

BEFORE THE COMMISSIONER OF  
POLITICAL PRACTICES OF THE STATE OF MONTANA

Eaton v. Bishop No. COPP 2018-CFP-044	DISMISSAL OF COMPLAINT BASED ON APPLICATION OF PRINCIPLE OF EXCUSABLE NEGLIGENCE
--	--

On September 20, 2018, Jake Eaton of Billings filed a campaign practices complaint against Representative Laurie Bishop of Livingston. The complaint alleged that candidate Bishop failed to provide the proper level of reporting detail to describe six campaign expenditures made by her 2016 campaign.

**SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES ADDRESSED**

This decision addresses the sufficiency of expense detail when reporting campaign expenditures and services. This Complaint will be dismissed for the same reasoning and analysis set forth in *Eaton v. Dunwell*, COPP-2018-018.

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

The foundational facts necessary for this Decision are as follows:

Finding of Fact No. 1: Montana's 2016 general election was held on Tuesday, November 8, 2016. (Montana Secretary of State.)

Finding of Fact No. 2: Laurie Bishop filed a hard-copy C-1 Statement of Candidate as a Democratic candidate for HD 60 in Park County with the COPP on May 15, 2015. (Commissioner's Records.)

Finding of Fact No. 3: Laurie Bishop timely filed the required C-5 campaign finance reports throughout the 2016 election cycle. (Commissioner's Records.)

## **DISCUSSION**

The Complaint asserts that six expenditures reported by candidate Bishop failed to include sufficient detail. The Commissioner thus examines candidate Bishop's campaign finance reports as described in the complaint.

The complaint alleges failure to sufficiently detail six expenditures and debts: 1) an expense in the amount of \$27.47 to A. Boyd for labels for GOTV; 2) an expense in the amount of \$453.28 to Artcraft Printers for walk cards and shipping; 3) an expense in the amount of \$671.83 to Laurie Bishop for yard signs; 4) a debt in the amount of \$1,401.00 to Artcraft Printers for printing of four mail pieces; 5) a debt in the amount of \$1,709.14 to MTS Mailing Service for labels for GOTV; and 6) a debt in the amount of \$748.76 to Laurie Bishop for parade shirts and materials. The Commissioner dismisses allegations Nos 1 as *de minimis*, as information excluded does not substantially affect disclosure.

Finding of Fact No. 4: Candidate Bishop's 2016 campaign finance reports show five reported expenditures and debts that lack sufficient detail. (Commissioner's Records.)

The expenses and debts described in allegations 2 – 6 above require additional detail. Such generic expenditure descriptions are more akin to a list or category than a description and do not provide the “purpose, quantity, subject matter” of the expense which are the details required to be reported by 44.11.502(7), ARM. Nor, does the listing meet Montana's statutory requirement of detail required for expenditures to consultants, or other persons who perform services for or on behalf of a candidate; the law requires that such expenditures “must be itemized and described in sufficient detail to disclose

the specific services performed by the entity to which payment or reimbursement was made”, Mont. Code Ann. § 13-37-229(2)(b).

Sufficiency Finding No. 1: There are sufficient facts to show that candidate Bishop’s 2016 campaign finance report failed to disclose sufficient detail describing five campaign expenditures and debts (FOF No. 4).

Similar problems of insufficient detail in expenditure reporting under the current rules and statutes was first substantively addressed on October 3, 2016 in *MDP v. MRLCC*, COPP-2016-CFP-029, by then-Commissioner Jonathan Motl. While MRLCC’s lack of expenditure reporting detail was a violation, such a finding was, at the time (2016 election cycle) a further application of the rule and statute at issue. Thus, the violation was dismissed under the “excusable neglect” principle:

[G]iven the first time nature of this determination and the likelihood that there are other candidates and committees in a similarly deficient reporting status.

*Id.*, at 7.

The Commissioner incorporates herein by reference the in-depth review of the *MDP v. MRLCC* decision recently set out in *Eaton v. Dunwell*, 2018-CFP-018. This Complaint against Representative Bishop will be dismissed for the same reasons and pursuant to the same two safeguards.

First, no later than February 15, 2018, Representative Bishop is directed to file an amended 2016 campaign finance report providing the required “sufficient detail” for the specific expenditure noted in this decision. Second, contingent on amended campaign finance reports being filed, the Commissioner hereby excuses (dismisses) Representative Bishop from a

campaign practice violation for the deficiencies identified above based on the principle of excusable neglect.<sup>1</sup>

### **DECISION**

The Commissioner has limited discretion when making the determination as to an unlawful campaign practice. First, the Commissioner “shall investigate” any alleged violation of campaign practices law. §13-37-111(2)(a), MCA. The mandate to investigate is followed by a mandate to take action; if there is “sufficient evidence” of a violation the Commissioner must (“shall notify,” *see* §13-37-124, MCA) initiate consideration for prosecution.

Second, having been charged to make a decision, the Commissioner must follow substantive law applicable to a particular campaign practice decision. This Commissioner, having been charged to investigate and decide, hereby determines that there is sufficient evidence, as set out in this Decision, to show that Bishop’s 2016 campaign practices violated Montana’s campaign practice laws, including, but not limited to the laws set out in the Decision. Having determined that sufficient evidence of a campaign practice violation exists, the next step is to determine whether there are circumstances or explanations that may affect prosecution of the violation and/or the amount of the fine.

The failure to fully and timely report and disclose cannot generally be excused by oversight or ignorance. Excusable neglect cannot be applied to oversight or ignorance of the law as it relates to failures to file and report. *See*


---

<sup>1</sup> The Commissioner notes that Representative Bishop has agreed to amend the campaign’s 2016 finance reports to fulfill the requirements set out by the Commissioner for dismissal.

discussion of excusable neglect principles in *Matters of Vincent*, Nos. COPP-2013-CFP-006, 009. In this Matter, however, application of excusable neglect is appropriate for the reasons set out above and is therefore applied to dismiss Sufficiency Finding No. 1.

Because the findings of violation are excused by application of excusable neglect principles, this Matter is dismissed in its entirety.

DATED this 15 day of November 2018.



---

Jeffrey A Mangan  
Commissioner of Political Practices  
Of the State of Montana  
P. O. Box 202401  
1209 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
Helena, MT 59620  
Phone: (406)-444-3919