

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

John McComish, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

Jan Brewer, et al.,

Defendants.

) No. CV-08-1550-PHX-ROS

) **PROPOSED ORDER**

_____)

This case involves claims by Plaintiffs that the campaign finance regime adopted by the State of Arizona violates their free speech and equal protection rights. In short, Plaintiffs believe the campaign finance regime violates their rights because the state provides additional funds to publicly-funded candidates in the event non-publicly-funded candidates exceed certain campaign expenditure and fundraising limits. As set forth below, the regime burdens Plaintiffs' First Amendment rights, is not supported by a compelling state interest, is not narrowly tailored, and is not the least restrictive alternative.

The four cross motions for summary judgment were filed in June 2009. The parties filed responses and replies in July 2009. Beginning in late July, and continuing through September 2009, the parties made various filings regarding supplementing the record and submission of supplemental authority. In October the Court directed additional briefing on crucial issues not addressed in the parties' original submissions. The additional briefing was

1 not complete until mid-November. In December 2009 the parties continued to submit
2 additional filings, and in January 2010 Plaintiffs filed a second motion for preliminary
3 injunction. The Court ordered expedited briefing on that motion as well as supplemental
4 briefing on the appropriate scope of available remedies.

5 The record in this case is unusually large and complicated. The summary judgment
6 briefing consists of more than one hundred separate docket entries, many of which consist
7 of multiple documents and hundreds of pages. Given the complicated nature of this case, the
8 Court deemed it prudent to review in great detail the parties' submissions before issuing its
9 ruling. This ruling is issued less than two months after the parties submitted the
10 supplemental briefing.¹

11 BACKGROUND

12 1. Passage of Clean Elections Act

13 The November 1998 election contained the initiative measure known as the Citizens
14 Clean Elections Act ("Act").² According to the findings and declarations contained in that
15 initiative, the intent of the Act was "to create a clean elections system that will improve the
16 integrity of Arizona state government by diminishing the influence of special-interest money,
17 will encourage citizen participation in the political process, and will promote freedom of
18 speech." The proponents of the Act believed the election-financing system in effect at that
19 time suffered from the eight flaws that follow:

- 20 1. Allowed "elected officials to accept large campaign contributions
21 from private interests over which they have governmental jurisdiction";
- 22 2. Gave "incumbents an unhealthy advantage over challengers";

23
24 ¹ The District Court hearing the *Davis* matter took approximately ten months to issue
its opinion, and it took the Supreme Court just under one year to issue its opinion.

25
26 ² Defendants' briefing recounts various episodes of corruption in Arizona's state
27 government allegedly leading up to passage of the Act. Plaintiffs concede the episodes
28 occurred, but disagree that they were the driving force for passage of the Act. From the
record presented in the context of what constitutes admissible evidence, it is impossible to
determine the extent to which the various corruption scandals led to passage of the Act.

- 1 3. Hindered “communication to voters by many qualified candidates”;
- 2 4. Suppressed “the voices and influence of the vast majority of Arizona
- 3 citizens in favor of a small number of wealthy special interests”;
- 4 5. Undermined “public confidence in the integrity of public officials”;
- 5 6. Cost “average taxpayers millions of dollars in the form of subsidies
- 6 and special privileges for campaign contributors”;
- 7 7. Drove “up the cost of running for state office, discouraging
- 8 otherwise qualified candidates who lack personal wealth or access to
- 9 special-interest funding”; and
- 10 8. Required “elected officials spend too much of their time raising
- 11 funds rather than representing the public.”³

12 The voter information pamphlet contained various arguments “for” and “against”
13 passage of the Act. According to the arguments in favor of the Act, “it’s money that talks
14 in political campaigns and it threatens the principles of our democracy.” Also, “[a] thriving
15 system depends upon solid governance and policies that benefit all of Arizonans, not just a
16 few who can afford to ‘pay to play.’” And “[p]olls reveal that a lack of confidence in
17 government is a major factor” why individuals choose not to vote. Voting in favor of the Act
18 would “end the money chase, halt corruption, limit campaign spending and reduce special
19 interest influence.” Voting in favor of the Act would also “make sure that no lobbyist or
20 special interest can again ‘buy’ a candidate as they are doing now.”

21 The arguments against the Act in the voter information pamphlet claimed it would
22 levy “a host of new taxes, create[] a new level of bureaucracy, provide[] taxpayer funds for
23 fringe candidates, punish[] candidates who don’t want to use taxpayer funds, and limit[] free
24 speech.” The opponents believed tax dollars should be saved “for education and the safety
25 of [their] children” instead of wasted on “wacky candidates.” The Act passed with
26 approximately 51% of the vote.

27 ³ This information is taken from the Ballot Propositions Publicity Pamphlet for the
28 1998 General Election. Available at
<http://www.azsos.gov/election/1998/Info/PubPamphlet/Cover.html>

1 **2. Operation of Act**

2 The Act, as currently constituted, provides a voluntary system of campaign financing
3 in which all candidates for public office must decide whether to be a “participating
4 candidate” or a “non-participating candidate.” Participating candidates must collect a certain
5 number of five-dollar “qualifying contributions.” Once a participating candidate collects the
6 minimum number of “qualifying contributions,” he or she receives an initial grant for the
7 primary. During the primary campaign, the participating candidate will receive additional
8 funds in the form of “matching funds” if the participating candidate has a non-participating
9 opponent that spends more than the initial grant.⁴ The participating candidate will also
10 receive matching contributions if there are “independent expenditures”⁵ against the
11 participating candidate or in favor of the non-participating opponent. Participating
12 candidates cannot raise or spend money in addition to the grant.

13 In the general election, a participating candidate receives a second initial grant.
14 Matching funds are awarded if the non-participating candidate’s receipts (i.e. contributions),
15 less expenditures made during the primary campaign, exceed the second initial grant.
16 Independent expenditures trigger matching funds in the general campaign the same way they
17 triggered matching funds in the primary campaign. Matching funds cap out at three times
18 the applicable spending limit. Independent expenditures by Political Action Committees⁶

19 _____
20 ⁴ “Matching funds” are a dollar-for-dollar match minus 6% meant to compensate for
21 the fundraising expenses incurred by traditional candidates. A.R.S. § 16-952(A). The parties
22 use the terms “matching contributions” and “matching funds” interchangeably. This opinion
will use matching funds.

23 ⁵ “Independent expenditures” are defined as “expenditures by a person or political
24 committee, other than a candidate’s campaign committee, that expressly advocates the
25 election or defeat of a clearly identified candidate, that is made without cooperation or
26 consultation with any candidate or committee or agent of the candidate and that is not made
in concert with or at the request or suggestion of a candidate, or any committee or agent of
the candidate.” A.R.S. § 16-901(14).

27 ⁶ Political Action Committees are groups organized “for the purpose of influencing
28 the result of any election.” A.R.S. 16-901.

1 (“PACs”) made on behalf of a candidate—non-participating or participating—or in opposition
2 to the participating opponent also count towards the spending limit.

3 Based on this structure, a candidate is faced with the initial choice of whether to
4 participate in public funding. If the candidate decides not to participate in public funding,
5 he or she must determine how much money to spend on the race and how much time to
6 engaged in seeking fundraising. Assuming the candidate has a publicly funded opponent,
7 the candidate’s expenditures and fundraising may result in additional funds granted to that
8 opponent. Those additional funds, however, are limited. Once a non-participating candidate
9 has raised or spent more than three times the initial grant, no additional matching funds will
10 be given to the participating opponent. Simply, there are no consequences once a non-
11 participating candidate has raised or spent more than three times the initial grant.

12 **3. Participation in and Consequences of Act**

13 The Act has been in place for the past five elections.⁷ Since 2002, candidate
14 participation has varied between 52% and 67%. (Doc. 293 at 3). The parties disagree on
15 whether the Act has had an impact on total campaign spending. It is undisputed that
16 campaign spending has increased since the Act’s passage, but it is unclear whether that
17 increase can be traced to the Act. The parties also disagree on whether candidates’ spending
18 patterns show the Act has any effect on candidate behavior. Defendants assert the spending
19 patterns of candidates prove the Act has no chilling effect. According to Defendants, if the
20 Act truly is chilling speech, one would expect to find candidates spend just up to but no more
21 than the spending limit. In other words, candidates would attempt to spend the maximum
22 amount they are able to spend without triggering matching funds. Aggregate statistics show
23 candidates do not do so. But this evidence does not dispose of Plaintiffs’ claims that their
24 speech was chilled and will be chilled. For example, some of the Plaintiffs triggered
25 matching funds. Those individuals now claim they would have spent more or spent at a
26

27
28 ⁷ The Act applies to elections for statewide offices.

1 different time if matching funds were not a possibility.⁸ Accordingly, the evidence regarding
2 candidate spending does not definitively establish a chilling effect, or lack thereof.

3 **4. Plaintiffs' Statements Regarding Burden of Act**

4 Plaintiffs and Plaintiff-Intervenors are incumbents, past or future candidates for office,
5 and Political Action Committees ("PACs"). Plaintiffs were asked during discovery to
6 explain how the Act burdens their rights. Plaintiffs' testimony is somewhat scattered and
7 shows only a vague interpretation of the burden of the Act. Evidence regarding each Plaintiff
8 is recounted below.

9 **a. John McComish**

10 Plaintiff John McComish is a member of the Arizona State House of Representatives
11 who plans on running for reelection in 2010. In 2008, Mr. McComish ran as a non-
12 participating candidate. (Doc. 316). In the 2008 election, Mr. McComish had at least three
13 participating opponents. Those opponents received matching funds based on Mr.
14 McComish's expenditures as well as expenditures by third parties. Mr. McComish claims
15 the Act requires him to take steps to minimize the impact of matching funds. Mr. McComish
16 does this "by refraining from making campaign expenditures that [he] would otherwise make
17 ... or by adopting a tactic of delaying [his] expenditures in such a manner as to minimize the
18 benefit any participating candidate may receive from matching funds." This, according to
19 Mr. McComish, "amounts to self-censorship because [he] will refrain from engaging in
20 communication at times and in manners that [he] would otherwise choose in order to avoid
21 disseminating viewpoints that are hostile to [his] candidacy." (*Id.* at 5).

22 Mr. McComish also believes matching funds "discriminate against traditional
23 candidates." (Doc. 316 at 5). This "discrimination" allegedly occurs when a non-
24 participating candidate triggers matching funds to his opponents. The Court is unable to
25 conceive of how an award of matching funds "discriminates" against McComish.

26
27 ⁸ Other Plaintiffs did not spend enough to trigger matching funds, and it does not
28 appear that they stopped spending just short of the point where matching funds would be
awarded.

1 Discrimination in a general sense requires that two individuals or groups be treated
2 differently by the government. Mr. McComish and the other Plaintiffs mentioned below
3 have not explained how they have been legally disfavored by the government in comparison
4 to participating candidates.

5 **b. Nancy McLain**

6 Plaintiff Nancy McLain is a member of the Arizona House of Representatives and
7 plans on running for reelection in 2010. During the 2008 primary election, Ms. McLain
8 triggered the award of matching funds to an opponent. (Doc. 317 at 4). Independent
9 expenditures, allegedly aiding Ms. McLain, triggered additional matching funds. During the
10 most recent general election, Ms. McLain had two participating opponents. The presence of
11 these opponents made her “reluctant to fundraise . . . or personally contribute or loan money
12 to [her] campaign.” Ms. McLain did not trigger matching funds for the general election. In
13 the future, Ms. McLain plans on minimizing her fundraising and spending, or altering the
14 mode of her fundraising and spending, to lessen the impact of any matching funds. Thus,
15 matching funds allegedly require that Ms. McLain engage in “self-censorship.”

16 Like Mr. McComish, Ms. McLain claims matching funds constitute a “discriminatory
17 legal framework.” Again, it is unclear what type of discrimination Ms. McLain believes is
18 at issue.

19 **c. Tony Bouie**

20 Tony Bouie is a non-participating candidate for the Arizona House of Representatives.
21 During the 2008 primary campaign, Mr. Bouie had participating and non-participating
22 opponents. Mr. Bouie and his non-participating opponent both exceeded the spending limit
23 during the primary campaign. Thus, the participating opponent received matching funds.
24 Mr. Bouie claims his “speech was chilled from the moment [he] understood the general idea
25 of matching funds.” (Doc. 318). Mr. Bouie ceased “the promotion of [his] campaign and
26
27
28

1 [held his] campaign speech until [his] expenditures could be timed⁹ to minimize the impact
2 of matching funds provisions.” The Act caused Mr. Bouie to “self-censor until the last days
3 of the election rather than sending out mailers, making auto calls, and passing out
4 information door-to-door.”

5 **d. Dean Martin**

6 Dean Martin is the current Arizona State Treasurer and was elected to the State Senate
7 in 2000, 2002, and 2004. (Doc. 288-2 at 4). In each of his campaigns, Mr. Martin ran as a
8 non-participating candidate. Mr. Martin claims during his most recent campaign he “was
9 forced to limit [his] speech and abide by the Act’s expenditure limits or risk being further
10 outspent by [his] government-funded opponent because of the operation of the Act.” (Doc.
11 288-6 at 113). Mr. Martin states “[t]he only way [he] could avoid being massively outspent
12 by [his] opponent was to prevent the triggering of additional matching funds to [his
13 opponent’s] campaign.” (*Id.* at 114). Thus, Mr. Martin “stopped accepting contributions to
14 [his] campaign.” (*Id.*). Mr. Martin triggered a relatively small amount of matching funds in
15 the 2006 State Treasurer race. (Doc. 362-1 at 22).

16 Despite Mr. Martin’s statement that matching funds forced him to limit his speech,
17 and the fact that Mr. Martin triggered matching funds in 2006, Mr. Martin was unable during
18 his deposition to recall whether he had ever triggered matching funds. (Doc. 309-8 at 3). It
19 follows that if matching funds were a serious concern, Mr. Martin would know whether he
20 had triggered such funds. Mr. Martin also testified he has supported legislation to repeal the
21 Act, and his opposition to matching funds is based, at least in part, on the provision that if
22 you accept government funding “you’re not allowed . . . to support your own campaign over
23 a certain amount.” (*Id.* at 9). Thus, it appears that Mr. Martin’s real focus has been on public
24 funding of elections in general, and not matching funds in particular.

25
26
27

⁹ Delaying expenditures as much as possible minimizes the impact of matching funds
28 because the participating opponent will not have time to spend the matching funds.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

e. Robert Burns

Robert Burns is an Arizona State Senator. Mr. Burns was first elected in 2002, was reelected in 2008, and plans on running in the 2010 election. (Doc. 288-6 at 91). During the 2008 campaign, Mr. Burns, a non-participating candidate, exceeded the matching funds threshold. (Doc. 354 at 7). He claims “the existence of matching funds coerces traditionally funded candidates into changing their message and the timing of getting out their message, even if ultimately the amount of messaging a traditional candidate chooses to engage in does not change.”

But Mr. Burns’ deposition seems to indicate that matching funds have had little to no impact on his campaign activities. For example, Mr. Burns was unable to state whether he had reduced his campaign communications because of the possibility of triggering matching funds. (Doc. 309-11). In fact, some of his testimony seems to indicate Mr. Burns simply communicated his message to the extent he felt necessary to win. (Doc. 309-11 at 5 “If I had to spend X number of dollars to get out a–a mailer, and I had that amount of money, I would go ahead and do the mailer.”).

f. Rick Murphy

Rick Murphy is an Arizona State Representative. Mr. Murphy was elected to the Arizona House in 2004 and was reelected in 2006 and 2008. Mr. Murphy accepted public funds in 2004 but ran as a non-participating candidate in the 2006 and 2008 campaigns. Mr. Murphy now claims he was coerced into accepting public funding for the 2004 campaign, but the record does not provide an explanation of this coercion.¹⁰ During the 2006 campaign, Mr. Murphy claims he “curtailed [his] speech and curtailed [his] fundraising in order to prevent [matching funds].” (Doc. 362-1 at 79).

¹⁰ According to one of Mr. Murphy’s campaign consultants, Mr. Murphy was not coerced into accepted public funding. In fact, the consultant believes Mr. Murphy “would not have been elected [in 2004] if Clean Elections did not exist.” The consultant reached this opinion because Mr. Murphy was not an incumbent and did not having the contacts necessary to independently raise funds. (Doc. 309-9 at 8).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

g. Arizona Free Enterprise Club’s Freedom Club PAC

The Arizona Free Enterprise Club’s Freedom Club PAC (“Freedom Club PAC”) “is a Candidate Support or Opposition Committee.” (Doc. 288-2 at 6). The Act allegedly harms the Freedom Club PAC because matching funds are triggered when it speaks out in favor of certain candidates. (Doc. 288-2 at 21). But the Freedom Club PAC does not make independent expenditures. (Doc. 362-1 at 83). The Freedom Club PAC contributes to Arizonans for a Sound Economy, another PAC, and it is this entity which actually expends funds. The Freedom Club PAC’s treasurer stated matching funds have never prevented it from spending money, but matching funds allegedly have altered the timing of certain expenditures. (Doc. 362-1 at 85).

h. Arizona Taxpayers Action Committee

The Arizona Taxpayers Action Committee (“ATAC”) is an Independent Expenditures Committee that was organized in 2006. It claims it “did not speak in opposition to a publicly funded candidate in the District 1 Senate primary race to avoid triggering matching funds to that candidate.” (Doc. 288-2 at 7). Defendants counter that the evidence shows no such abstention occurred. Instead, the decision not to spend money was based on the fact ATAC had no money to spend. (Doc. 354 at 9). Based on the unreliable and conflicting evidence, the Court cannot determine which side is presenting the more accurate picture.

ANALYSIS

I. Procedural History

The Court previously denied Plaintiffs’ applications for a temporary restraining order and a preliminary injunction. (Doc. 30, 185). In the ruling denying the preliminary injunction, the Court found that the Clean Elections Act “imposes a substantial burden on the First Amendment right to use personal funds for campaign speech.”¹¹ (Doc. 185 at 10). The Court also found Defendants had not established a compelling state interest justifying that

¹¹ The prior rulings did not address the precise nature of the burden allegedly imposed upon Plaintiffs. As explored below, identifying the burden is more difficult than that alluded to by the prior rulings.

1 burden. (Doc. 185 at 14). The preliminary injunction was denied, however, because of the
2 “extraordinary balance of the harms required in the context of an ongoing election.” (Doc.
3 185 at 18). The parties have now completed discovery and have filed motions for summary
4 judgment.

5 **II. Standard For Summary Judgment**

6 A court must grant summary judgment if the pleadings and supporting documents,
7 viewed in the light most favorable to the non-moving party, “show that there is no genuine
8 issue as to any material fact and that the moving party is entitled to a judgment as a matter
9 of law.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(c). The party opposing summary judgment “may not rest upon
10 the mere allegations or denials of [the party’s] pleading, but . . . must set forth specific facts
11 showing that there is a genuine issue for trial.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(e).

12 **III. Proper Standard of Review**

13 The first disagreement between the parties is the proper standard of review.
14 According to the Ninth Circuit, if the Act “places a severe burden on fully protected speech
15 and associational freedoms,” the court must apply strict scrutiny. *Lincoln Club of Orange*
16 *County v. City of Irvine*, 292 F.3d 934, 938 (9th Cir. 2002). But if the Act “places only a
17 minimal burden on fully protected speech and associational freedoms, or if the speech and
18 associational freedoms are not fully protected under the First Amendment, [courts] apply a
19 lower level of constitutional scrutiny.” *Id.* Thus, the proper standard of review depends
20 upon two inquiries. First, what type of speech is at issue? And second, is that speech being
21 burdened?

22 **A. Type of Speech**

23 Based on longstanding Supreme Court precedent, there is an important distinction
24 between contributions and expenditures. Contributions are not considered “to be fully
25 protected political speech.” *Lincoln Club of Orange County*, 292 F.3d at 938. Instead,
26 “contributions are merely speech by proxy,” and do not merit full protection. *Id.*
27 Expenditures, however, are recognized as fully protected speech. Candidates have a “First
28 Amendment right to engage in unfettered political speech,” such as the expenditure of their

1 personal funds. *Davis v. Federal Election Comm'n*, 128 S. Ct. 2759, 2771 (2008). Thus, if
2 the Act is seen as burdening contributions, it will be subject to a lower level of scrutiny; if
3 the Act is seen as burdening expenditures, it will be subject to a higher level of scrutiny; and
4 if the Act is seen as a burden on both expenditures and contributions, the higher level of
5 scrutiny is appropriate. *Lincoln Club of Orange County*, 292 F.3d at 938 (applying strict
6 scrutiny to provision regulating both contributions and expenditures).

7 Defendants argue the Act “is fundamentally a restriction on contributions.” (Doc. 382
8 at 6). This is an oversimplification. For a primary campaign, matching contributions are
9 explicitly tied to a candidate’s “expenditures.” While those expenditures might consist of
10 a candidate spending contributions from third parties, it is possible for a candidate to trigger
11 matching funds during the primary based on his or her expenditure of personal funds. For
12 the general campaign, matching funds are dependent on “contributions,” but the expenditure
13 of personal funds is also defined as a “contribution.” Accordingly, the Act has the ability,
14 if not always the effect, of regulating expenditures in both the primary and general
15 campaigns. The Act’s burden must be evaluated in terms of potentially affecting “fully
16 protected speech.” *Lincoln Club of Orange County*, 292 F.3d at 938.

17 **B. Level of Burden**

18 According to Plaintiffs, matching funds place a “drag on campaign speech.” (Doc.
19 297 at 15). That drag is present because “Matching Funds cause the vigorous exercise of
20 First Amendment rights by Plaintiffs, political action committees and their supporters to
21 produce fundraising advantages for their opposing government-subsidized candidates.” (*Id.*)
22 In other words, Plaintiffs allege they will refrain from raising funds or spending their
23 personal monies to prevent participating candidates from receiving matching funds. This,
24 according to Plaintiffs, is a severe burden on their free speech rights. Plaintiffs’ argument
25 relies in large part on the Supreme Court’s recent decision in *Davis v. Federal Election*
26 *Commission*, 128 S. Ct. 2759 (2008). While *Davis* is instructive, it does not answer the
27 precise question now before the Court.
28

1 In *Davis*, the Supreme Court addressed the so-called “Millionaire’s Amendment”
2 contained in the federal Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 2002. According to that
3 amendment, when a candidate’s expenditure of personal funds exceeded \$350,000, the
4 candidate’s opponent became eligible to accept contributions from individuals at treble the
5 normal limit. The opponent also became eligible to accept unlimited “coordinated party
6 expenditures,” *i.e.* expenditures by national or state political party committees. The Supreme
7 Court concluded the amendment “requires a candidate to choose between the First
8 Amendment right to engage in unfettered political speech and subjection to discriminatory
9 fundraising limitations.” The discriminatory fundraising limitations constituted the “special
10 and potentially significant burden” of conferring a “fundraising advantage[] for opponents
11 in the competitive context of electoral politics.” *Id.* at 2772.

12 In some respects the burden Plaintiffs allegedly suffer in this case is analogous to the
13 burden in *Davis*. Plaintiffs submit evidence that they have felt “chilled” and that but for the
14 matching provisions they would have spent or will spend more money on campaigns. Thus,
15 it appears that in Plaintiffs’ view, the “burden” is that an exercise of their First Amendment
16 right to spend as much as they wish will result in Arizona conferring an additional benefit
17 on publicly-financed candidates. Those candidates presumably will spend the matching
18 funds, *i.e.* generate more speech. In other words, the “burden” created by the Act is that
19 Plaintiffs’ speech will lead directly to more speech. Given that the purpose of the First
20 Amendment is to “secure the widest possible dissemination of information from diverse and
21 antagonistic sources,” it seems illogical to conclude that the Act creating more speech is a
22 constitutionally prohibited “burden” on Plaintiffs. *Buckley v. Valeo*, 424 U.S. 1, 49.

23 Another strange aspect of the alleged burden is that public financing of elections is
24 permitted by the Constitution. If the Act provided for a single lump sum award, instead of
25 incremental awards, the law would fall squarely within the regime blessed in *Buckley* and
26 reaffirmed in *Davis*. Presumably the Act would also be permissible if the incremental awards
27 were linked to some occurrence other than a non-publicly financed candidate’s speech. Thus,
28 Plaintiffs are left to argue their First Amendment rights are violated not by the fact of public

1 financing, or the level of that financing, but by the fact that Arizona provides incremental
2 grants linked to their activities. If a single lump sum award¹² would not burden Plaintiffs'
3 free speech rights in any cognizable way, finding a burden solely because of the incremental
4 nature of the awards seems difficult to establish.¹³

5 Despite the unsettling nature of Plaintiffs' claims, *Davis* requires this Court find
6 Plaintiffs have established a cognizable burden. Plaintiffs face a choice very similar to that
7 faced in *Davis*: either "abide by a limit on personal expenditures" or face potentially serious
8 negative consequences. In *Davis*, the negative consequence was having one's opponent
9 subject to higher contribution limits. Here, the negative consequence is having one's
10 opponent receive additional funds. "Arguably the benefit conferred by [matching funds] is
11 more constitutionally objectionable than increasing an opponent's individual contribution
12 limits. In the latter scenario, the opponent must still go out and raise the additional
13 contributions . . . [Matching funds], by contrast, ensure[] that there will be additional money
14 to counteract the excess expenditures by the non-participating candidate . . ." *Green Party*
15 *of Connecticut v. Garfield*, 2009 WL 2730525, at *67 (D. Conn. 2009). Accordingly, if the
16 statute in *Davis* constituted a burden, matching funds must also constitute a burden.¹⁴

17
18 ¹² Based on the practical realities, this entire case only makes sense under the
19 assumption that single lump-sum awards are not fiscally possible. No rational candidate
20 would prefer a system wherein his opponents receive the maximum award in a single lump
21 sum instead of incremental awards.

22 ¹³ Using the amounts available for a general election for a legislative candidate as an
23 example, the spending limit is \$19,382. Once a non-participating candidate spends more
24 than that amount, the participating opponent receives dollar-for-dollar matching funds, up
25 to a maximum of approximately \$54,000. Arizona could award an initial grant of \$54,000
26 to each legislative candidate who opted for public financing, and this award would constitute
27 no constitutionally prohibited "burden" on Plaintiffs' rights. Thus, Plaintiffs' argument is
28 that an award under the current regime of \$25,000 (the initial grant plus some matching
funds) violates their rights, but an award of twice that amount (not based on matching funds)
would not.

¹⁴ The pre-*Davis* precedents from other circuits no longer appear valid. In analyzing
North Carolina's matching funds regime, the Fourth Circuit found matching funds impose

1 Determining that matching funds constitute a cognizable burden does not end the
2 inquiry. The weight of that burden must also be assessed. Unfortunately, *Davis* provided
3 no guidance on how the statute at issue constituted a “substantial burden” on the plaintiffs’
4 rights. After explaining its holding that discriminatory fundraising limitations constituted
5 a burden, the *Davis* court jumped to the conclusion that the burden was “substantial.”¹⁵ This
6 *ipse dixit* was announced “without the slightest veneer of reasoning to shield the obvious fiat
7 by which it [is] reached.” *Francis v. Henderson*, 425 U.S. 536, 552 (1976) (Brennan, J.
8 dissenting). But the lack of reasoning does not free this Court to ignore the conclusion. If
9 lifting a candidate’s opponent’s fundraising limitations constitutes a “substantial burden,”
10 awarding funds to a candidate’s opponent must constitute a “substantial burden” as well.
11 Accordingly, Arizona’s matching funds constitute a substantial burden and are permissible
12 only if they are supported by a compelling government interest and are narrowly tailored to
13 achieve that interest.

14
15 _____
16 no burden whatsoever. That court ruled that even with matching funds, candidates
17 “remain[ed] free to raise and spend as much money, and engage in as much political speech,
18 as they desire. They will not be jailed, fined or censured if they exceed the trigger amounts.”
19 *N. Carolina Right to Life Comm. Fund for Indep. Political Expenditures v. Leake*, 524 F.3d
20 427, 437 (4th Cir. 2008). The distribution of matching funds “furthers, not abridges,
21 pertinent First Amendment values by ensuring that the participating candidate will have an
22 opportunity to engage in responsive speech.” *Id.* Of course, the same rationale could apply
23 to the statute at issue in *Davis*, but the Supreme Court decided otherwise. The First Circuit
24 also concluded matching funds pose no burden. *Daggett v. Comm’n on Governmental Ethics
25 and Election Practices*, 205 F.3d 445, 464 (1st Cir. 2000). In so holding, that court found
26 plaintiffs had “misconstrue[d] the meaning of the First Amendment protection of their
27 speech. They have no right to speak free from response . . . [t]he public funding system in
28 no way limits the quantity of speech one can engage in or the amount of money one can
29 spend engaging in political speech, nor does it threaten censure or penalty for such
30 expenditures.” *Id.* Again, this holding cannot be reconciled with *Davis*. If the mere
31 *potential* for your opponent to raise additional funds is a substantial burden, the granting of
32 additional funds to your opponent must also be a burden.

33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

¹⁵ This was directly contrary to the lower court’s factual finding that the Millionaires’ Amendment was having no chilling effect. *Davis v. FEC*, 501 F. Supp. 2d 22, 31 (D.D.C. 2007).

1 **IV. The Burden Fails Strict Scrutiny**

2 Having found the Act constitutes a substantial burden, Defendants must show the Act
3 is “narrowly tailored to serve a compelling state interest.” *Austin v. Michigan Chamber of*
4 *Commerce*, 494 U.S. 652, 657 (1990). “Further, ‘if a less restrictive alternative would serve
5 the Government’s purpose, the legislature must use that alternative.’” *Video Software*
6 *Dealers Ass’n v. Schwarzenegger*, 556 F.3d 950, 961 (9th Cir. 2009) (quoting *United States*
7 *v. Playboy Entm’t Group, Inc.*, 529 U.S. 803, 813 (2000)). The Act does not meet any of
8 these requirements.

9 **A. The Act is Not Supported by a Compelling Interest**

10 *Davis* states the *only* legitimate and compelling interest is the elimination of
11 corruption or the perception of corruption. Based on earlier cases, the contours of this
12 anticorruption concern are far from clear.¹⁶ But the most recent Supreme Court cases seem
13 to recognize corruption only in the sense of “politicians [being] too compliant with the
14 wishes of large contributors.” *Nixon*, 528 U.S. at 389, 390. In other words, the only
15 legitimate anticorruption interest is in preventing the reality or appearance of *quid pro quo*
16 arrangements between politicians and contributors. This type of anticorruption interest
17 supports some aspects of the Act, but it does not support the Act’s application to self-
18 financed candidates.

19 Under the Act, if a candidate wishes to expend his or her own money, that expenditure
20 will trigger the “burden” of matching funds. Defendants have not identified any
21 anticorruption interest served by burdening self-financed candidates’ speech in this manner.
22 In fact, the Supreme Court has recognized that “reliance on personal funds *reduces* the threat
23

24
25 ¹⁶ The Supreme Court has repeatedly *upheld* statutes “designed to protect against the
26 undue influence of aggregations of wealth on the political process.” 128 S. Ct. at 2781 (J.
27 Stevens dissent). There is at least an open question whether a state’s anticorruption interest
28 includes countering “the corrosive and distorting effects of immense aggregations of wealth”
on the political process. *Austin v. Michigan Chamber of Commerce*, 494 U.S. 652, 660
(1990).

1 of corruption” and “discouraging use of personal funds disserves the anticorruption interest.”
2 *Davis*, 128 S. Ct. at 2773. Thus, there is no compelling interest served by the Act.

3 **B. The Act is Not Narrowly Tailored**

4 The conclusion that the Act is not serving a valid anticorruption interest also leads to
5 the conclusion that the Act is not narrowly tailored. “A statute is narrowly tailored if it
6 targets and eliminates no more than the exact source of the ‘evil’ it seeks to remedy.” *Frisby*
7 *v. Schultz*, 487 U.S. 474, 785 (1988). The Act allegedly seeks to target and eliminate the
8 “evil” of the appearance or reality of corruption. But the Act places a burden on a
9 candidate’s expenditure of personal funds even though there is no apparent and
10 constitutionally recognized anticorruption interest served by such a restriction. Thus, the Act
11 is restricting speech that has nothing to do with the allegedly compelling interest. The Act
12 is not narrowly tailored.

13 **C. The Act is Not the Least Restrictive Alternative**

14 Finally, the Act is not the least restrictive alternative. At the very least, the Act could
15 have been structured such that it does not place a burden on a candidate’s expenditure of
16 personal funds. For example, the Act could tie matching funds solely to contributions made
17 by third parties to a candidate. Such a structure would achieve the anticorruption goal
18 recognized by the Supreme Court without burdening a candidate’s decision to expend
19 personal funds.

20 The Act, in its current form, is not supported by a compelling interest, is not narrowly
21 tailored, and is not the least restrictive alternative. The Act is unconstitutional under the First
22 Amendment.

23 **V. Equal Protection Claims**

24 Plaintiffs claim the Act violates their right to equal protection based on participating
25 and non-participating candidates being treated “differently with respect to direct
26 expenditures, independent expenditures or contributions made on their behalf.” (Doc. 1 at
27 18). Because the Act violates the First Amendment, the Court need not resolve this issue.

28 Accordingly,

1 **IT IS ORDERED** the Motions for Summary Judgment (Doc. 287, 288) are
2 **GRANTED.**

3 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** the Motions for Summary Judgment (Doc. 285, 293)
4 are **DENIED.**

5 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** the Motion for Leave to File Separate Response (Doc.
6 373) is **DENIED.**

7 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** the Motions to File Supplemental Authority (Doc.
8 393, 399) are **GRANTED.**

9 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** the Motion for Status Hearing (Doc. 404) is
10 **DENIED.**

11 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** the Motion for Preliminary Injunction (Doc. 416) and
12 Motion for Hearing (Doc. 418) are **DENIED.**

13 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** the Clerk shall enter judgment in favor of Plaintiffs.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28