRP —Non-targeted "Federal Election Activity"

- 52. Plaintiff CRP realleges and incorporates by reference all of the allegations contained in all of the preceding paragraphs.
- 53. As applied to CRP's intended "Federal election activity" in future elections, which will not targeted at any federal candidate or race, *supra*, the Federal Funds Restriction is unconstitutional because the activity is not "unambiguously related to the campaign of a particular federal candidate." Buckley, 424 U.S. at 80. Failing this threshold requirement, the Federal Funds Restriction does not come within congressional authority to regulate elections and is overbroad for sweeping in First Amendment activity without constitutional authority.
- 54. As applied to the proposed activities, the Federal Funds Restriction is unconstitutional under the First Amendment guarantees of free speech and association.

#### **Prayer for Relief**

Wherefore, Plaintiffs pray for the following relief:

- 1. a declaratory judgment declaring 2 U.S.C. § 441i unconstitutional in all the asapplied situations in Counts 1-9;
- 2. a permanent injunction enjoining defendant FEC from enforcing 2 U.S.C. § 441i against Plaintiffs in all the as-applied situations in Counts 1-9;
  - 3. costs and attorneys fees pursuant to any applicable statute or authority; and
  - 4. any other relief this Court in its discretion deems just and appropriate.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ James Bopp, Jr.

James Bopp, Jr., Bar #CO0041

/s/ Richard E. Coleson

Richard E. Coleson\*

/s/ Clayton J. Callen

Clayton J. Callen\*

/s/ Kaylan L. Phillips

Kaylan L. Phillips\*

Charles H. Bell, Jr.,
Bell, McAndrews & Hiltachk, LLP
455 Capitol Mall, Suite 801
Sacramento, CA 95814
Tel: (916) 442-7757
Fax: (916) 442-7759
cbell@bmhlaw.com

cbell@bmhlaw.com
Counsel for California Republican Party
and San Diego Republican Party

BOPP, COLESON & BOSTROM 1 South Sixth Street Terre Haute, IN 47807-3510 812/232-2434 telephone 812/234-3685 facsimile Lead Counsel for all Plaintiffs \*Pro Hac Vice Motion pending

# Case 1:08-cv-01953-RJL Document 1-2 Filed 11/13/2008 Page 1 of 2 1953

#### **CIVIL COVER SHEET**

JS-44 (Rev.1/05 DC)						•			
I (a) PLAINTIFFS			DEFENDAN	ΓS					
Republican National Committee, ( Robert M. (Mike) Duncan, Republ	Federal Election Commission								
		W001:	COUNTY OF PESI	DENCE OF EI	DET LISTED D	NECENDANT		i	
(b) COUNTY OF RESIDENCE OF FIRST LISTED PLAINTIFF (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)			COUNTY OF RESIDENCE OF FIRST LISTED DEFENDANT (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)  NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED						
(c) ATTORNEYS (FIRM NAME, ADDRESS, AN	D TELEPHONE NUMBER	)	AT						
James Bopp, Jr. Bopp, Coleson & Bostrom 1 S. Sixth St. Terre Haute, IN 47807-3510			T Case:	ned To	v-01953 : Leon, : 11/13	Richard J.			
P: (812) 232-2434 F: (812) 235-3685	; 		<u>LV</u> Descr	iption: (	3-Judge	Court			
			NSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (PLACE AN x IN ONE BOX FOR AND ONE BOX FOR DEFENDANT) FOR DIVERSITY CASES ONLY!						
	l Ouestion		PTF	DFT			PTF	DFT	
	overnment Not a Party)	Citizen of this S	State O 1	<b>O</b> 1		d or Principal Place in This State	O 4	O 4	
	te Citizenship of	Citizen of Anotl		O 2 O 3	Incorporate	d and Principal Place in Another State	O 5	O 5	
	1	Foreign Country	y		Foreign Nat	tion	<b>O</b> 6	0 6	
11	/. CASE ASSIC	CNMENT	AND NATE	IDE OF	CUTT		•		
(Place a X in one category, A			. 10075 - 100075 - 100 - 10007 - 100 - 10 - 10007			onding Nature o	f Suit)		
	ersonal Injury/ O C.		Administrative Agency eview		cy O	O D. Temporary Restraining Order/Preliminary			
1	151		Medicare Act			Injunction			
☐ 410 Antitrust ☐ 310 Airplane ☐ 315 Airplane Product Liability ☐ 320 Assault, Libel & Slander ☐ 330 Federal Employers Liability ☐ 340 Marine ☐ 345 Marine Product Liability		Social Security:    861 HIA ((1395ff)   862 Black Lung (923)   863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)   864 SSID Title XVI			be s assi	Any nature of suit from any category may be selected for this category of case assignment.  *(If Antitrust, then A governs)*			
355 Motor V 360 Other P 362 Medical 365 Product	350 Motor Vehicle 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 360 Other Personal Injury 362 Medical Malpractice 365 Product Liability 368 Ashestes Product Liability 893		1 Agricultural Acts 12 Economic Stabilization Act 13 Environmental Matters 14 Energy Allocation Act 10 Other Statutory Actions (If						
			Administrative Ag		***				
O E. General Civil (Other) OR O F. Pro Se General Civil									
Real Property  210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure 230 Rent, Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property  Personal Property 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage 385 Property Damage Product Liability	Bankruptcy  422 Appeal 28 U 423 Withdrawal  Prisoner Petitions 535 Death Pena 540 Mandamus 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Con  Property Rights 820 Copyrights 830 Patent 840 Trademark  Federal Tax Suits 870 Taxes (US p	l 28 USC 157  lity s & Other s dition	625 Drug of Pr 630 Liqu 640 RR & 650 Airli 660 Occu Safet 690 Othe  Other Statute 400 State	culture r Food &Dr r Related Sei operty 21 Us or Laws & Truck ne Regs pational y/Health r	zure C	470 Racketeer Int Corrupt Org 480 Consumer C 490 Cable/Satelli 810 Selective Ser 850 Securities/Co Exchange 875 Customer Cl 3410 900 Appeal of fee under equal 950 Constitutions Statutes 890 Other Statute not administ review or Priva	anization: redit te TV vice ommoditie allenge 1 e determin access to ality of St ory Action	s 2 USC nation Justice ate	
	defendant  871 IRS-Third   USC 7609		Rates  460 Depo	s/etc.		(	1	3	

,****						
O G. Habeas Corpus/ 2255  530 Habeas Corpus-General 510 Motion/Vacate Sentence	O H. Employment Discrimination  442 Civil Rights-Employment (criteria: race, gender/sex, national origin, discrimination, disability age, religion, retaliation)	O I. FOIA/PRIVACY ACT  895 Freedom of Information Act 890 Other Statutory Actions (if Privacy Act)	J. Student Loan  152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (excluding veterans)			
	*(If pro se, select this deck)*	*(If pro se, select this deck)*				
O K. Labor/ERISA (non-employment)  710 Fair Labor Standards Act 720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations 730 Labor/Mgmt. Reporting & Disclosure Act 740 Labor Railway Act 790 Other Labor Litigation 791 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act	444 Welfare 440 Other Civil Rights 445 American w/Disabilities-	110 Insurance 120 Marine 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment Enforcement of Judgment 153 Recovery of Overpayment Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholder's Suits	of			
ORIGIN Original O 2 Removed From State Court Or Reopened Or Reopened Or Reopened Specify  Original O 2 Removed From State Court Or Reopened Or Reopened Or Reopened Specify Or Reopened Or Reopened Or Reopened Specify Or Reopened Or Reo						
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION (CITE THE U.S. CIVIL STATUTE UNDER WHICH YOU ARE FILING AND WRITE A BRIEF STATEMENT OF CAUSE.)  First Amendment as applied challenge to portions of Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act.						
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT	CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER F.R.C.P. 23	DEMAND \$	Check YES only if demanded in complain			
VIII. RELATED CASE(S)  IF ANY	(See instruction) YES	NO If yes, please com	plete related case form			
DATE Nov. 13, 2008	SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECO	ord Jangy				
INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING CIVIL COVER SHEET JS-44						

**Authority for Civil Cover Sheet** 

The JS-44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replaces nor supplements the filings and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. Consequently a civil cover sheet is submitted to the Clerk of Court for each civil complaint filed. Listed below are tips for completing the civil cover sheet These tips coincide with the Roman Numerals on the Cover Sheet

- COUNTY OF RESIDENCE OF FIRST LISTED PLAINTIFF/DEFENDANT (b) County of residence Use 11001 to indicate plaintiff is resident of Washington, D.C., 88888 if plaintiff is resident of the United States but not of Washington, D.C., and 99999 if plaintiff is outside the United States. 1.
- CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES This section is completed only if diversity of citizenship was selected as the Basis of Jurisdiction under Section 111.
- CASE ASSIGNMENT AND NATURE OF SUIT The assignment of a judge to your case will depend on the category you select that best represents the IV. primary cause of action found in your complaint. You may select only one category You must also select one corresponding nature of suit found under the category of case
- CAUSE OF ACTION Cite the US Civil Statute under which you are filing and write a brief statement of the primary cause VI.
- RELATED CASES, IF ANY If you indicated that there is a related case, you must complete a related case form, which may be obtained from the Clerk's VIII.

Because of the need for accurate and complete information, you should ensure the accuracy of the information provided prior to signing the form