FREE SPEECH,

Plaintiff,

CASE NO. 12-CV-127-SWS

1

VS.

OCTOBER 3, 2012 8:28 A.M. - 9:05 A.M.

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION,

CASPER, WYOMING

Defendant.

TRANSCRIPT OF TELEPHONIC ORAL RULING
ON PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION
BEFORE THE HONORABLE SCOTT W. SKAVDAHL
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

# APPEARANCES:

For Plaintiff:

**John B. Speight** 4021 Snyder Cheyenne, Wyoming 82001

Stephen R. Klein WYOMING LIBERTY GROUP 1902 Thomes Avenue, Suite 201 Cheyenne, Wyoming 82001

Benjamin T. Barr 10737 Hunting Lane Rockville, Maryland 20850

For Defendant:

Erin R. Chlopak David B. Kolker Adav Noti FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION 999 E Street NW Washington, DC 20463

Nicholas Vassallo UNITED STATES ATTORNEY'S OFFICE P.O. Box 668 Cheyenne, Wyoming 82003-0668 Appellate Case: 12-8078 Document: 01018976607 Date Filed: 01/02/2013 Page: 72

APPEARANCES: (Page 2 of 2) Jamie L. Hendrich, CSR-RPR-CRR Reported By: Official Federal Court Reporter U.S. District Courthouse 111 South Wolcott, Room 217 Casper, Wyoming 82601 (307) 265-5280 

			3
1	CITATION INDEX		
2	Austin v. Michigan Chamber of Commerce, 494 U.S. 652, 1990	6	
3	Awad v. Ziriax, 670 F.3d 1111, at 1125, (10 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 2012)	15	
5	Buckley v. Valeo, 424 U.S. 1, 1976	7	
6	Citizens United v. FEC, 558 U.S. 310, 130 S.Ct.876, 2010	6	
7 8	FEC v. Survival Education Fund, Incorporated, 65 F.3d 285, at 295 (2 <sup>d</sup> Cir. 1995)	19	
9	FEC v. Wisconsin Right to Life, 551 U.S. 449, 2007	8	
11	McConnell v. Federal Election Commission, 540 U.S. 93, 2003	6	
12 13	New Mexico Youth Organized v. Herrera, 611 F.3d 669, 676 (10 <sup>th</sup> Circuit 2010)	17	
14	The Real Truth About Abortion, Inc. v. Federal Election Commission, 681 F.3d 544, 555 (4th Cir. 2012)	11	
15 16	Winter v. Natural Resource Defense Council, 555 U.S. 7 at 20, 2008		
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
	1		

THE COURT: Good morning, counsel.

MR. BARR: Good morning, Your Honor.

MS. CHLOPAK: Good morning.

THE COURT: Court is in session in the matter of Free Speech versus the Federal Election Commission, Case Number 12-CV-127. I note the presence of Mr. Speight, Mr. Klein and Mr. Barr on behalf of plaintiffs -- plaintiff and the presence of Mr. Kolker, Ms. Chlopak and Mr. Noti on behalf of the defendant, Federal Election Commission.

This matter comes before the Court on plaintiff's motion for preliminary injunctive relief pursuant to Rule 65 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Plaintiff, based upon alleged infringement of its constitutional rights, seeks to have this Court enjoin defendant, the Federal Election Commission, from enforcement of various regulatory provisions and policies. The Court finds and orders as follows:

As to the background in this matter, Plaintiff Free Speech is an unincorporated, nonprofit association formed on February 21, 2012, and is comprised of three Wyoming residents. Free Speech's stated mission is to promote and protect free speech, limited government and constitutionally -- constitutional accountability and to advocate positions on various political issues, including free speech, environmental policy, gun rights, land rights and control over personal healthcare. Its bylaws require that it operate independently

of political candidates, committees and political parties. See the *Complaint*, Paragraphs 1 and 10, and Exhibit A to Exhibit 1. Free Speech seeks to run various advertisements addressing political issues and seeks to engage in fundraising from other like-minded individuals to support its positions through public media.

On July 26, 2012, plaintiff filed this action, challenging certain FEC regulations that plaintiff alleges abridge its First Amendment freedoms. Specifically, plaintiff brings facial and "as applied" challenges against 11 C.F.R, Section 100.22(b), alleging its definition of "express advocacy" is unconstitutionally vague and overly broad and triggers burdensome registration and reporting requirements which act as the functional equivalent of a prior restraint of political speech.

Plaintiff further challenges the constitutionality of the FEC's interpretation and enforcement process regarding political committee status, solicitation tests, the "major purpose" test and express advocacy determinations. See Complaint, Paragraph 2.

In order to understand and analyze the issues raised, it is helpful to lay out the applicable statutory and regulatory framework and evolution of law affecting political campaigns and elections. It is also helpful to identify, to the extent able, the perceived evils sought to be curtailed by

this set of campaign laws. The primary purpose of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, hereinafter "The Act" or "FECA," was to limit the actuality and appearance of corruption resulting from the giving of large sums of money and the spending of money in political campaigns for federal office.

Thus, under Title 2, United States Code, Section 441a, limitations are imposed upon the amount of contributions that can be made directly to candidates for federal office and the expenditures that a candidate may make in running for office. There were also concerns regarding independent expenditures which were not made by a candidate for federal office but nonetheless a person advocating for the election or defeat of a clearly identified candidate. These independent expenditures, in part, give rise to the issues before the Court in this case.

Prior to the United States Supreme Court's decision in Citizens United versus Federal Election Commission, 130 Supreme Court 876, 2010, the federal law prohibited corporations and unions from using treasury funds, money, to make independent expenditures for speech that was either defined as electioneering communication or for speech expressly advocating the election or defeat of a candidate. This preclusion on corporate expenditures for electioneering communications was upheld in McConnell versus Federal Election Commission, 540 U.S. 93, 2003. However, in doing so, the Supreme Court relied upon its prior holding in Austin versus Michigan Chamber of

Commerce, 494 U.S. 652, 1990 Supreme Court decision which upheld the State of Michigan's direct restriction on the independent expenditures of funds by a corporation that supported or opposed any candidate for state office.

In Citizens United, the Supreme Court overruled its decision in Austin and held unconstitutional Title 2, United States Code, Section 441b's restrictions on corporate independent expenditures. In addition, the Court in Citizens United overruled that portion of McConnell which had upheld amendments to Section 316(b) of FECA, precluding corporations and unions from using their general treasury funds, money, to finance electioneering communications. See Citizens United at 913; McConnell at 203 through 205.

Despite this conclusion on the preclusion of expenditures, it is equally if not more significant to the claims in this case to note what the Court in Citizens United found was constitutionally permissible. In Citizens United, there was also a challenge made to the disclaimer and disclosure requirements under Title 2, United States Code, Section 441d. In analyzing these disclaimer and disclosure requirements, the Court in Citizens United noted: "Disclaimer and disclosure requirements may burden the ability to speak, but they impose no ceiling on campaign-related activities," citing Buckley, 424 U.S. at 64, and "do not prevent anyone from speaking," citing McConnell, supra, at 201. The Court has

subjected these requirements to "exacting scrutiny" which requires a "substantial relation" between the disclosure required and a "sufficiently important" governmental interest. Buckley, supra, at 64. The Court went on, in Citizens United, to conclude that the disclosure and disclaimer requirements were constitutional, reaffirming its analysis in McConnell as it pertained to the disclosure provisions. Id. at 915.

The case law has also drawn distinctions between campaign advocacy and issue advocacy. To that extent, in Federal Election Commission versus Wisconsin Right to Life, 551 U.S. 449, the Supreme Court, in 2007, held that statutory restrictions on the use of corporate funds to advertisements that were "issue advocacy" advertisements as opposed to "express advocacy" were unconstitutional.

In reaching that conclusion, the Court noted that the speech at issue was not the "functional equivalent of express campaign speech." Thus, the interests held to justify restricting corporate campaign speech or its functional equivalent did not justify restricting the "issue advocacy" speech involved in Wisconsin Right to Life. In making this distinction, the Court noted that the dangers associated with advocacy or campaign speech or its functional equivalent does not exist with respect to issue advocacy. See Wisconsin Right to Life, at 470. It is behind this wall of precedent that the merit of plaintiff's claims must be measured. The definition

of these terms is important to the analysis of the issues presented.

Under the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971,

"independent expenditure" is defined as "an expenditure

expressly advocating the election or defeat of a clearly

identified candidate" and not made by or in coordination with a

candidate or political party or committee. See Title 2, United

States Code, Section 431(17).

An "expenditure" is defined as "any purchase, payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit or gift of money or anything of value made by any person for the purposes of influencing any election for federal office." See Section 431(9)(A)(i), Title 2.

Under 11 C.F.R, Section 100.22, "expressly advocating" is defined as any communication that (a) uses phrases such as "vote for the president," "reelect your congressman," "support the Democratic nominee," "cast your ballot for the Republican challenger for U.S. Senate in Georgia," "Smith for Congress," "Bill McKay in '94," "vote pro-life" or "vote pro-choice" accompanied by a listing of clearly identified candidates described as pro-life or pro-choice, "vote against Old Hickory;" "defeat" accompanied by a picture of one or more candidates; "reject the incumbent" or communications of campaign slogans or individual words which in context can have no other reasonable meaning than to urge the election or defeat

- 9

of one or more clearly identified candidates such as posters, bumper stickers, advertisements, et cetera, which say, "Nixon's the one"; "Carter '76"; "Reagan/Bush" or "Mondale!"; or Subsection (b) of Section 100.22 which provides: "When taken as a whole and with limited reference to external events, such as the proximity to the election, could only be interpreted by a reasonable person as containing advocacy of the election or defeat of one or more clearly identified candidates because, one, the electoral portion of the communication is unmistakable, unambiguous and suggestive of only one meaning; and, two, reasonable minds could not differ as to whether it encourages actions to elect or defeat one or more clearly identified candidates or encourages some other kind of action.

A person or organization, other than a political committee, that finances independent expenditures aggregating more than \$250 a calendar year is required to file with the FEC a disclosure report that identifies, inter alia, the date and amount of each expenditure and anyone who contributed over \$200 to further it. See United States Code, Section 434(c) of Title 2; and 11 C.F.R., Section 109.10(e).

The Act further defines a "political committee,"
commonly known as a "PAC," as "any committee, club, association
or other group of persons which receives contributions
aggregating in excess of \$1,000 during a calendar year or which
makes expenditures aggregating in excess of \$1,000 during a

8.

calendar year." Title 2, United States Code, Section 431(4)(A). The terms "expenditures" and "contributions" are, in turn, defined to encompass any spending or fundraising "for the purpose of influencing any election for federal office." See Sections 431(8)(A)(i) and 431(9)(A)(i).

In Buckley versus Valeo, 424 U.S. 1, 1976, the Supreme Court narrowed the statutory definition of a PAC, limiting its reach to "only encompass organizations that are under the control of a candidate or the 'major purpose' of which is the nomination or election of a candidate. An organization that is not controlled by a candidate must therefore register as a PAC if its contributions or expenditures exceed \$1,000 and its 'major purpose' is the nomination or election of a federal candidate." See The Real Truth About Abortion, Inc. versus Federal Election Commission, 681 F.3d 544, 555, Fourth Circuit 2012 decision, hereinafter "RTAA."

Political committees must comply with certain organizational and disclosure requirements. They must register with the FEC and file periodic reports for disclosure to the public of their total operating expenses and cash on hand as well as their receipts and disbursements with limited exceptions for most transactions below a 200-dollar threshold. See Title 2, United States Code, Sections 433 and 434. Each PAC must have a treasurer who maintains its records and a separately designated bank account. PACs also must disclose,

in their regularly scheduled reports, additional information about their independent expenditures, including the date, amount and candidates supported or opposed for each independent expenditure over \$200, Sections 434(b)(4)(H)(iii), (6)(B)(iii). Additionally, PACs must identify themselves through disclaimers on all of their public political advertising, on their website and in mass emails. 11 C.F.R, Section 110.11(a)(1).

In 2007, after considering and receiving public comments, the FEC decided not to promulgate a new definition of "political committee" but instead to continue its longstanding practice of determining each organization's major purpose through a case-by-case analysis of an organization's conduct. The published notice of this decision explained that while the "major purpose" test can be satisfied "through sufficiently extensive spending on federal campaign activity," 72 Federal Register 5595, 5601, a fact-intensive analysis of each organization's conduct, including public statements, fundraising appeals and spending on other activity, can be instructive in evaluating the organization's campaign activities compared to its activities unrelated to campaigns. Id. at 5601 through 602.

The Act defines "contribution" to include "any gift, subscription, loan, advance or deposit of money or anything of value made by any person for the purposes of influencing any election for federal office." 2 United States Code, Section

431(8)(A)(i). The Act requires "any person" who "solicits any contribution through any broadcasting station, newspaper, magazine, outdoor advertising facility, mailing or any other type of general public political advertising" to include a specified disclaimer in the solicitation. *Id.*, Section 441d(a); and see also 11 C.F.R., Section 110.11(a)(3).

Plaintiff wishes to pay for advertisements in various media outlets that will bring to light a variety of public issues such as gun rights, land rights, environmental policy, healthcare and free speech, including their connection with public servants and candidates for public office. Free Speech plans to run these advertisements from the present to November and further speak about related issues as they arise between November as well. See the *Complaint*, at Paragraph 13.

Plaintiff seeks to finance and distribute these communications without registering as a political committee or complying with the disclaimer and disclosure obligations required for certain types of campaign-related communications. Free Speech also intends to solicit donations of funds to finance additional unidentified advertisements well beyond the 2012 electoral cycle. Plaintiff represents it is not under the control of any federal candidate nor does it have, as its major purpose, the election or defeat of clearly identified candidates for federal office -- see Complaint, Paragraph 14 -- and plaintiff insists it intends to engage solely in "issue"

advocacy." Plaintiff's first cause of action alleges Section 100.22(b) is unconstitutional on its face because it goes "beyond any proper construction of express advocacy and offers no clear guidance -- or guidelines for speakers to tailor their constitutionally protected conduct and speech, and it fails "to limit its application to expenditures for communications that in express terms advocate the election or defeat of a clearly identified candidate for federal office" in accordance with Buckley. See Complaint, Paragraphs 74 and 75.

Plaintiff alleges that Section 100.22(b) is unconstitutional as applied because the FEC "maintains a practice of applying a variety of ad hoc, case-by-case factors in each enforcement matter, advisory opinion and consideration of the regulation in question." See Complaint at Paragraph 76; and the FEC applies it to cover protected "issue advocacy" communications. Complaint, at Paragraph 77.

Plaintiff's second cause of action alleges that
Section 100.22(b) is unconstitutional because the "heavy
regulations and compliance requirements" associated with the
FEC's arbitrary classification of some speech as express
advocacy acts as the functional equivalent of a prior
restraint. See Complaint, Paragraphs 81 and 82. Plaintiff's
third cause of action alleges it cannot realistically raise
funds or seek donations due to the cumbersome application of
the FEC's unconstitutionally vague solicitation standards,

inhibiting it from "associating with like-minded individuals and speaking out to raise awareness of issues." *Complaint*, at Paragraph 87.

Finally, plaintiff's fourth cause of action alleges that the FEC's application of the "major purpose" test to determine political committee status is unconstitutional because it evaluates more than an organization's independent expenditures and founding documents. See Complaint, at Paragraph 103. By the present motion, plaintiff seeks a preliminary injunction enjoining the FEC from enforcing the challenged provisions and policies facially and as applied until a final hearing on the merits may be held.

The standard of review applicable to this matter requires that to obtain an extraordinary remedy of a preliminary injunction, plaintiff must show that four factors weigh in its favor: One, it is substantially likely to succeed on the merits; two, it will suffer irreparable injury if the injunction is denied; three, its threatened injury outweighs the injury the opposing party will suffer under the injunction; and, four, the injunction would not be adverse to the public interest. See Awad, A-W-A-D, versus Ziriax, Z-I-R-I-A-X, 670 F.3d 1111, at 1125, Tenth Circuit 2012, citing Winter versus Natural Resource Defense Council, 555 U.S. 7 at 20, 2008. Preliminary injunctions that alter the status quo or afford the movant all the relief that it will recover at the

conclusion of a full trial on the merits are disfavored and must be more closely scrutinized. *Id.* In such instances, the moving party must make "a strong showing both with regard to the likelihood of success on the merits and with regard to the balance of harms." *Id.* 

Plaintiff argues that because the FEC's regulatory structure acts as the functional equivalent of a prior restraint, it asserts that strict scrutiny is warranted to review of its claims. At the core of plaintiff's challenges, however, are rules and policies which implement only the disclosure requirements. The question before the Court is not whether plaintiff can make expenditures for the speech it proposes nor raise money without limitation but simply whether it must provide disclosure of it's electoral advocacy.

Controlling precedent does not support an argument that strict scrutiny is applicable. As noted, "disclaimer and disclosure requirements may burden the ability to speak, but they impose no ceiling on campaign-related activities and do not prevent anyone from speaking. The Court has subjected these requirements to 'exacting scrutiny', which requires a 'substantial relation' between the disclosure requirement and a 'sufficiently important' governmental interest. See Citizens United versus FEC, 558 U.S. 310. See also RTAA versus FEC, 681 F.3d 544. Similarly, the Tenth Circuit has noted that regulations requiring disclosure, as distinguished from

regulations that limit the amount of speech a group may undertake, are subject to the "exacting scrutiny." See

New Mexico Youth Organized versus Herrera, 611 F.3d 669, 676,
2010 Tenth Circuit decision.

The disclosure and organizational requirements for independent expenditures and political committees "are not as burdensome on speech as are limits imposed on campaign activities or limits imposed on contributions to the expenditures by campaigns." RTAA, 681 F.3d, at 548.

Accordingly, an intermediate level of scrutiny known as "exacting scrutiny" is the appropriate standard to apply in reviewing provisions that impose disclosure requirements such as the regulation and policy at issue here. See RTAA, at 549.

In terms of the issue as to the constitutionality of 11 C.F.R., Section 1000 -- or 100.22(b), "Citizens United supports the FEC's use of a functional equivalent test in defining 'express advocacy.' If mandatory disclosure requirements are permissible when applied to ads that merely mention a federal candidate, then applying the same burden to ads that go further and are the functional equivalent of express advocacy cannot automatically be impermissible." See RTAA, 681 F.3d 551-52.

"The language of Section 100.22(b) is consistent with the test for the functional equivalent of express advocacy that was adopted in Wisconsin Right to Life, a test that the

controlling opinion specifically stated was not impermissibly vague." Id., at 552, citing FEC versus Wisconsin Right to Life, at 474, Footnote 7.

"Although it is true that the language of Section 100.22(b) does not exactly mirror the functional equivalent definition in Wisconsin Right to Life, the difference between the two tests are not meaningful. Indeed, the test under Section 100.22(b) is likely narrower than the one articulated in Wisconsin Right to Life since it requires a communication to have an 'electoral portion' that is unmistakable and unambiguous." RTAA, at 552.

The fact that the FEC could not conclusively agree as to whether certain of plaintiff's proposed ads constituted express advocacy under its regulations and policies does not make Section 100.22(b) unconstitutionally vague. This fact proves little because cases that fall close to the line will inevitably arise when applying Section 100.22(b). This kind of difficulty is simply inherent in any kind of standards-based test. See RTAA, at 554. It also may reflect the inherent problem in an equal number of commissioners and the unfortunate political divide; but, in any event, that does not invalidate the process.

Turning to whether the disclosure requirements triggered by 100.22(b) act as a prior restraint. "In *Buckley*, the Supreme Court explained that disclosure could be justified

based on a governmental interest in providing the electorate with information about the sources of election-related spending." See Citizens United at 914. It "upheld a disclosure requirement for independent expenditures even though it invalidated a provision that imposed a ceiling on those expenditures." See Citizens United at 915.

In this case, plaintiff fails to demonstrate how any of the challenged provisions, none of which impose any restrictions or limitations on its speech, function as a prior restraint. The plaintiff appears to seek to expand the discussion in *Citizens United* as to the formation of a PAC and the burdens imposed upon going through that process, but this Court does not find that those same burdens are analogous in this case and thus do not act as a prior restraint or the equivalent of the same.

As to the constitutionality of the solicitation standard, in evaluating whether plaintiff's donation requests would constitute "solicitations" of contributions, the FEC employed the Second Circuit's test: Disclosure is required "if a communication contains solicitations clearly indicating that the contributions will be targeted to the election or defeat of a clearly identified candidate for federal office." FEC versus Survival Education Fund, Incorporated, 65 F.3d 285, at 295; Second Circuit 1995, "SEF" hereinafter. Draft B found two of plaintiff's proposed donation requests will solicit

contributions and two will not. *Complaint*, Exhibit C, at page 17. Draft B of the opinion of the FEC reasonably applies -- of the advisory opinion, I should state, reasonably applies the *SEF* standard for solicitations in reaching this conclusion.

The Second Circuit, in SEF, recognized that the disclosure requirements for solicitations "serve important First Amendment values. Potential contributors are entitled to know that they are supporting independent critics of a candidate and not a group that may be in league with that candidate's opponent. Section 441d(a)(3) is thus 'a reasonable and minimally restrictive method,' Buckley, 424 U.S., at 82, of ensuring open electoral competition that does not unduly trench upon an individual's First Amendment rights." SEF, 65 F.3d at 296.

I would add: Based upon Citizens United's analysis and the allowance of corporate contributions, the reporting requirements become even more significant because the corporate structure does not allow identification of the individual who is making the speech at issue.

The constitutionality -- as to the constitutionality of the "major purpose" test and "political committee status": "Following Buckley, the Commission adopted a policy of determining PAC status on a case-by-case basis. See Political Committee Status, 72 Federal Register 5595, 5596-97, this '2007 Notice.' Under this approach, the Commission first considers a

group's political activities such as spending on a particular 'electoral' or 'issue advocacy' campaign -- see *Id.* at 5601 -- and then it evaluates an organization's 'major purpose' as revealed by that group's public statements, fundraising appeals, government filings and organizational documents." See *Id.*, *RTAA*, 681 F.3d at 555.

In deciding not to adopt a statutory definition of a PAC, the FEC explained that "applying the 'major purpose' doctrine requires the flexibility of a case-by-case analysis of an organization's conduct that is incompatible with a one-size-fits-all rule." 72 Federal Register at 5601. The 2007 notice also "explained the framework for establishing political committee status under FECA and discussed several recently resolved administrative matters that provide considerable guidance to all organizations regarding political committee status." 72 Federal Register, at 5595-96.

"Although Buckley did create the 'major purpose' test, it did not mandate a particular methodology for determining an organization's major purpose, and thus the Commission was free to administer FECA political committee regulations either through categorical rules or through individualized adjudications." See RTAA, 681 F.3d, at 556.

"The necessity of a contextual inquiry is supported by judicial decisions applying the 'major purpose' test which have used the same fact-intensive analysis that the Commission has

adopted." RTAA at 557. The Commission, in its policy, adopted a sensible approach to determining whether an organization qualifies for PAC status; and, more importantly, the Commission's multi-factor 'major purpose' test is consistent with Supreme Court precedent and does not unlawfully deter protected speech. Accordingly, we find the policy constitutional." That's RTAA at 558.

This Court similarly finds the policy constitutional in this matter; and because the Court finds the plaintiff has failed to establish a substantial likelihood of success on the merits of its actions, the plaintiff is not entitled to a preliminary injunction in this matter and will therefore deny the requested preliminary injunction.

I will direct a minute order be entered, incorporating by reference this Court's oral ruling which has been transcribed or placed on transcript by the court reporter.

Are there any questions regarding the matter at this point in time, Mr. Barr?

MR. BARR: There are no questions on plaintiff's end.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Kolker or Ms. Chlopak?

MS. CHLOPAK: No. No questions here, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Very well.

MR. VASSALLO: Your Honor, this is Nick Vassallo. I just wanted to note for the record that I had joined the call a few minutes before you came on the line.

```
23
             THE COURT: Very well, Mr. Vassallo. So noted.
1
             Thank you all. Have a good day.
2
3
             MR. BARR: Thank you.
             MS. CHLOPAK: Thank you.
4
             THE COURT: Court will stand in recess.
5
        (The proceedings conclude at 9:05 a.m.)
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

REPORTER CERTIFICATE I, JAMIE L. HENDRICH, Official Federal Court Reporter in the United States District Court for the District of Wyoming, certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter. \_10.17.12\_\_ /s/\_ Date JAMIE L. HENDRICH, CSR-RPR-CRR Official Federal Court Reporter 

Page: 96

13:14,24 14:9,14,16 14:22 15:2,8 20:1 compliance 14:19 comply 11:17 complying 13:17 comprised 4:19 concerns 6:10 conclude 8:5 23:6 conclusion 7:14 8:15 16:1 20:4 conclusively 18:12 conduct 12:12,17 14:5 21:10 Congress 9:18 congressman 9:16 connection 13:10 considerable 21:15 consideration 14:13 considering 12:8 considers 20:25 consistent 17:23 22:4 constitute 19:18 constituted 18:13 constitutional 4:13,22 8:6 22:7,8 constitutionality 5:16 17:14 19:16 20:20,20 constitutionally 4:21 7:17 14:5 construction 14:3 containing 10:7 contains 19:20 context 9:24 contextual 21:23 continue 12:10 contributed 10:18 contribution 12:22 13:2 contributions 6:7 10:23 11:2,12 17:8 19:18,21 20:1,16 contributors 20:7 control 4:24 11:9 13:22 controlled 11:11 controlling 16:15 18:1 coordination 9:6 core 16:9 corporate 6:22 7:7 8:12,18 20:16,17 corporation 7:3 corporations 6:17 7:10 correct 24:4 corruption 6:3 Council 3:15 15:23 counsel 4:1 court 1:1 2:2 4:1,4,4 4:10,14,16 6:14,17,24

7:1,5,8,16,21,25 8:4 8:11,15,21 11:7 16:11 16:19 18:25 19:13 22:5,8,9,16,20,22 23:1,5,5 24:2,3,7 Courthouse 2:3 Court's 6:15 22:15 cover 14:15 create 21:17 critics 20:8 CSR-RPR-CRR 2:2 cumbersome 14:24 curtailed 5:25 cycle 13:21 C.F.R 5:10 9:14 10:20 12:7 13:6 17:15

dangers 8:21 date 10:17 12:2 24:6 David 1:19 day 23:2 DC 1:21 decided 12:9

D

decided 12:9 deciding 21:7 decision 6:15 7:1,6 11:16 12:13 17:4 decisions 21:24 defeat 6:12,21 9:5,22

9:25 10:8,12 13:23 14:7 19:21 defendant 1:7,19 4:9

4:14 **Defense** 3:15 15:23

defined 6:19 9:4,9,15 11:3

defines 10:21 12:22 defining 17:17 definition 5:11 8:25 11:7 12:9 18:6 21:7

Democratic 9:17 demonstrate 19:7

denied 15:18 deny 22:12

deposit 9:10 12:23 described 9:21

designated 11:25

Despite 7:14 deter 22:5

determinations 5:19 determine 15:6

determining 12:11 20:23 21:18 22:2

differ 10:11 difference 18:6 difficulty 18:18

difficulty 18:18 direct 7:2 22:14 directly 6:8 disbursements 11:21 disclaimer 7:18,20,21 8:5 13:5,17 16:16 disclaimers 12:5 disclose 11:25 disclosure 7:19,20,22 8:2,5,7 10:17 11:18 11:19 13:17 16:11,14 16:17,21,25 17:5,12 17:17 18:23,25 19:4 19:19 20:6 discussed 21:13 discussion 19:11 disfavored 16:1 distinction 8:21 distinctions 8:8 distinguished 16:25 distribute 13:15 distribution 9:10 District 1:1,1,10 2:3 24:3,3 divide 18:21 doctrine 21:9 documents 15:8 21:5 doing 6:24 donation 19:17,25 donations 13:19 14:24 Draft 19:24 20:2 drawn 8:8 due 14:24

E

E 1:21 Education 3:7 19:23 either 6:19 21:20 elect 10:12 election 1:6,20 3:10,14 4:5,9,14 6:2,12,16,21 6:23 8:10 9:3,5,12,25 10:6,7 11:4,10,13,15 12:25 13:23 14:7 19:21 electioneering 6:20,22 7:12 elections 5:24 election-related 19:2 electoral 10:9 13:21 16:14 18:10 20:12 21:2 electorate 19:1 emails 12:7 employed 19:19 encompass 11:3,8 encourages 10:12,13 enforcement 4:15 5:17 14:13

enforcing 15:10

engage 5:4 13:25 enjoin 4:14 enjoining 15:10 ensuring 20:12 entered 22:14 entitled 20:7 22:11 environmental 4:23 13:9 **equal** 18:20 equally 7:15 equivalent 5:14 8:16 8:19,22 14:21 16:7 17:16,20,24 18:5 19:15 Erin 1:19 establish 22:10 establishing 21:12 et 10:2 evaluates 15:7 21:3 evaluating 12:19 19:17 event 18:21 events 10:5 evils 5:25 evolution 5:23 exacting 8:1 16:20 17:2,11 exactly 18:5 exceed 11:12 exceptions 11:22 excess 10:24,25 Exhibit 5:2,2 20:1 exist 8:23 expand 19:10 expenditure 9:4,4,9 10:18 12:4 expenditures 6:9,10 6:13,19,22 7:3,8,15 10:15,25 11:2,12 12:2 14:6 15:8 16:12 17:6 17:9 19:4,6 expenses 11:20 explained 12:13 18:25 21:8.12 express 5:11,19 8:14 8:16 14:3,7,20 17:17 17:21,24 18:14 expressly 6:20 9:5,14 extensive 12:15 extent 5:25 8:9 external 10:5 extraordinary 15:14

face 14:2 facial 5:10 facially 15:11 facility 13:3

fact 18:12,15 factors 14:12 15:15 fact-intensive 12:16 21.25 failed 22:10 fails 14:5 19:7 fall 18:16 favor 15:16 February 4:19 FEC 3:6,7,9 5:8 10:16 11:19 12:9 14:11,15 15:10 16:23,23 18:2 18:12 19:18,22 20:2 21:8 FECA 6:2 7:10 21:13,20 FEC's 5:17 14:20,25 15:5 16:6 17:16 federal 1:6,20 2:2 3:10 3:14 4:5,9,12,14 6:1 6:5,8,11,16,17,23 8:10 9:3,12 11:4,13 11:15 12:15,15,25 13:22,24 14:8 17:19 19:22 20:24 21:11,16 24:2,7 file 10:16 11:19 filed 5:7 filings 21:5 final 15:12 Finally 15:4 finance 7:12 13:15,20 finances 10:15 find 19:13 22:6 finds 4:16 22:8,9 first 5:9 14:1 20:7,13 20:25 flexibility 21:9 Following 20:22 follows 4:16 Footnote 18:3 foregoing 24:4 formation 19:11 formed 4:18 found 7:17 19:24 founding 15:8 four 15:15,20 fourth 11:15 15:4 framework 5:23 21:12 free 1:3 4:4,17,20,20 4:23 5:3 13:10,11,19 21:19 freedoms 5:9 full 16:1 function 19:9 functional 5:14 8:16 8:18,22 14:21 16:7 17:16,20,24 18:5 Fund 3:7 19:23

iii 12:4 fundraising 5:4 11:3 12:18 21:4 funds 6:18 7:3,11 8:12 13:19 14:24 further 5:16 10:19,21 13:13 17:20 F.3d 3:3,8,12,14 11:15 15:22 16:24 17:3,9,22 19:23 20:13 21:6,22 G general 7:11 13:4 Georgia 9:18 gift 9:10 12:22 give 6:14 giving 6:4 go 17:20 goes 14:2 going 19:12 good 4:1,2,3 23:2 government 4:21 21:5 governmental 8:3 16:22 19:1 group 1:15 10:23 17:1 20:9 group's 21:1,4 guidance 14:4 21:15 guidelines 14:4 gun 4:24 13:9 н hand 11:20 harms 16:5 healthcare 4:25 13:10 hearing 15:12 heavy 14:18 held 7:6 8:11,17 15:12 helpful 5:22,24 Hendrich 2:2 24:2,6 hereinafter 6:2 11:16 19:24 Herrera 3:12 17:3 Hickory 9:22 hoc 14:12 holding 6:25 Honor 4:2 22:21,23 HONORABLE 1:9

I Id 8:7 12:21 13:5 16:2 16:5 18:2 21:2,6 identification 20:18 identified 6:13 9:6,20 10:1,8,13 13:23 14:8 19:22 identifies 10:17 identify 5:24 12:5 impermissible 17:21 impermissibly 18:1 implement 16:10 important 8:3 9:1 16:22 20:6 importantly 22:3 impose 7:23 16:18 17:12 19:8 imposed 6:7 17:7,8 19:5,12 include 12:22 13:4 including 4:23 12:2,17 13:10 incompatible 21:10 Incorporated 3:7 19:23 incorporating 22:14 incumbent 9:23 independent 6:10,13 6:18 7:3,8 9:4 10:15 12:2,3 15:7 17:6 19:4 independently 4:25 INDEX 3:1 indicating 19:20 individual 9:24 20:18 individualized 21:21 individuals 5:5 15:1 individual's 20:13 inevitably 18:17 influencing 9:12 11:4 12:24 information 12:1 19:2 infringement 4:13 inherent 18:18,19 inhibiting 15:1 injunction 1:9 15:10 15:15,18,19,20 22:12 22:13 injunctions 15:24 injunctive 4:11 injury 15:17,18,19 inquiry 21:23 insists 13:25 instances 16:2 instructive 12:19 intends 13:19,25 inter 10:17 interest 8:3 15:21 16:22 19:1 interests 8:17 intermediate 17:10 interpretation 5:17

interpreted 10:6

invalidate 18:21

invalidated 19:5

involved 8:20

irreparable 15:17 issue 8:9,13,16,19,23 13:25 14:15 17:13,14 20:19 21:2 issues 4:23 5:4,21 6:14 9:1 13:9,13 15:2

Jamie 2:2 24:2,6 John 1:12 joined 22:24 JUDGE 1:10 judicial 21:24 July 5:7 justified 18:25 justify 8:17,19

K kind 10:13 18:17,18 Klein 1:14 4:6 know 20:8 known 10:22 17:10 Kolker 1:19 4:8 22:20

L 2:2 24:2,6 land 4:24 13:9 Lane 1:17 language 17:23 18:4 large 6:4 law 5:23 6:17 8:8 laws 6:1 lay 5:22 league 20:9 level 17:10 LIBERTY 1:15 Life 3:9 8:10,20,24 17:25 18:3,6,9 light 13:8 likelihood 16:4 22:10 like-minded 5:5 15:1 limit 6:3 14:6 17:1 limitation 16:13 limitations 6:7 19:9 limited 4:21 10:5 11:21 limiting 11:7 limits 17:7,8 line 18:16 22:25 listing 9:20 little 18:16 loan 9:10 12:23 longstanding 12:10

magazine 13:3 mailing 13:3 maintains 11:24 14:11 major 5:18 11:9,13

12:11,14 13:22 15:5 20:21 21:3,8,17,19,24 22:4 making 8:20 20:19 mandate 21:18 mandatory 17:17 Maryland 1:18 mass 12:7 matter 4:4,10,17 14:13 15:13 22:9,12,17 24:5 matters 21:14 McConnell 3:10 6:23 7:9,13,25 8:6 McKay 9:19 meaning 9:25 10:10 meaningful 18:7 measured 8:25 media 5:6 13:8 mention 17:19 merely 17:18 merit 8:25 merits 15:12,17 16:1,4 22:11 method 20:11 methodology 21:18 Mexico 3:12 17:3 Michigan 3:2 6:25 Michigan's 7:2 minds 10:11 minimally 20:11 minute 22:14 minutes 22:25 mirror 18:5 mission 4:20 Mondale 10:3 money 6:4,5,18 7:11 9:10 12:23 16:13 morning 4:1,2,3 motion 1:9 4:11 15:9 movant 15:25 moving 16:3 multi-factor 22:4

narrowed 11:7 narrower 18:8 Natural 3:15 15:23 necessity 21:23 new 3:12 12:9 17:3 newspaper 13:2 Nicholas 1:22 Nick 22:23 Nixon's 10:2 nomination 11:10,13 nominee 9:17 nonprofit 4:18 note 4:6 7:16 22:24 noted 7:21 8:15,21

16:16,24 23:1 Noti 1:20 4:8 notice 12:13 20:25 21:12 November 13:12,14 number 4:5 18:20

NW 1:21

# 0

obligations 13:17 obtain 15:14 OCTOBER 1:5 offers 14:3 office 1:23 6:5,8,9,11 7:4 9:12 11:4 12:25 13:11,24 14:8 19:22 Official 2:2 24:2,7 Old 9:21 one-size-fits-all 21:11 open 20:12 operate 4:25 operating 11:20 opinion 14:13 18:1 20:2,3 opponent 20:10 opposed 7:4 8:13 12:3 opposing 15:19 oral 1:8 22:15 order 5:21 22:14 orders 4:16 organization 10:14 11:10 22:2 organizational 11:18 17:5 21:5

organizations 11:8

organization's 12:11

Organized 3:12 17:3

outdoor 13:3 outlets

13:8 outweighs

overruled 7:5,9

15:18 overly 5:12

12:12,17,19 15:7 21:3

21:15

21:10,19

PAC 10:22 11:7.11.24 19:11 20:23 21:8 22:3 PACs 11:25 12:5 page 2:1 20:1 Paragraph 5:20 13:14 13:24 14:14,16 15:3,9 Paragraphs 5:2 14:9 14:22 part 6:14 particular 21:1,18

19:9.14

problem 18:20

parties 5:1 party 9:7 15:19 16:3 pay 13:7 payment 9:9 perceived 5:25 periodic 11:19 permissible 7:17 17:18 person 6:12 9:11 10:7 10:14 12:24 13:1 personal 4:24 persons 10:23 pertained 8:7 phrases 9:15 picture 9:22 placed 22:16 plaintiff 1:4,12 4:7,12 4:17 5:7,8,9,16 13:7 13:15,21,25 14:10 15:9,15 16:6,12 19:7 19:10 22:9,11 plaintiffs 4:7 plaintiff's 1:9 4:10 8:25 14:1,17,22 15:4 16:9 18:13 19:17,25 22:19 plans 13:12 point 22:18 policies 4:16 15:11 16:10 18:14 policy 4:24 13:9 17:13 20:22 22:1,6,8 political 4:23 5:1,1,4 5:15,18,23 6:5 9:7 10:14,21 11:17 12:6 12:10 13:4,16 15:6 17:6 18:21 20:21,23 21:1,13,15,20 portion 7:9 10:9 18:10 positions 4:22 5:5 posters 10:1 Potential 20:7 practice 12:11 14:12 precedent 8:24 16:15 22:5 precluding 7:10 preclusion 6:21 7:14 preliminary 1:9 4:11 15:10,15,24 22:12,13 presence 4:6,7 present 13:12 15:9 presented 9:2 president 9:16 prevent 7:24 16:19 primary 6:1 prior 5:14 6:15,25 14:21 16:7 18:24

Procedure 4:12 proceedings 23:6 24:5 process 5:17 18:22 19:12 prohibited 6:17 promote 4:20 promulgate 12:9 proper 14:3 proposed 18:13 19:25 proposes 16:13 protect 4:20 protected 14:5,15 22:6 proves 18:16 provide 16:14 21:14 provides 10:4 providing 19:1 provision 19:5 provisions 4:15 8:7 15:11 17:12 19:8 proximity 10:6 pro-choice 9:19,21 pro-life 9:19,21 public 5:5 11:20 12:6,8 12:17 13:4,8,11,11 15:20 21:4 published 12:13 purchase 9:9 purpose 5:19 6:1 11:4 11:9,13 12:11,14 13:23 15:5 20:21 21:3,8,17,19,24 22:4 purposes 9:11 12:24 pursuant 4:11 P.O 1:23

qualifies 22:3 question 14:14 16:11 questions 22:17,19,21 quo 15:24

## R

R 1:14,19 raise 14:23 15:2 16:13 raised 5:21 reach 11:8 reaching 8:15 20:4 reaffirming 8:6 Reagan/Bush 10:3 Real 3:13 11:14 realistically 14:23 reasonable 9:25 10:7 10:11 20:10 reasonably 20:2,3 receipts 11:21 receives 10:23 receiving 12:8 recess 23:5

recognized 20:5
record 22:24 24:5
records 11:24
recover 15:25
reelect 9:16
reference 10:5 22:15
reflect 18:19
regard 16:3,4
regarding 5:17 6:10
21:15 22:17
register 11:11,18
12:16 20:24 21:11,16
registering 13:16
registration 5:13
regularly 12:1
regulation 14:14 17:13
regulations 5:8 14:19
16:25 17:1 18:14
21:20
regulatory 4:15 5:23
16:6
reject 9:23
related 13:13
relation 8:2 16:21
relied 6:24
relief 4:11 15:25
remedy 15:14
report 10:17
Reported 2:2
reporter 2:2 22:16
24:1,2,7 reporting 5:13 20:16
reports 11:19 12:1
represents 13:21
Republican 9:17
requested 22:13
requests 19:17,25
require 4:25
required 8:3 10:16
13:18 19:19
requirement 16:21
19:4
requirements 5:13
7:19,21,22 8:1,5
11:18 14:19 16:11,17
16:20 17:5,12,18
18:23 20:6,17
requires 8:2 13:1
15:14 16:20 18:9
21:9
requiring 16:25
residents 4:19
resolved 21:14
Resource 3:15 15:23
respect 8:23
restraint 5:14 14:22
16:8 18:24 19:10,14
restricting 8:18,19

restriction 7:2 restrictions 7:7 8:12 restrictive 20:11 resulting 6:4 revealed 21:4 review 15:13 16:9 reviewing 17:12 right 3:9 8:10,20,23 17:25 18:2,6,9 22:20 rights 4:13,24,24 13:9 13:9 20:13 rise 6:14 Rockville 1:18 Room 2:3 RTAA 11:16 16:23 17:9 17:13,22 18:11,19 21:6,22 22:1,7 rule 4:11 21:11 rules 4:12 16:10 21:21 ruling 1:8 22:15 run 5:3 13:12 running 6:9 s S 24:6 satisfied 12:14

scheduled 12:1

scrutinized 16:2

**SCOTT** 1:9

scrutiny 8:1 16:8,16,20 17:2,10,11 second 14:17 19:19,24 Section 5:11 6:6 7:7,10 7:20 9:8,12,14 10:4 10:19,20 11:1 12:7,25 13:5,6 14:1,10,18 17:15,23 18:4,8,15,17 20:10 Sections 11:5,23 12:4 see 5:1,19 7:12 8:23 9:7,12 10:19 11:5,14 11:23 13:6,14,24 14:9 14:14,22 15:8,21 16:22,23 17:2,13,21 18:19 19:3,6 20:23 21:2,5,22 seek 14:24 19:10 seeks 4:13 5:3,4 13:15 SEF 19:24 20:4,5,13 **Senate** 9:18 sensible 22:2 separately 11:25 Stephen 1:14 servants 13:11 stickers 10:2 serve 20:6 Street 1:21 session 4:4 strict 16:8,16

set 6:1 show 15:15 showing 16:3" significant 7:15 20:17 similarly 16:24 22:8 simply 16:13 18:18 SKAVDAHL 1:9 slogans 9:24 Smith 9:18 Snyder 1:13 solely 13:25 solicit 13:19 19:25 solicitation 5:18 13:5 14:25 19:16 solicitations 19:18,20 20:4,6 solicits 13:1 sought 5:25 sources 19:2 South 2:3 speak 7:22 13:13 16:17 speakers 14:4 speaking 7:25 15:2 16:19 specifically 5:9 18:1 specified 13:5 speech 1:3 4:5,18,21 4:23 5:3,15 6:19,20 8:16,17,18,20,22 13:10,11,19 14:5,20 16:12 17:1,7 19:9 20:19 22:6 Speech's 4:20 Speight 1:12 4:6 spending 6:5 11:3 12:15.18 19:3 21:1 **stand** 23:5 standard 15:13 17:11 19:17 20:4 standards 14:25 standards-based 18:18 state 7:2,4 20:3 stated 4:20 18:1 statements 12:17 21:4 States 1:1,10,23 6:6,15 7:7,19 9:8 10:19 11:1 11:23 12:25 24:3 station 13:2 status 5:18 15:6,24 20:21,23,24 21:13,16 22:3 statutory 5:22 8:11 11:7 21:7

strong 16:3 structure 16:7 20:18 subject 17:2 subjected 8:1 16:19 subscription 12:23 Subsection 10:4 substantial 8:2 16:21 22:10 substantially 15:16 succeed 15:16 success 16:4 22:10 suffer 15:17,19 sufficiently 8:3 12:14 16:22 suggestive 10:10 Suite 1:15 sums 6:4 support 5:5 9:16 16:15 supported 7:4 12:3 21:23 supporting 20:8 supports 17:16 supra 7:25 8:4 Supreme 6:15,16,24 7:1,5 8:11 11:6 18:25 Survival 3:7 19:23 S.Ct.876 3:6

### ٦

T1:17

tailor 14:4 taken 10:4 targeted 19:21 TELEPHONIC 1:8 Tenth 15:22 16:24 17:4 terms 9:1 11:2 14:7 17:14 test 5:19 12:14 15:5 17:16,24,25 18:7,19 19:19 20:21 21:17,24 22:4 tests 5:18 18:7 Thank 23:2,3,4 third 14:23 Thomes 1:15 threatened 15:18 three 4:19 15:18 threshold 11:22 time 22:18 Title 6:6 7:6,19 9:7,13 10:20 11:1,23 total 11:20 transactions 11:22 transcribed 22:16 transcript 1:8 22:16 24.4 treasurer 11:24

			30
treasury 6:18 7:11	13:7	111 2:3	431(8)(A)(i) 11:5 13:1
trench 20:12	Vassallo 1:22 22:23,23	<b>1111</b> 3:3 15:22	431(9)(A)(i) 9:13 11:5
trial 16:1	23:1	<b>1125</b> 3:3 15:22	<b>433</b> 11:23
	versus 4:5 6:16,23,25	12-CV-127 4:6	<b>434</b> 11:23
triggered 18:24		12-CV-127-SWS 1:4	434(b)(4)(H)(iii) 12:4
triggers 5:13	8:10 11:6,14 15:21,23		
true 18:4	16:23,23 17:3 18:2	13 13:14	<b>434(c)</b> 10:19
Truth 3:13 11:14	19:22	<b>130</b> 3:6 6:16	441a 6:6
turn 11:3	vote 9:16,19,19,21	<b>14</b> 13:24	441b's 7:7
Turning 18:23	<b>VS</b> 1:5	<b>15</b> 3:4,16	441d 7:20
two 10:11 15:17 18:7	w	<b>17</b> 3:12 20:2	441d(a) 13:6
19:24 20:1	W 1:9	19 3:8	441d(a)(3) 20:10 449 3:9 8:11
type 13:4	wall 8:24	1902 1:15	
types 13:18	wanted 22:24	<b>1971</b> 6:2 9:3	470 8:24 474 18:3
U	warranted 16:8	1976 3:5 11:6 1990 3:2 7:1	494 3:2 7:1
unambiguous 10:10	Washington 1:21		494 3.2 7.1
_	, -	<b>1995</b> 3:8 19:24	5
18:11 unconstitutional 7:6	website 12:6	2	<b>540</b> 3:11 6:23
	weigh 15:16	<b>2</b> 2:1,1 5:20 6:6 7:6,19	<b>544</b> 3:14 11:15 16:24
8:14 14:2,11,18 15:6	went 8:4 Winter 3:15 15:22		<b>544</b> 3:14 11:15 16:24 <b>548</b> 17:9
unconstitutionally		9:7,13 10:20 11:1,23	<b>549</b> 17:13
5:12 14:25 18:15	Wisconsin 3:9 8:10,20	12:25 2d 3:8	<b>551</b> 3:9 8:11
understand 5:21	8:23 17:25 18:2,6,9	<b>20</b> 3:16 15:23	<b>551-52</b> 17:22
undertake 17:2	wishes 13:7	200-dollar 11:22	<b>552</b> 18:2,11
unduly 20:12	Wolcott 2:3		<b>554</b> 18:19
unfortunate 18:20	words 9:24	2003 3:11 6:24	<b>555</b> 3:14,16 11:15
unidentified 13:20	Wyoming 1:1,6,13,15	2007 3:9 8:11 12:8	
unincorporated 4:18	1:16,24 2:4 4:19 24:4	20:24 21:12	15:23 21:6
unions 6:18 7:11	Υ	2008 3:16 15:24	<b>556</b> 21:22
United 1:1,10,23 3:6	year 10:16,24 11:1	201 1:15 7:25	<b>557</b> 22:1
6:6,15,16 7:5,6,9,12	Youth 3:12 17:3	2010 3:6,12 6:17 17:4	<b>558</b> 3:6 16:23 22:7
7:16,17,19,21 8:4 9:7	Youth 3:12 17:3	2012 1:5 3:4,14 4:19	<b>5595</b> 12:16 20:24
10:19 11:1,23 12:25	Z	5:7 11:16 13:21	<b>5595-96</b> 21:16
16:23 17:15 19:3,6,11	Ziriax 3:3 15:21	15:22	<b>5596-97</b> 20:24
24:3	Z-I-R-I-A-X 15:21	203 7:13	<b>5601</b> 12:16,21 21:2,11
United's 20:15	2-1-K-1-A-X 15.21	20463 1:21	6
unlawfully 22:5	\$	205 7:13	<b>6</b> 3:2,6,11 12:4
unmistakable 10:10	\$1,000 10:24,25 11:12	20850 1:18	
18:10	\$200 10:18 12:4	21 4:19	<b>602</b> 12:21 <b>611</b> 3:12 17:3
unrelated 12:20	\$250 10:16	<b>217</b> 2:3	<b>64</b> 7:24 8:4
upheld 6:23 7:2,9 19:3	\$230 10.10	<b>26</b> 5:7	<b>65</b> 3:8 4:11 19:23
urge 9:25	1	265-5280 2:4	20:13
use 8:12 17:16	<b>1</b> 3:5 5:2,2 11:6	<b>285</b> 3:8 19:23	<b>652</b> 3:2 7:1
uses 9:15	10 5:2	<b>295</b> 3:8 19:23	668 1:23
<b>U.S</b> 2:3 3:2,5,6,9,11,16	10th 3:4,12	<b>296</b> 20:14	<b>669</b> 3:12 17:3
6:24 7:1,24 8:11 9:18	10.17.12 24:6	3	1
11:6 15:23 16:23	100.22 9:14 10:4	3 1:5	<b>670</b> 3:3 15:22
20:11	100.22(b) 5:11 14:2	<b>307</b> 2:4	<b>676</b> 3:12 17:3 <b>681</b> 3:14 11:15 16:23
v	14:10,18 17:15,23	<b>310</b> 3:6 16:23	•
	18:5,8,15,17,24	1	17:9,22 21:6,22
v 3:2,3,5,6,7,9,10,12,13	1000 17:15	<b>316(b)</b> 7:10	7
3:15	103 15:9	4	7 3:5,16 15:23 18:3
vague 5:12 14:25 18:2	<b>10737</b> 1:17	4th 3:14	<b>72</b> 12:15 20:24 21:11
18:15 Malan 3:5 11:6	109.10(e) 10:20	<b>4021</b> 1:13	21:16
Valeo 3:5 11:6	11 3:14 5:10 9:14	<b>4021</b> 1:13 <b>424</b> 3:5 7:24 11:6	<b>74</b> 14:9
value 9:11 12:24	10:20 12:7 13:6		<b>75</b> 14:9
values 20:7	17:15	20:11	
variety 13:8 14:12	110.11(a)(1) 12:7	431(17) 9:8	<b>76</b> 10:3 14:14
various 4:15,23 5:3	110.11(a)(1) 12:7	431(4)(A) 11:2	77 14:16
	TTO:TT(0)(2) 13:0		1

Appellate Case: 12-8078 Document: 01018976607 Date Filed: 01/02/2013 Page: 101

	- [	}	
8 8 3:9 8:28 1:5 81 14:22 82 14:22 20:11 82001 1:13,16 82003-0668 1:24			
<b>82601</b> 2:4 <b>87</b> 15:3 <b>876</b> 6:17 <b>9</b> <b>9:05</b> 1:5 23:6	-		
913 7:13 914 19:3 915 8:7 19:6 93 3:11 6:24 94 9:19 999 1:21			