

BEFORE THE FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

In the Matter of)
) MUR 6247
www.examiner.com; Friends of David)
Smith and Lucie Weaver, in her official)
capacity as Treasurer; David A. Smith;)
Anschutz Company; Clarity Digital)
Group, LLC)

CERTIFICATION

I, Darlene Harris, recording secretary for the Federal Election Commission executive session on July 27, 2010, do hereby certify that the Commission decided by a vote of 6-0 to take the following actions in MUR 6247:

1. Dismiss MUR 6247 on the basis of prosecutorial discretion as outlined in Heckler v. Chaney, 470 U.S. 821 (1985).
2. Direct the Office of General Counsel to draft an appropriate Factual and Legal Analysis pursuant to the meeting discussion and informally circulate the revised Factual and Legal Analysis to the Commission for review.
3. Approve the appropriate letters.
4. Close the file.

Commissioners Bauerly, Hunter, McGahn II, Petersen, Walther and Weintraub voted affirmatively for the decision.

Attest:

July 29, 2010
Date

Darlene Harris
Darlene Harris
Deputy Secretary of the Commission

10044280637



FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20463

AUG 24 2010

CERTIFIED MAIL
RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

Vickers L. Cunningham, Sr.
9090 N. Stemmons Frwy., Suite A
Dallas, TX 75247

RE: MUR 6247

Dear Mr. Cunningham:

This is in reference to the complaint you filed with the Federal Election Commission on January 19, 2010, concerning David Smith and www.examiner.com. After considering the circumstances of this matter, the Commission determined to dismiss this matter on the basis of prosecutorial discretion and closed the file on July 27, 2010. The Factual and Legal Analysis explaining the Commission's decision is enclosed.

Documents related to the case will be placed on the public record within 30 days. See Statement of Policy Regarding Disclosure of Closed Enforcement and Related Files, 68 Fed. Reg. 70,426 (Dec. 18, 2003) and Statement of Policy Regarding Placing First General Counsel's Reports on the Public Record, 74 Fed. Reg. 66132 (Dec. 14, 2009).

The Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended, allows a complainant to seek judicial review of the Commission's dismissal of this action. See 2 U.S.C. § 437g(a)(8).

If you have any questions, please contact me at (202) 694-1650.

Sincerely,

P. Christopher Hughey
Acting General Counsel

Mark D. Shonkwiler ^{KDX}

BY: Mark D. Shonkwiler
Assistant General Counsel

Enclosure
Factual and Legal Analysis

10044280639

1 **FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION**

2 **FACTUAL AND LEGAL ANALYSIS**

3
4 **RESPONDENTS:** www.examiner.com

MUR: 6247

5 Anschutz Company

6 Clarity Digital Group, LLC

7
8 This matter was generated by a complaint filed by Vickers L. Cunningham. *See*
9 2 U.S.C. § 437(g)(a)(1). The complaint alleged that Anschutz Company (“Anschutz”)
10 and Clarity Digital Group, LLC, d/b/a Examiner.com (“Examiner”) (together, the
11 “Examiner Entities”), violated the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended
12 (the “Act”), in connection with a posting made on Examiner’s website relating to a
13 fundraiser for David Smith’s congressional campaign (the “Announcement”). In light of
14 the *de minimis* amount of the alleged in-kind contribution, the Commission exercised its
15 prosecutorial discretion and dismissed the complaint.

16 Examiner operates a website that provides local information, resources, and
17 perspectives on approximately 240 different cities in North America, almost exclusively
18 through user-generated content. Examiner Resp., 2. Contributors (hired as independent
19 contractors and referred to as “Examiners”) are recruited and paid for their contributions
20 to the website on the basis of page views, unique visitors, session length, and advertising
21 performance. *Id.* While Examiner does not review or edit postings submitted by
22 Examiners, it retains the right to remove any posting in the event the posting does not

10044280640

1 comply with Examiner's policies, or in the event Examiner finds the posting
2 unacceptable for any other reason. *Id.*

3 David Smith ("Smith") was a candidate for the Republican nomination in the race
4 for U.S. Representative from Texas' 32nd Congressional District.¹ A Statement of
5 Organization designating Friends of David Smith as Smith's principal campaign
6 committee was filed on December 30, 2009.

7 Smith became the Examiner assigned to report on Dallas County Republican
8 politics in July 2009, and since that time has contributed approximately 300 postings.
9 See Dallas County Republican Examiner's Articles, [http://www.examiner.com/x-17004-](http://www.examiner.com/x-17004-Dallas-County-Republican-Examiner)
10 [Dallas-County-Republican-Examiner](http://www.examiner.com/x-17004-Dallas-County-Republican-Examiner). On November 3, 2009, Smith posted the
11 Announcement on Examiner's website declaring his candidacy and including information
12 about his "Fundraiser & Campaign Kick-Off," to be hosted at a local restaurant. The
13 Announcement also included a disclaimer stating that the "event notification" was not
14 subject to state reporting requirements. Examiner Resp., 2. In his response, Smith states
15 that he is paid an average of one cent per page view for his postings, and that his
16 remuneration for the posting in question was approximately one dollar. Smith Resp., 2.
17 The Examiner estimated that under their contract, Smith earned a total of \$8.06 for the
18 posting. Examiner Resp., 2.

19 The Complaint alleges that the Examiner Entities made prohibited corporate
20 contributions in connection with a coordinated communication in violation of 2 U.S.C. §

¹ The Republican primary was held on March 2, 2010, and the incumbent, Rep. Pete Sessions, garnered approximately 83% of the votes cast, defeating Smith. Office of the Secretary of State of Texas, 2010 Republican Party Primary Election, Election Night Returns at http://enr.sos.state.tx.us/enr/results/mar02_148_state.htm.

10044280641

10044280642

1 441b. Complainant further alleges that the Announcement failed to include disclaimers
2 required by 2 U.S.C. § 441d.

3 After receiving the Complaint, Examiner removed the Announcement from its
4 website and suspended Smith from posting additional material pending the resolution of
5 this matter. Examiner Resp., 3. The Examiner Entities' response to the Complaint
6 argues that: (1) there has been no transfer of value that could qualify as a "contribution"
7 or "expenditure" under the Act; (2) even if the Announcement did qualify as a
8 "contribution" or "expenditure," the press exemption applies; (3) Examiner, as an
9 "independent internet medium," has no disclosure or disclaimer requirement with respect
10 to the Announcement; (4) Examiner is immune from civil liability pursuant to Section
11 230 of the Communications Decency Act of 1996; and (5) the amount in question is *de*
12 *minimis*. See generally Examiner Resp.

13 Smith also filed a response in which he asks the Commission to dismiss the
14 Complaint brought by a supporter of his political opponent because the Announcement
15 "was treated not as a paid advertisement but as newsworthy content" and Smith's "intent
16 was not to skirt the laws . . . but to make public an announcement." Smith Resp., 4.

17 The amount of the alleged in-kind contribution in this matter is *de minimis*.
18 Additionally, the evidence shows that Examiner removed the Announcement from its
19 website upon receiving notification of the Complaint. In light of the overall
20 circumstances, it would not be an efficient use of the Commission's resources to pursue
21 this matter further. Accordingly, the Commission exercised its prosecutorial discretion
22 and dismissed the complaint as to Anschutz Company and Clarity Digital Group, LLC,
23 d/b/a Examiner.com. See *Heckler v. Chaney*, 470 U.S. 821, 831 (1985). The

- 1 Commission did not determine the applicability of the press exemption or Section 230 of
- 2 the Communications Decency Act of 1996 to this matter.

10044280643

1 **FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION**

2 **FACTUAL AND LEGAL ANALYSIS**

3
4 **RESPONDENTS: Friends of David Smith and Lucie Weaver, MUR: 6247**
5 **in her official capacity as Treasurer**

6 **David A. Smith**

7
8 This matter was generated by a complaint filed by Vickers L. Cunningham. See
9 2 U.S.C. § 437(g)(a)(1). The complaint alleged that David Smith (“Smith”) and Friends
10 of David Smith and Lucie Weaver, in her official capacity as Treasurer (“the
11 Committee”), violated the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended (the
12 “Act”), in connection with a posting made on Examiner’s website relating to a fundraiser
13 for Smith’s congressional campaign (the “Announcement”), and that Smith failed to file a
14 timely Statement of Candidacy. In light of the *de minimis* amount of the alleged in-kind
15 contribution, the Commission exercised its prosecutorial discretion and dismissed the
16 complaint.

17 Clarity Digital Group, LLC, d/b/a Examiner.com (“Examiner”) (together with
18 Anschutz Company (“Anschutz”), the “Examiner Entities”) operates a website that
19 provides local information, resources, and perspectives on approximately 240 different
20 cities in North America, almost exclusively through user-generated content. Examiner
21 Resp., 2. Contributors (hired as independent contractors and referred to as “Examiners”)
22 are recruited and paid for their contributions to the website on the basis of page views,
23 unique visitors, session length, and advertising performance. *Id.* While Examiner does
24 not review or edit postings submitted by Examiners, it retains the right to remove any

10044280544

1 posting in the event the posting does not comply with Examiner's policies, or in the event
2 Examiner finds the posting unacceptable for any other reason. *Id.*

3 Smith was a candidate for the Republican nomination in the race for U.S.
4 Representative from Texas' 32nd Congressional District.¹ A Statement of Organization
5 designating Friends of David Smith as Smith's principal campaign committee was filed
6 on December 30, 2009.

7 Smith became the Examiner assigned to report on Dallas County Republican
8 politics in July 2009, and since that time has contributed approximately 300 postings.
9 *See* Dallas County Republican Examiner's Articles, [http://www.examiner.com/x-17004-](http://www.examiner.com/x-17004-Dallas-County-Republican-Examiner)
10 [Dallas-County-Republican-Examiner](http://www.examiner.com/x-17004-Dallas-County-Republican-Examiner). On November 3, 2009, Smith posted the
11 Announcement on Examiner's website declaring his candidacy and including information
12 about his "Fundraiser & Campaign Kick-Off," to be hosted at a local restaurant. The
13 Announcement also included a disclaimer stating that the "event notification" was not
14 subject to state reporting requirements. Examiner Resp., 2. In his response, Smith states
15 that he is paid an average of one cent per page view for his postings, and that his
16 remuneration for the posting in question was approximately one dollar. Smith Resp., 2.
17 The Examiner estimated that under their contract, Smith earned a total of \$8.06 for the
18 posting. Examiner Resp., 2.

19 The Complaint alleges that Smith and the Committee accepted prohibited
20 corporate contributions in connection with a coordinated communication in violation of 2
21 U.S.C. § 441b. Complainant further alleges that the Announcement failed to include

¹ The Republican primary was held on March 2, 2010, and the incumbent, Rep. Pete Sessions, garnered approximately 83% of the votes cast, defeating Smith. Office of the Secretary of State of Texas, 2010 *Republican Party Primary Election, Election Night Returns* at http://enr.sos.state.tx.us/enr/results/mar02_148_state.htm.

10044280646

1 disclaimers required by 2 U.S.C. § 441d. Lastly, Complainant alleges that Smith violated
2 2 U.S.C. § 432 by failing to file a Statement of Candidacy with the Commission.

3 After receiving the Complaint, Examiner removed the Announcement from its
4 website and suspended Smith from posting additional material pending the resolution of
5 this matter. Examiner Resp., 3. The Examiner Entities' response to the Complaint
6 argues that: (1) there has been no transfer of value that could qualify as a "contribution"
7 or "expenditure" under the Act; (2) even if the Announcement did qualify as a
8 "contribution" or "expenditure," the press exemption applies; (3) Examiner, as an
9 "independent internet medium," has no disclosure or disclaimer requirement with respect
10 to the Announcement; (4) Examiner is immune from civil liability pursuant to § 230 of
11 the Communications Decency Act of 1996; and (5) the amount in question is *de minimis*.
12 See generally Examiner Resp.

13 Smith also filed a response in which he asks the Commission to dismiss the
14 Complaint brought by a supporter of his political opponent because the Announcement
15 "was treated not as a paid advertisement but as newsworthy content" and Smith's "intent
16 was not to skirt the laws . . . but to make public an announcement." Smith Resp., 4.

17 The amount of the alleged in-kind contribution in this matter is *de minimis*.
18 Additionally, the evidence shows that Examiner removed the Announcement from its
19 website upon receiving notification of the Complaint. In light of the overall
20 circumstances, it would not be an efficient use of the Commission's resources to pursue
21 this matter further. Accordingly, the Commission exercised its prosecutorial discretion
22 and dismissed the complaint as to David Smith and Friends of David Smith and Lucie
23 Weaver, in her official capacity as Treasurer. See *Heckler v. Chaney*, 470 U.S. 821, 831

- 1 (1985). The Commission did not determine the applicability of the press exemption or
- 2 Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act of 1996 to this matter.

1004428069



FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20463

AUG 24 2010

Lucie Weaver, Treasurer
Friends of David Smith
8571 Southwestern Blvd., #2235
Dallas, TX 75206

RE: MUR 6247

Dear Ms. Weaver:

On January 26, 2010, the Federal Election Commission notified you of a complaint alleging violations of certain sections of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended ("the Act"). A copy of the complaint was forwarded to you at that time.

Upon further review of the allegations contained in the complaint, and information you supplied, the Commission, on July 27, 2010, voted to dismiss this matter. The Factual and Legal Analysis, which more fully explains the Commission's decision, is enclosed for your information.

Documents related to the case will be placed on the public record within 30 days. *See* Statement of Policy Regarding Disclosure of Closed Enforcement and Related Files, 68 Fed. Reg. 70426 (Dec. 18, 2003) and Statement of Policy Regarding Placing First General Counsel's Reports on the Public Record, 74 Fed. Reg. 66132 (Dec. 14, 2009).

If you have any questions, please contact Peter Reynolds, the attorney assigned to this matter, at (202) 694-1650.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Mark D. Shonkwiler" with a stylized flourish at the end.

Mark D. Shonkwiler
Assistant General Counsel

Enclosure
Factual and Legal Analysis

10044280649

1 **FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION**

2 **FACTUAL AND LEGAL ANALYSIS**

3
4 **RESPONDENTS:** Friends of David Smith and Lucie Weaver, MUR: 6247
5 in her official capacity as Treasurer

6 David A. Smith

7
8 This matter was generated by a complaint filed by Vickers L. Cunningham. See
9 2 U.S.C. § 437(g)(a)(1). The complaint alleged that David Smith (“Smith”) and Friends
10 of David Smith and Lucie Weaver, in her official capacity as Treasurer (“the
11 Committee”), violated the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended (the
12 “Act”), in connection with a posting made on Examiner’s website relating to a fundraiser
13 for Smith’s congressional campaign (the “Announcement”), and that Smith failed to file a
14 timely Statement of Candidacy. In light of the *de minimis* amount of the alleged in-kind
15 contribution, the Commission exercised its prosecutorial discretion and dismissed the
16 complaint.

17 Clarity Digital Group, LLC, d/b/a Examiner.com (“Examiner”) (together with
18 Anschutz Company (“Anschutz”), the “Examiner Entities”) operates a website that
19 provides local information, resources, and perspectives on approximately 240 different
20 cities in North America, almost exclusively through user-generated content. Examiner
21 Resp., 2. Contributors (hired as independent contractors and referred to as “Examiners”)
22 are recruited and paid for their contributions to the website on the basis of page views,
23 unique visitors, session length, and advertising performance. *Id.* While Examiner does
24 not review or edit postings submitted by Examiners, it retains the right to remove any

10044280550

1 posting in the event the posting does not comply with Examiner's policies, or in the event
2 Examiner finds the posting unacceptable for any other reason. *Id.*

3 Smith was a candidate for the Republican nomination in the race for U.S.
4 Representative from Texas' 32nd Congressional District.¹ A Statement of Organization
5 designating Friends of David Smith as Smith's principal campaign committee was filed
6 on December 30, 2009.

7 Smith became the Examiner assigned to report on Dallas County Republican
8 politics in July 2009, and since that time has contributed approximately 300 postings.
9 See Dallas County Republican Examiner's Articles, [http://www.examiner.com/x-17004-](http://www.examiner.com/x-17004-Dallas-County-Republican-Examiner)
10 [Dallas-County-Republican-Examiner](http://www.examiner.com/x-17004-Dallas-County-Republican-Examiner). On November 3, 2009, Smith posted the
11 Announcement on Examiner's website declaring his candidacy and including information
12 about his "Fundraiser & Campaign Kick-Off," to be hosted at a local restaurant. The
13 Announcement also included a disclaimer stating that the "event notification" was not
14 subject to state reporting requirements. Examiner Resp., 2. In his response, Smith states
15 that he is paid an average of one cent per page view for his postings, and that his
16 remuneration for the posting in question was approximately one dollar. Smith Resp., 2.
17 The Examiner estimated that under their contract, Smith earned a total of \$8.06 for the
18 posting. Examiner Resp., 2.

19 The Complaint alleges that Smith and the Committee accepted prohibited
20 corporate contributions in connection with a coordinated communication in violation of 2
21 U.S.C. § 441b. Complainant further alleges that the Announcement failed to include

¹ The Republican primary was held on March 2, 2010, and the incumbent, Rep. Pete Sessions, garnered approximately 83% of the votes cast, defeating Smith. Office of the Secretary of State of Texas, 2010 Republican Party Primary Election, Election Night Returns at http://enr.sos.state.tx.us/enr/results/mar02_148_state.htm.

10044280651

1 disclaimers required by 2 U.S.C. § 441d. Lastly, Complainant alleges that Smith violated
2 2 U.S.C. § 432 by failing to file a Statement of Candidacy with the Commission.

3 After receiving the Complaint, Examiner removed the Announcement from its
4 website and suspended Smith from posting additional material pending the resolution of
5 this matter. Examiner Resp., 3. The Examiner Entities' response to the Complaint
6 argues that: (1) there has been no transfer of value that could qualify as a "contribution"
7 or "expenditure" under the Act; (2) even if the Announcement did qualify as a
8 "contribution" or "expenditure," the press exemption applies; (3) Examiner, as an
9 "independent internet medium," has no disclosure or disclaimer requirement with respect
10 to the Announcement; (4) Examiner is immune from civil liability pursuant to § 230 of
11 the Communications Decency Act of 1996; and (5) the amount in question is *de minimis*.
12 See generally Examiner Resp.

13 Smith also filed a response in which he asks the Commission to dismiss the
14 Complaint brought by a supporter of his political opponent because the Announcement
15 "was treated not as a paid advertisement but as newsworthy content" and Smith's "intent
16 was not to skirt the laws . . . but to make public an announcement." Smith Resp., 4.

17 The amount of the alleged in-kind contribution in this matter is *de minimis*.
18 Additionally, the evidence shows that Examiner removed the Announcement from its
19 website upon receiving notification of the Complaint. In light of the overall
20 circumstances, it would not be an efficient use of the Commission's resources to pursue
21 this matter further. Accordingly, the Commission exercised its prosecutorial discretion
22 and dismissed the complaint as to David Smith and Friends of David Smith and Lucie
23 Weaver, in her official capacity as Treasurer. See *Heckler v. Chaney*, 470 U.S. 821, 831

10044280652

- 1 (1985). The Commission did not determine the applicability of the press exemption or
- 2 Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act of 1996 to this matter.

10044280652



FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20463

AUG 24 2010

David A. Smith
8571 Southwestern Blvd., #2235
Dallas, TX 75206

RE: MUR 6247

Dear Mr. Smith:

On January 26, 2010, the Federal Election Commission notified you of a complaint alleging violations of certain sections of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended ("the Act"). A copy of the complaint was forwarded to you at that time.

Upon further review of the allegations contained in the complaint, and information you supplied, the Commission, on July 27, 2010, voted to dismiss this matter. The Factual and Legal Analysis, which more fully explains the Commission's decision, is enclosed for your information.

Documents related to the case will be placed on the public record within 30 days. See Statement of Policy Regarding Disclosure of Closed Enforcement and Related Files, 68 Fed. Reg. 70426 (Dec. 18, 2003) and Statement of Policy Regarding Placing First General Counsel's Reports on the Public Record, 74 Fed. Reg. 66132 (Dec. 14, 2009).

If you have any questions, please contact Peter Reynolds, the attorney assigned to this matter, at (202) 694-1650.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Mark D. Shonkwiler" with a stylized flourish at the end.

Mark D. Shonkwiler
Assistant General Counsel

Enclosure
Factual and Legal Analysis

10044280655

1 **FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION**

2 **FACTUAL AND LEGAL ANALYSIS**

3
4 RESPONDENTS: Friends of David Smith and Lucie Weaver, MUR: 6247
5 in her official capacity as Treasurer
6 David A. Smith

7
8 This matter was generated by a complaint filed by Vickers L. Cunningham. *See*
9 2 U.S.C. § 437(g)(a)(1). The complaint alleged that David Smith (“Smith”) and Friends
10 of David Smith and Lucie Weaver, in her official capacity as Treasurer (“the
11 Committee”), violated the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended (the
12 “Act”), in connection with a posting made on Examiner’s website relating to a fundraiser
13 for Smith’s congressional campaign (the “Announcement”), and that Smith failed to file a
14 timely Statement of Candidacy. In light of the *de minimis* amount of the alleged in-kind
15 contribution, the Commission exercised its prosecutorial discretion and dismissed the
16 complaint.

17 Clarity Digital Group, LLC, d/b/a Examiner.com (“Examiner”) (together with
18 Anschutz Company (“Anschutz”), the “Examiner Entities”) operates a website that
19 provides local information, resources, and perspectives on approximately 240 different
20 cities in North America, almost exclusively through user-generated content. Examiner
21 Resp., 2. Contributors (hired as independent contractors and referred to as “Examiners”)
22 are recruited and paid for their contributions to the website on the basis of page views,
23 unique visitors, session length, and advertising performance. *Id.* While Examiner does
24 not review or edit postings submitted by Examiners, it retains the right to remove any

10044260656

1 posting in the event the posting does not comply with Examiner's policies, or in the event
2 Examiner finds the posting unacceptable for any other reason. *Id.*

3 Smith was a candidate for the Republican nomination in the race for U.S.
4 Representative from Texas' 32nd Congressional District.¹ A Statement of Organization
5 designating Friends of David Smith as Smith's principal campaign committee was filed
6 on December 30, 2009.

7 Smith became the Examiner assigned to report on Dallas County Republican
8 politics in July 2009, and since that time has contributed approximately 300 postings.
9 See Dallas County Republican Examiner's Articles, [http://www.examiner.com/x-17004-](http://www.examiner.com/x-17004-Dallas-County-Republican-Examiner)
10 [Dallas-County-Republican-Examiner](http://www.examiner.com/x-17004-Dallas-County-Republican-Examiner). On November 3, 2009, Smith posted the
11 Announcement on Examiner's website declaring his candidacy and including information
12 about his "Fundraiser & Campaign Kick-Off," to be hosted at a local restaurant. The
13 Announcement also included a disclaimer stating that the "event notification" was not
14 subject to state reporting requirements. Examiner Resp., 2. In his response, Smith states
15 that he is paid an average of one cent per page view for his postings, and that his
16 remuneration for the posting in question was approximately one dollar. Smith Resp., 2.
17 The Examiner estimated that under their contract, Smith earned a total of \$8.06 for the
18 posting. Examiner Resp., 2.

19 The Complaint alleges that Smith and the Committee accepted prohibited
20 corporate contributions in connection with a coordinated communication in violation of 2
21 U.S.C. § 441b. Complainant further alleges that the Announcement failed to include

¹ The Republican primary was held on March 2, 2010, and the incumbent, Rep. Pete Sessions, garnered approximately 83% of the votes cast, defeating Smith. Office of the Secretary of State of Texas, 2010 Republican Party Primary Election, Election Night Returns at http://enr.sos.state.tx.us/enr/results/mar02_148_state.htm.

10044280658

1 disclaimers required by 2 U.S.C. § 441d. Lastly, Complainant alleges that Smith violated
2 2 U.S.C. § 432 by failing to file a Statement of Candidacy with the Commission.

3 After receiving the Complaint, Examiner removed the Announcement from its
4 website and suspended Smith from posting additional material pending the resolution of
5 this matter. Examiner Resp., 3. The Examiner Entities' response to the Complaint
6 argues that: (1) there has been no transfer of value that could qualify as a "contribution"
7 or "expenditure" under the Act; (2) even if the Announcement did qualify as a
8 "contribution" or "expenditure," the press exemption applies; (3) Examiner, as an
9 "independent internet medium," has no disclosure or disclaimer requirement with respect
10 to the Announcement; (4) Examiner is immune from civil liability pursuant to § 230 of
11 the Communications Decency Act of 1996; and (5) the amount in question is *de minimis*.
12 *See generally* Examiner Resp.

13 Smith also filed a response in which he asks the Commission to dismiss the
14 Complaint brought by a supporter of his political opponent because the Announcement
15 "was treated not as a paid advertisement but as newsworthy content" and Smith's "intent
16 was not to skirt the laws . . . but to make public an announcement." Smith Resp., 4.

17 The amount of the alleged in-kind contribution in this matter is *de minimis*.
18 Additionally, the evidence shows that Examiner removed the Announcement from its
19 website upon receiving notification of the Complaint. In light of the overall
20 circumstances, it would not be an efficient use of the Commission's resources to pursue
21 this matter further. Accordingly, the Commission exercised its prosecutorial discretion
22 and dismissed the complaint as to David Smith and Friends of David Smith and Lucie
23 Weaver, in her official capacity as Treasurer. *See Heckler v. Chaney*, 470 U.S. 821, 831

- 1 (1985). The Commission did not determine the applicability of the press exemption or
- 2 Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act of 1996 to this matter.

10044280659



FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20463

AUG 24 2010

Thomas B. Kelley, Esq.
Levine Sullivan Koch and Schulz, LLP
1888 Sherman Street, #370
Denver, CO 80203

RE: MUR 6247
Anschutz Company;
Clarity Digital Group, LLC,
d/b/a www.examiner.com

Dear Mr. Kelley:

On January 26, 2010, the Federal Election Commission notified your clients, Anschutz Company and Clarity Digital Group, LLC, d/b/a www. examiner.com, of a complaint alleging violations of certain sections of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended. A copy of the complaint was forwarded to your clients at that time.

Upon further review of the allegations contained in the complaint, and information supplied by your clients, the Commission, on July 27, 2010, voted to dismiss this matter. The Factual and Legal Analysis, which more fully explains the Commission's decision, is enclosed for your information.

Documents related to the case will be placed on the public record within 30 days. See Statement of Policy Regarding Disclosure of Closed Enforcement and Related Files, 68 Fed. Reg. 70426 (Dec. 18, 2003) and Statement of Policy Regarding Placing First General Counsel's Reports on the Public Record, 74 Fed. Reg. 66132 (Dec. 14, 2009).

If you have any questions, please contact Peter Reynolds, the attorney assigned to this matter, at (202) 694-1650.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Mark D. Shonkwiler" with a stylized flourish at the end.

Mark D. Shonkwiler
Assistant General Counsel

Enclosure
Factual and Legal Analysis

10044280651

1 **FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION**

2 **FACTUAL AND LEGAL ANALYSIS**

3
4 **RESPONDENTS:** **www.examiner.com**

MUR: 6247

5 **Anschutz Company**

6 **Clarity Digital Group, LLC**

7
8 **This matter was generated by a complaint filed by Vickers L. Cunningham. See**
9 **2 U.S.C. § 437(g)(a)(1). The complaint alleged that Anschutz Company (“Anschutz”)**
10 **and Clarity Digital Group, LLC, d/b/a Examiner.com (“Examiner”) (together, the**
11 **“Examiner Entities”), violated the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended**
12 **(the “Act”), in connection with a posting made on Examiner’s website relating to a**
13 **fundraiser for David Smith’s congressional campaign (the “Announcement”). In light of**
14 **the *de minimis* amount of the alleged in-kind contribution, the Commission exercised its**
15 **prosecutorial discretion and dismissed the complaint.**

16 **Examiner operates a website that provides local information, resources, and**
17 **perspectives on approximately 240 different cities in North America, almost exclusively**
18 **through user-generated content. Examiner Resp., 2. Contributors (hired as independent**
19 **contractors and referred to as “Examiners”) are recruited and paid for their contributions**
20 **to the website on the basis of page views, unique visitors, session length, and advertising**
21 **performance. *Id.* While Examiner does not review or edit postings submitted by**
22 **Examiners, it retains the right to remove any posting in the event the posting does not**

10041280562

19044280663

1 comply with Examiner’s policies, or in the event Examiner finds the posting
2 unacceptable for any other reason. *Id.*

3 David Smith (“Smith”) was a candidate for the Republican nomination in the race
4 for U.S. Representative from Texas’ 32nd Congressional District.¹ A Statement of
5 Organization designating Friends of David Smith as Smith’s principal campaign
6 committee was filed on December 30, 2009.

7 Smith became the Examiner assigned to report on Dallas County Republican
8 politics in July 2009, and since that time has contributed approximately 300 postings.
9 *See Dallas County Republican Examiner’s Articles*, [http://www.examiner.com/x-17004-](http://www.examiner.com/x-17004-Dallas-County-Republican-Examiner)
10 *Dallas-County-Republican-Examiner*. On November 3, 2009, Smith posted the
11 Announcement on Examiner’s website declaring his candidacy and including information
12 about his “Fundraiser & Campaign Kick-Off,” to be hosted at a local restaurant. The
13 Announcement also included a disclaimer stating that the “event notification” was not
14 subject to state reporting requirements. Examiner Resp., 2. In his response, Smith states
15 that he is paid an average of one cent per page view for his postings, and that his
16 remuneration for the posting in question was approximately one dollar. Smith Resp., 2.
17 The Examiner estimated that under their contract, Smith earned a total of \$8.06 for the
18 posting. Examiner Resp., 2.

19 The Complaint alleges that the Examiner Entities made prohibited corporate
20 contributions in connection with a coordinated communication in violation of 2 U.S.C. §

¹ The Republican primary was held on March 2, 2010, and the incumbent, Rep. Pete Sessions, garnered approximately 83% of the votes cast, defeating Smith. Office of the Secretary of State of Texas, 2010 Republican Party Primary Election, Election Night Returns at http://enr.sos.state.tx.us/enr/results/mar02_148_state.htm.

1 441b. Complainant further alleges that the Announcement failed to include disclaimers
2 required by 2 U.S.C. § 441d.

3 After receiving the Complaint, Examiner removed the Announcement from its
4 website and suspended Smith from posting additional material pending the resolution of
5 this matter. Examiner Resp., 3. The Examiner Entities' response to the Complaint
6 argues that: (1) there has been no transfer of value that could qualify as a "contribution"
7 or "expenditure" under the Act; (2) even if the Announcement did qualify as a
8 "contribution" or "expenditure," the press exemption applies; (3) Examiner, as an
9 "independent internet medium," has no disclosure or disclaimer requirement with respect
10 to the Announcement; (4) Examiner is immune from civil liability pursuant to Section
11 230 of the Communications Decency Act of 1996; and (5) the amount in question is *de*
12 *minimis*. See generally Examiner Resp.

13 Smith also filed a response in which he asks the Commission to dismiss the
14 Complaint brought by a supporter of his political opponent because the Announcement
15 "was treated not as a paid advertisement but as newsworthy content" and Smith's "intent
16 was not to skirt the laws . . . but to make public an announcement." Smith Resp., 4.

17 The amount of the alleged in-kind contribution in this matter is *de minimis*.
18 Additionally, the evidence shows that Examiner removed the Announcement from its
19 website upon receiving notification of the Complaint. In light of the overall
20 circumstances, it would not be an efficient use of the Commission's resources to pursue
21 this matter further. Accordingly, the Commission exercised its prosecutorial discretion
22 and dismissed the complaint as to Anschutz Company and Clarity Digital Group, LLC,
23 d/b/a Examiner.com. See *Heckler v. Chaney*, 470 U.S. 821, 831 (1985). The

10044280664

- 1 Commission did not determine the applicability of the press exemption or Section 230 of
- 2 the Communications Decency Act of 1996 to this matter.

10044280665