

**STATE OF CONNECTICUT**  
**STATE ELECTIONS ENFORCEMENT COMMISSION**

In the Matter of a Complaint by  
Paul S. Lavoie, Trumbull

File No. 2015-087

**FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS**

The Complainant filed this Complaint pursuant to Connecticut General Statutes § 9-7b. The Complainant alleged that the Trumbull Democratic Town Committee (TDTC) failed to properly process ticket sales for its annual "car raffle" fundraiser in January 2015 leading to various campaign finance law violations pursuant to General Statutes Title 9, Chapter 155.

After an investigation of the Complaint, the Commission makes the following findings and conclusions:

1. Complainant alleged that the Trumbull Democratic Town Committee (TDTC) failed to properly process ticket sales for its annual "car raffle" fundraiser in January 2015 and therefore to prevent various campaign finance violations pursuant to General Statutes, Title 9, Chapter 155.
2. Specifically, Complainant claimed that:
  - (1) TDTC did not ensure that raffle ticket purchasers provided their names as contributors to the TDTC (§ 9-608).
  - (2) TDTC did not ensure that raffle ticket purchasers were not communicator lobbyists and therefore prohibited from making contributions to the TDTC as a party committee (§ 9-610);
  - (3) TDTC did not ensure that raffle ticket purchasers were not state contractors and therefore prohibited from making contributions to the TDTC as a party committee (§ 9-612 (f)); and,
  - (4) TDTC did not ensure that raffle ticket purchasers were not either US citizens or foreign nationals with a permanent resident status (Federal Elections Act of 1974 (FECA)).
3. By way of background, at all times relevant to this complaint Thomas E. Kelly was the TDTC Chairperson and Lisa M. Labella was the Treasurer of the TDTC. Further, in October 2014 the TDTC received and registered a permit for its 2015 car raffle fundraiser From the State of Connecticut Department of Consumer Protection (DCP).

4. General Statutes § 9-608, provides in pertinent part:

...

(c) (1) Each statement filed under subsection (a), (e) or (f) of this section shall include, but not be limited to: **(A) An itemized accounting of each contribution, if any, including the full name and complete address of each contributor and the amount of the contribution;** ... (F) for each individual who contributes in excess of one hundred dollars but not more than one thousand dollars, in the aggregate, to the extent known, the principal occupation of such individual and the name of the individual's employer, if any; (G) for each individual who contributes in excess of one thousand dollars in the aggregate, the principal occupation of such individual and the name of the individual's employer, if any; **(H) for each itemized contribution made by a lobbyist, the spouse of a lobbyist or any dependent child of a lobbyist who resides in the lobbyist's household, a statement to that effect;** and (I) for each individual who contributes in excess of four hundred dollars in the aggregate to or for the benefit of any candidate's campaign for nomination at a primary or election to the office of chief executive officer or a slate or town committee financing the nomination or election or a candidate for chief executive officer of a town, city or borough, a statement indicating whether the individual or a business with which he is associated has a contract with said municipality that is valued at more than five thousand dollars. ...

[Emphasis added.]

5. General Statutes § 9-610, provides in pertinent part:

...

**(g) No communicator lobbyist, member of the immediate family of a communicator lobbyist, or political committee established or controlled by a communicator lobbyist or a member of the immediate family of a communicator lobbyist shall make a contribution or contributions in excess of one hundred dollars to, or for the benefit of** (1) an exploratory committee or a candidate committee established by a candidate for nomination or election to the office of Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Attorney General, State Comptroller, State Treasurer, Secretary of the State, state senator or state representative, (2) a political committee established or controlled by any such candidate, (3) a legislative caucus committee or a legislative leadership committee, or (4) **a party committee.**

6. General Statutes § 9-612, provides in pertinent part:

...  
(f) (2) (A) *No state contractor, prospective state contractor, principal of a state contractor or principal of a prospective state contractor, with regard to a state contract or a state contract solicitation with or from a state agency in the executive branch or a quasi-public agency or a holder, or principal of a holder, of a valid prequalification certificate, shall make a contribution to,* or, on and after January 1, 2011, knowingly solicit contributions from the state contractor's or prospective state contractor's employees or from a subcontractor or principals of the subcontractor on behalf of (i) an exploratory committee or candidate committee established by a candidate for nomination or election to the office of Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Attorney General, State Comptroller, Secretary of the State or State Treasurer, (ii) a political committee authorized to make contributions or expenditures to or for the benefit of such candidates, or *(iii) a party committee;*

(B) *No state contractor, prospective state contractor, principal of a state contractor or principal of a prospective state contractor, with regard to a state contract or a state contract solicitation with or from the General Assembly or a holder, or principal of a holder, of a valid prequalification certificate, shall make a contribution to,* or, on and after January 1, 2011, knowingly solicit contributions from the state contractor's or prospective state contractor's employees or from a subcontractor or principals of the subcontractor on behalf of (i) an exploratory committee or candidate committee established by a candidate for nomination or election to the office of state senator or state representative, (ii) a political committee authorized to make contributions or expenditures to or for the benefit of such candidates, or *(iii) a party committee; ....*

[Emphasis added.]

7. Allegation One: *TDTC did not ensure that raffle ticket purchasers provided their names as contributors to the TDTC (§ 9-608).*

8. Upon investigation, the Commission finds that the raffle tickets were priced at \$10.00 each, were sequentially numbered and included receipts with for the name, address and telephone number of the individual purchaser.
9. The Commission further finds that the data of individual purchasers of raffle tickets was logged sequentially by ticket number and identified the name, address and total number of tickets purchased and aggregate amount of the purchase for each individual who purchased raffle tickets.
10. The Commission concludes therefore that the information obtained and recorded by the TDTC pertaining to each raffle ticket sold satisfied the requirements of General Statutes § 9-608 pertaining to the identification of individuals raffle ticket purchasers as contributors to the TDTC. The Commission therefore dismisses Allegation One as it was not supported by the facts after investigation.
11. *Allegation Two: TDTC did not ensure that raffle ticket purchasers were not communicator lobbyists and therefore prohibited from making contributions to the TDTC as a party committee (§ 9-610).*
12. After investigation, the Commission finds that the TDTC implemented a process to aggregate the total dollar amount of purchases of raffle tickets by each individual for the purpose of complying with the \$100.00 permissible limit of contributions by communicator lobbyists to a party committee pursuant to General Statutes § 9-610 (g).
13. Further, the Commission finds a lack of evidence that communicator lobbyists purchased raffle tickets for the January 2015 TDTC car raffle or otherwise exceed contribution limits to the TDTC as a party committee.
14. The Commission therefore dismisses Allegation Two pertaining to violations of General Statutes § 9-610 and the communicator lobbyist contribution ban as it was not supported by the facts after investigation.
15. *Allegation Three: TDTC did not ensure that raffle ticket purchasers were not state contractors and therefore prohibited from making contributions to the TDTC as a party committee (§ 9-612).*
16. The Commission finds that the TDTC, in response to this complaint and investigation, asserts that it was fully cognizant of the state contractor contribution ban pursuant to General Statutes § 9-612 (f) at the time of ticket sales for its January 2015 car raffle and therefore had safe guards in place to screen such sales.


17. The Commission further finds that the TDTC's attempts to comply with the state contractor contribution ban and General Statutes § 9-612 (f) were corroborated by records pertaining to compliance advice regarding the same solicited and received by the TDTC from both the Commission and DCP regarding the January 2015 raffle.
18. Finally, the Commission finds credible evidence that purchasers of multiple raffle tickets that reached a threshold of \$50.00 or more in the aggregate were required to complete a TDTC contributor card that included a certification as to whether the individual was a state contractor or not.
19. The Commission Allegation Three pertaining to violations of General Statutes § 9-612 and the state contractor contribution ban as it was not supported by the facts after investigation.
20. Allegation Four: *TDTC did not ensure that raffle ticket purchasers were either US citizens or foreign nationals with a permanent resident status and thus permitted to make campaign contributions FECA.*
21. The Commission finds that the TDTC (1) implemented multiple procedures as detailed herein regarding the sales of raffle tickets to individuals as contributors to the TDTC to satisfy Connecticut Campaign Finance Laws *as well as* (2) registered with DCP in order to satisfy additional state laws governing the sale of raffle tickets for charitable purposes.
22. Additionally, the Commission finds ample evidence that the TDTC contacted both the Commission compliance unit and DCP staff to ensure that their January 2015 sale of raffle tickets met the requisite requirements of each state agencies perspective jurisdiction and acted to implement such advice and instructions from the state.
23. Finally, the Commission finds that the TDTC's use of contributor cards to validate permissible sources for ticket purchases and contributions adequately addresses the claims made in Allegation Four. The Commission therefore dismisses Allegation Four for lack of supporting evidence after investigation.
24. This complaint warrants dismissal because Complainant's allegations were not supported by the facts and law under the circumstances detailed herein pertaining the methods used by the TDTC's in conducting its January 2015 car raffle fundraiser.

**ORDER**

The following Order is recommended on the basis of the aforementioned findings:

That the complaint is dismissed.

Adopted this 15<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2015 at Hartford, Connecticut.

  
Anthony J. Castagno, Chairperson  
By Order of the Commission