Case: Giffords v. FEC	
Court: U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia	Docket number: 19-1192
Judge: Sullivan Magistrate:	Complaint filed: 04/24/19
Staff: S. Ward/H. Ward/Contino	FEC #: MUR 7427, MUR 7497, MUR 7524, MUR 7553 (NRA)
Related case:	

Giffords claims the Commission has unlawfully failed to act on four administrative complaints alleging that entities affiliated with the National Rifle Association violated FECA through expenditures coordinated with a number of federal candidates in the 2014, 2016, and 2018 election cycles. Plaintiff seeks injunctive and declaratory relief.

**Previous:** The district court granted summary judgment to plaintiff on September 30, 2021 and, following a status conference with the parties, authorized the filing of a private right of action on November 1, 2021. On January 26, 2024, non-parties National Rifle Association of America and National Rifle Association Political Victory Fund (collectively, "NRA") filed a Motion for Relief from Orders and Judgment. FEC filed a response on February 7, 2024. The case was stayed prior to Giffords filing a response pending issuance of the mandate in Campaign Legal Center v. 45Committee, 118 F.4th 378 (D.C. Cir. 2024). The stay was lifted on December 3, 2024.

Date	Action
01/08/25	FEC's Response to Non-Parties' Supplemental Statement
01/10/25	Plaintiff's Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Opposition to Non-Parties the National Rifle Association of America and National Rifle Association of America Political Victory Fund's Motion for Relief from Orders and Judgment Under Rule 60(b)(4)
01/14/25	Plaintiff's Motion to Admit Daniel S. Lenz Pro Hac Vice
01/14/25	Notice of Error regarding Plaintiff's Motion to Admit Daniel S. Lenz <i>Pro Hac Vice</i>
01/17/25	The National Rifle Association of America and National Rifle

	Association of America Political Victory Fund's Reply in Support of Their Motion for Relief from Orders and Judgment
01/24/25	Minute Order granting Plaintiff's Motion to Admit Daniel S. Lenz <i>Pro Hac Vice</i>
01/28/25	The Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to File a Sur-Reply in Opposition to Non-Parties the National Rifle Association of America and National Rifle Association of America Political Victory Fund's Motion for Relief from Orders and Judgment Under Rule 60(b)(4)
01/28/25	Plaintiff's Sur-Reply in Opposition to Non-Parties the National Rifle Association of America and National Rifle Association of America Political Victory Fund's Motion for Relief from Orders and Judgment Under Rule 60(b)(4)
01/31/25	Plaintiff's Appearance of Counsel (D. Lenz)

Case: Leopold, et al. v. FEC	
Court: U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia	Docket number: 20-1331
Judge: Reyes Magistrate:	Complaint filed: 05/19/20
Staff: S. Ward/Mueller FEC #: FOIA 202	
Related case:	

This FOIA matter filed by Jason Leopold and Buzzfeed, Inc. asks the court to require Transportation Security Administration, U.S. Department of Homeland Security, U.S. Agency for International Development, Office of the Director on National Intelligence, and the Commission to respond to their FOIA request and produce various records regarding the COVID-19 pandemic and the government's response to it.

Date	Action
01/21/25	The Department of Homeland Security, FEC, Office of the Director of National Intelligence, Transportation Security Administration, and the U.S. Agency for International Development's Joint Status Report

Case: NF	RSC, et al. v. FEC, et al.	
Court: Supreme Court		Docket number: 24-621
Judge:	Magistrate:	Complaint filed: 12/04/24
Staff: Bel	l/S. Ward/ Mueller/H.Ward/Golvach/Weiman	FEC #:

**Related case:** NRSC, et al. v. FEC, et al., No. 22-639 (S. D. Ohio), NRSC, et al. v. FEC, et al., No. 24-3051 (6th Cir.)

## Description:

In this case, the National Republican Senatorial Committee, National Republican Congressional Committee, James David Vance, and Steven Joseph Chabot allege that the Federal Election Campaign Act's limits on coordinated party expenditures, including those under 52 U.S.C. § 30116(d), violate the First Amendment. The Court's Opinion and Order granted plaintiffs' Motion to Certify Question to the En Banc Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit pursuant to 52 U.S.C. § 30110. Plaintiffs file a Petition for a Writ of Certiorari with the Supreme Court.

Date	Action
01/02/25	Letter from Elizabeth B. Prelogar, Solicitor General, Department of Justice to Scott S. Harris, Clerk, United States Supreme Court of the United States regarding Extension of Time
01/03/25	Motion to extend the time to file a response is granted and the time is extended to and including February 6, 2025, for all respondents
01/06/25	Brief for <i>Amicus Curiae</i> Republican Governors Association in Support of Petitioners
01/06/25	Brief of <i>Amicus Curiae</i> of Senator Mitch McConnell in Support of Petitioners
01/06/25	Brief of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America as Amicus Curiae in Support of Petitioners
01/06/25	Brief of <i>Amici Curiae</i> State of Ohio and 13 Other States in Support of the Petitioners
01/06/25	Amicus Brief of Georgia Republican Party, Inc. in Support of Petition for Writ Certiorari

01/06/25	Brief of Institute for Free Speech as <i>Amicus Curiae</i> in Support Petitioners
01/08/25	Letter from Dave Yost, Office of the Ohio Solicitor General, to Scott S. Harris, Clerk, United States Supreme Court regarding Errata
01/27/25	Letter from the Acting Solicitor General, Sarah M. Harris, Department of Justice to Scott S. Harris, Clerk, Supreme Court of the United States regarding Extension of Time
01/28/25	Motion to extend the time to file a response is granted and the time is further extended to and including March 10, 2025, for all respondents

Case: Oliver, et al. v. FEC	
<b>Court:</b> U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Ohio	Docket number: 24-1166
Judge: Knepp Magistrate: Clay	Complaint filed: 07/11/24
Staff: S. Ward/H. Ward/Coon	FEC #:
Related case:	

In this case, Plaintiffs Colleen and Steve Oliver filed suit against the Commission claiming the conduit reporting requirement at 52 U.S.C. § 30116(a)(8) is unconstitutional as applied to donations of up to \$200 and violates the First Amendment.

Previous: This case was voluntarily dismissed on November 22, 2024.

Date	Action
01/13/25	Transcript Availability of Telephone Conference held on November 19, 2024 before Judge James R. Knepp

Case: Plumbers and Pipefitters Local Union No. 9, et al	; FEC v.
Court: U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia	Docket number: 24-1450
Judge: Sooknanan Magistrate:	Complaint filed: 05/17/24
Staff: Bell/H. Ward/Mueller	FEC #:
Related case:	

Pursuant to 52 U.S.C. § 30109(a)(5)(D), (6)(A), the Commission filed this civil action to enforce a conciliation agreement against Plumbers and Pipefitters Local Union No. 9 and Plumbers and Pipefitters Local Union No. 9 Political Action Committee.

Date	Action
01/08/25	Case directly reassigned to Judge Sparkle L. Sooknanan. Judge Amit P. Mehta is no longer assigned to the case.
01/15/25	FEC's Consent Motion to File Certain Exhibits to the Complaint Under Seal
01/17/25	Order granting FEC's Consent Motion to File Certain Exhibits to the Complaint Under Seal. The documents attached as Exhibits 1 – 3 to that Motion shall be substituted for the documents currently docketed as ECF 17-1, 17-2, and 17-3. The documents currently docketed at ECF 17-1, 17-2, and 17-3, as well as the documents docketed at ECF 2-2, 2-3, 2-4, 4-2, 4-3, 4-4, shall hereby remain <i>UNDER SEAL</i> .
01/22/25	Redacted Exhibit 1 to FEC's Complaint and Redacted Exhibit 2 to Administrative Complaint and Redacted Exhibit 3 to Supplemental Administrative Complaint placed on the docket by the Court

Case: FEC v. Rivera		
<b>Court:</b> U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Florida	Docket number: 17-22643	
Judge: Cannon Magistrate: Goodman/Sanchez	Complaint filed: 07/14/17	
Staff: S. Ward/Mueller	FEC #: MUR 6655	
Related case: FEC v. Rivera, No. 22-11437 (11th Cir)		

This is an offensive suit against former U.S. Congressman David Rivera alleging knowing and willful violations of the ban on contributions in the name of another at 52 U.S.C. § 30122. The Commission alleges that Rivera engaged in a scheme to secretly fund more than \$55,000 in in-kind contributions to the primary election campaign of a rival of the candidate Rivera would eventually face in the general election to represent Florida's 26<sup>th</sup> Congressional District.

**Previous:** The court granted the FEC's motion for summary judgment and awarded a civil penalty in the amount of \$456,000.

Date	Action
01/06/25	Stipulation of Dismissal with prejudice
01/08/25	Order Closing Case and Dismissing with Prejudice

Case: Sudo	lhapas v. FEC		
Court: U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia		Docket number: 24-1312	
Judge:	Magistrate:	Complaint filed:	10/01/24
Staff: Bell/Cunningham		FEC #:	
Related cas	e:		

In this matter petitioner Kataphon Suddhapas has brought an action directly in the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals pursuant to Rule 15(a) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure and 5 U.S.C. § 702, seeking review of the FEC's correspondence of September 30, 2024, informing petitioner that his administrative complaint failed to raise any issues falling within the agency's jurisdiction. Petitioner's administrative complaint appeared to allege extremely large numbers of illegal or improper acts by the Pennsylvania Governor Josh Shapiro, Pennsylvania University Trustees and others allegedly constituting contributions to presidential candidate Kamala Harris.

Date	Action
01/17/25	Order addressing that on November 18, 2024, FEC filed a Motion to Dismiss and Response in Opposition to Motion to Transfer. Any response was due by December 2, 2024. To date, no response has been received from petitioner. As a result, the petitioner must show cause by February 18, 2025, why FEC's dispositive motion should not be considered and decided without a response. Failure by petitioner to respond to this order may result in dismissal of the case for failure to prosecute.