

**STATE OF MINNESOTA
CAMPAIGN FINANCE AND PUBLIC DISCLOSURE BOARD**

**PROBABLE CAUSE
DETERMINATION**

IN THE MATTER OF THE COMPLAINT OF MATT WERDEN REGARDING ACTION 4 LIBERTY AND THE DR. NEIL SHAH FOR GOVERNOR COMMITTEE

On May 4, 2022, the Campaign Finance and Public Disclosure Board received a complaint submitted by counsel for Matt Werden regarding Action 4 Liberty and the Dr. Neil Shah for Governor committee. Action 4 Liberty is a nonprofit 501(c)(4) association not registered with the Board. Action 4 Liberty PAC is a political committee registered with the Board. Dr. Neil Shah for Governor is the principal campaign committee of Dr. Neil Shah.

The complaint alleges that Action 4 Liberty violated Minnesota Statutes section 211B.15, subdivision 2, by making prohibited corporate contributions to the Shah committee, and the Shah committee violated the same statute by accepting those contributions. The complaint asserts that during the time period of August 6 through November 3, 2021, at least eight emails were sent by or on behalf of the Shah committee from the email address neil@electneil.com (Shah emails). The complaint alleges and contains evidence that those emails each included five or more hyperlinks that routed internet traffic to or through the internet domain action4liberty.com. The complaint includes copies of the Shah emails as well as lists of the URLs contained within the hyperlinks in each email. The URLs each begin with https://www.action4liberty.com/, then contain additional characters, which the complaint alleges consist of Urchin Tracking Module (UTM) parameters and identifiers. The complaint alleges and contains evidence that some of the hyperlinks contained within the Shah emails routed users through Action 4 Liberty's internet domain, and then automatically redirected them to the Shah committee's donation page.¹

The complaint further asserts that during the time period of July 27, 2021, through February 21, 2022, at least four emails mentioning Dr. Shah were sent by or on behalf of Action 4 Liberty using the email address jake@action4liberty.com (Action 4 Liberty emails). The complaint includes copies of the Action 4 Liberty emails as well as lists of the URLs contained within the hyperlinks in each email. Each email states that it was sent by Jake Duesenberg, who is the president of Action 4 Liberty and the chair of the Action 4 Liberty PAC. The complaint argues that one of the emails, dated August 3, 2021, constituted an endorsement of Dr. Shah's candidacy for governor. The August 3 email stated that "[f]ortunately, the race to remove Governor Walz from office has a new doctor in it! Dr. Neil Shah launched his campaign this morning to Save Minnesota from career politicians." The email said that Dr. Shah "just signed the Never Again Pledge today pledging to the people of Minnesota to make passing the **Never Again Bill** his top priority as Governor." The subject line of the email was "Candidate Dr. Neil Shah Signs Never Again Pledge," and within the email Mr. Duesenberg thanked Dr. Shah twice for signing the pledge and asked recipients to "[t]ake the time to thank Dr. Neil Shah for making

¹ secure.anedot.com/50abec70-246e-4f71-b4a2-c868366ab853/electshahjd

the **Never Again Bill** a priority.” The complaint alleges and contains evidence that the August 3 email included a hyperlink that routed users to the action4liberty.com domain, then automatically redirected them to the website of the Shah committee.² The August 3 email also included hyperlinks allowing recipients to directly email Dr. Shah at neil.shah@electneil.com to thank him for signing the Never Again Pledge. The complaint alleges and contains evidence that the Action 4 Liberty emails each included hyperlinks with URLs with the same UTM parameters and identifiers as those contained within the Shah emails.

The complaint notes that both the Shah emails and the Action 4 Liberty emails each contained text at the bottom stating “Created with NationBuilder, software for leaders.” The complaint also states that the Shah committee did not report any itemized expenditures within the 2021 calendar year paid to NationBuilder or to Action 4 Liberty. The Shah emails and the Action 4 Liberty emails included with the complaint each contain text toward the bottom stating “To stop receiving emails, click here.” The phrase “click here” is hyperlinked and when selected, the user is ultimately directed to the same Action 4 Liberty website URL,³ regardless of whether the email is one of the Shah emails or one of the Action 4 Liberty emails. The complaint argues that the emails show that Action 4 Liberty is providing the Shah committee “with its membership email lists and/or access to its membership.”

The complaint further argues that similarities between the emails and use of the action4liberty.com domain within the hyperlinks in the Shah emails demonstrates that the Shah emails were created by or for Action 4 Liberty, were controlled by Action 4 Liberty, were paid for by Action 4 Liberty, and were utilized for the exclusive use of Action for Liberty and the Shah committee. The complaint asserts that Action 4 Liberty made campaign expenditures that “were not independent because its links are incorporated in Dr. Shah’s e-mails, and the links route users to Dr. Shah’s official website.” The complaint alleges and provides evidence that none of the Action 4 Liberty emails contained a disclaimer identifying them as campaign material paid for by the Action 4 Liberty PAC or as independent expenditures. The complaint notes that the Action 4 Liberty PAC filed no-change statements covering all of 2021 and the first quarter of 2022, stating that no contributions were received, and no disbursements were made, by the committee during those periods.

On May 12, 2022, the Board chair determined that the complaint alleged prima facie violations of Minnesota Statutes section 211B.15, subdivision 2, as to Action 4 Liberty and the Dr. Neil Shah for Governor committee, and of Minnesota Statutes section 10A.20, subdivision 3, as to the Dr. Neil Shah for Governor committee.

On May 25, 2022, the Board received a supplemental complaint submitted by counsel for Mr. Werden. The supplemental complaint relies on the factual assertions made in the original complaint and alleges that Action 4 Liberty violated Minnesota Statutes section 10A.27, subdivision 13, by making contributions to the Shah committee in excess of \$200 without providing a disclosure statement as required of an association not registered with the Board.

² electneil.com

³ action4liberty.com/unsubscribe?

The supplemental complaint alleges that the Shah committee violated the same statute by accepting those contributions without the required disclosure statement.

On May 26, 2022, the Board chair determined that the supplemental complaint alleged a prima facie violation of Minnesota Statutes section 10A.27, subdivision 13, as to Action 4 Liberty and the Dr. Neil Shah for Governor committee. On June 1, 2022, the Board laid the matter over until its next meeting in order to allow sufficient time for Action 4 Liberty and the Shah committee to respond to the complaint and the supplemental complaint.

On May 26, 2022, the Shah committee provided a written response to the original complaint. The Shah committee stated that it “did not receive any contributions including in-kind contributions from Action 4 Liberty.” The Shah committee’s response explains that the committee “hired and paid substantial sums to RPR Consulting, a third-party consulting firm, to perform a variety of consulting and campaign services.” The Shah committee stated that “[t]hese services included, but were not limited to, acquiring email lists and drafting and sending email marketing. It is the Campaign’s understanding that RPR paid Action 4 Liberty to enter various list-sharing agreements to be used by RPR Consultants.”⁴ The Shah committee’s response notes that the committee incurred over \$146,000 in campaign expenditures payable to RPR Consultants in 2021 and that those expenditures were included within the committee’s 2021 year-end report of receipts and expenditures. That report included 14 separate campaign expenditures payable to RPR Consultants, each of which were described as “Other Services.”⁵ All but one of the 14 expenditures was disclosed with text explaining that each expenditure was for “DIGITAL, STRATEGY, SOCIAL MEDIA AND COMMUNICATIONS.” The Shah committee’s 2021 year-end report does not contain any references to Action 4 Liberty or NationBuilder.

The Shah committee’s response argues that because the committee’s

emails were not created by, paid for, or controlled by Action 4 Liberty, and because the Campaign has no knowledge of nor had knowledge of or control over disclaimers or practices included in any Action 4 Liberty emails created and sent independently from the Campaign, and because there was no coordination between the Campaign and Action 4 Liberty, the Werden Complaint makes no credible claims against the Campaign and should be dismissed.

With its written response the Shah committee provided a copy of an invoice that it obtained from RPR Consultants in order to respond to the complaint. The invoice reflects that it was issued by Action 4 Liberty to Shawn Dow of “RPR Consulting, INC” and includes the cost “for use of email service” for the month of August 2021. According to the Arizona Corporation Commission, Shawn Dow is a director of, and shareholder in, RPR Consultants, Inc.

⁴ The original complaint and written responses to the complaint variously name the consulting business paid by the Shah committee as RPR Consulting or RPR Consultants. According to the [website](#) of the Arizona Corporation Commission, the legal name of the business referenced in the complaint appears to be RPR Consultants, Inc.

⁵ cfb.mn.gov/rptViewer/Main.php?do=viewPDF&year=21&type=pcc&period=YE&se=0®num=18697

On June 10, 2022, Jeffrey O'Brien, counsel for Action 4 Liberty, provided a written response to the original and supplemental complaints. Mr. O'Brien stated that the Shah emails "were sent via Action 4 Liberty's Nationbuilder account, but Action 4 Liberty was paid by RPR for the use of the account." Mr. O'Brien said that "Action 4 Liberty engaged in an arms-length transaction with RPR and was paid for the use of" assets referred to as Action 4 Liberty's "digital backbone" within the original complaint. Mr. O'Brien asserted that "Action 4 Liberty did not give anything to the Shah for Governor committee. Rather, Action 4 Liberty rented its NationBuilder account and other information to RPR Consulting, Inc., a private consulting firm, for a price negotiated between the parties."

Within Action 4 Liberty's response Mr. O'Brien argued that no prohibited contribution occurred because Action 4 Liberty did not make a contribution. Mr. O'Brien noted that the Board has "declared that the sale of any product or service for fair market value does not and will not constitute a contribution." In support of that statement Mr. O'Brien referenced three advisory opinions issued by the Board, including Advisory Opinion 369,⁶ affirming that a political committee may sell internet-based services to candidates without making a contribution if the cost of those services reflects the fair market value of equivalent services available to candidates on the open market; Advisory Opinion 320,⁷ affirming that a corporation may provide goods or services to political entities registered with the Board and that the goods or services provided will not constitute an in-kind contribution if the corporation charges fair market value; and Advisory Opinion 270,⁸ stating that if an individual sells a product to a political party unit for less than the full retail value of that product, the difference is an in-kind contribution from the individual to the party unit.

Mr. O'Brien provided copies of the same invoices provided by the Shah committee. Each of the invoices provided by Mr. O'Brien were redacted to exclude the amounts billed and paid.

With respect to the Action 4 Liberty emails Mr. O'Brien stated that the "emails all relate to the issue advocacy which Action 4 Liberty is known for" and that "Dr. Shah's presence within these emails is merely coincidental and nowhere is he 'endorsed.'"

On June 21, 2022, the Board sent a letter to the Shah committee, seeking the total amount that RPR Consultants or Shawn Dow was paid by the committee for access to and use of Action 4 Liberty's NationBuilder account. That information would assist the Board in determining whether fair market value was paid for use of Action 4 Liberty's NationBuilder account and the data stored therein. If a service is provided to a candidate's committee at a cost that is less than fair market value the result is an in-kind contribution from the vendor to the candidate.

⁶ cfb.mn.gov/pdf/advisory_opinions/AO369.pdf

⁷ cfb.mn.gov/pdf/advisory_opinions/AO320.pdf

⁸ cfb.mn.gov/pdf/advisory_opinions/AO270.pdf

On June 28, 2022, Darrin Rosha, counsel for the Shah committee, provided a written response to the letter seeking additional information. The response includes copies of two invoices showing that Action 4 Liberty was paid a total of \$2,191.10 via RPR Consultants for use of components of its NationBuilder account. Mr. Rosha explained to Board staff that while a third invoice was issued by Action 4 Liberty, it was not paid and the parties reached an agreement whereby payment of the two prior invoices would be considered payment in full for the services Action 4 Liberty provided over a period of approximately three months. Each invoice that was paid includes a \$100 flat fee for use of Action 4 Liberty's email list and a \$500 flat fee for use of Action 4 Liberty's phone list. Approximately 45% of the total amount invoiced was paid through a 10% commission on the amount of contributions the Shah committee received as a result of using Action 4 Liberty's NationBuilder account.

Within the response Mr. Rosha explained that the Shah committee had its own NationBuilder account and decided to use its own lists and cease using Action 4 Liberty's NationBuilder account after the invoices were paid because it "determined it received a better return from doing so." Mr. Rosha argued that this decision "demonstrates that the [Shah committee] not only paid fair market value for the services Action 4 Liberty provided including use of the email platform, it determined it was paying more than necessary based on its own growing lists and NationBuilder account."

Action 4 Liberty has not disputed that it is a corporation within the meaning of Minnesota Statutes section 211B.15. Action 4 Liberty has not disputed that it is an unregistered association within the meaning of Minnesota Statutes section 10A.27. Neither Action 4 Liberty nor the Shah committee have claimed that Action 4 Liberty provided the Shah committee with a disclosure statement pursuant to Minnesota Statutes section 10A.27, subdivision 13.

The Board considered this matter at its meeting on July 6, 2022. R. Reid LeBeau II, counsel for the complainant, appeared before the Board via Webex. Mr. O'Brien appeared before the Board via Webex on behalf of Action 4 Liberty.

Mr. LeBeau argued that the services provided by Action 4 Liberty to the Shah committee spanned a period of seven months and extended far beyond renting lists containing contact information of potential supporters. Mr. LeBeau asserted that the value of those services was likely far greater than \$2,191, the amount the Shah committee has stated was paid to Action 4 Liberty.

With respect to the Action 4 Liberty emails, Mr. LeBeau argued that the similarity of the UTM parameters and identifiers embedded within the hyperlinks in the Shah emails and the Action 4 Liberty emails demonstrates that those emails came from the same source, which is evidence of coordination between the Shah committee and Action 4 Liberty. Mr. LeBeau also asserted that the fact that Action 4 Liberty served as a vendor of services provided to the Shah committee is evidence of coordination in the content and production of the Action 4 Liberty emails.

During the July 6 Board meeting Mr. O'Brien argued that RPR Consultants paid Action 4 Liberty fair market value for the use of its NationBuilder account, thus there was no prohibited contribution. Mr. O'Brien stated that RPR Consultants and Action 4 Liberty "figured out what percentage of the time for a particular month that the consultant was going to be using the program and prorated the monthly fee based on that." In response to a question from a Board member asking him to explain the use of the term prorated, Mr. O'Brien explained that Action 4 Liberty "pays a monthly fee to NationBuilder . . . to have this account." Mr. O'Brien further explained that "the parties determined how much of the time for that month that the consultant was going to be using the account under this rental and charged the consultant for that percentage of time for that month." Mr. O'Brien stated that "if the consultant was going to be using it - estimated to be using it 10% of the time, they paid 10% of the monthly fee."

With respect to the Action 4 Liberty emails, Mr. O'Brien characterized those emails as promotion of Action 4 Liberty and its Never Again Pledge, rather than an endorsement of or attempt to support Dr. Shah's candidacy for governor. Mr. O'Brien noted that the August 3, 2021, email attached to the original complaint as Exhibit E named other gubernatorial candidates who signed the Never Again Pledge, in addition to Dr. Shah.

Analysis

When the Board chair makes a finding that a complaint raises a prima facie violation, the full Board then must determine whether probable cause exists to believe an alleged violation that warrants an investigation has occurred. Minn. Stat. § 10A.022, subd. 3 (d). A probable cause determination is not a complete examination of the evidence on both sides of the issue. Rather, it is a determination of whether a complaint raises sufficient questions of fact which, if true, would result in the finding of a violation.

If the Board finds that probable cause exists, the Board is required to determine whether the alleged violation warrants a formal investigation, considering the type and magnitude of the alleged violation, the knowledge of the respondents, any benefit to be gained from a formal investigation, the availability of Board resources, and whether the violation has been remedied. Minn. R. 4525.0210, subp. 5. If the Board finds that probable cause exists but does not order a formal investigation, the Board is required to either dismiss the complaint or order a staff review. Minn. R. 4525.0210, subp. 6.

Corporate Contributions

Minnesota Statutes section 10A.01, subdivision 9, defines the term contribution, in relevant part, to mean "money, a negotiable instrument, or a donation in kind that is given to a political committee, political fund, principal campaign committee, local candidate, or party unit." Minnesota Statutes section 10A.01, subdivision 13, defines the term donation in kind to mean "anything of value that is given, other than money or negotiable instruments. An approved expenditure is a donation in kind."

“A donation in kind must be disclosed at its fair market value,” pursuant to Minnesota Statutes section 10A.20, subdivision 3, paragraph (c). Minnesota Rules 4503.0100, subpart 3a, defines the phrase fair market value to mean “the amount that an individual would pay to purchase the same or similar service or item on the open market.”

Minnesota Statutes section 10A.01, subdivision 9, defines the term expenditure, in relevant part, to mean “a purchase or payment of money or anything of value, or an advance of credit, made or incurred for the purpose of influencing the nomination or election of a candidate or for the purpose of promoting or defeating a ballot question.” Minnesota Statutes section 10A.01, subdivision 4, defines the term approved expenditure as “an expenditure made on behalf of a candidate or a local candidate by an entity other than the candidate's principal campaign committee or the local candidate, if the expenditure is made with the authorization or expressed or implied consent of, or in cooperation or in concert with, or at the request or suggestion of the candidate or local candidate, the candidate's principal campaign committee, or the candidate's or local candidate's agent. An approved expenditure is a contribution to that candidate or local candidate.” A coordinated expenditure is an approved expenditure pursuant to Minnesota Statutes section 10A.175, subdivision 5.

Minnesota Statutes section 211B.15, subdivision 1, defines the term corporation to mean “(1) a corporation organized for profit that does business in this state; (2) a nonprofit corporation that carries out activities in this state; or (3) a limited liability company formed under chapter 322C, or under similar laws of another state, that does business in this state.” Minnesota Statutes section 211B.15, subdivision 2, provides that:

- (a) A corporation may not make a contribution or offer or agree to make a contribution directly or indirectly, of any money, property, free service of its officers, employees, or members, or thing of monetary value to a political party, organization, committee, or individual to promote or defeat the candidacy of an individual for nomination, election, or appointment to a political office.
- (b) A political party, organization, committee, or individual may not accept a contribution or an offer or agreement to make a contribution that a corporation is prohibited from making under paragraph (a).
- (c) For the purpose of this subdivision, "contribution" includes an expenditure to promote or defeat the election or nomination of a candidate to a political office that is made with the authorization or expressed or implied consent of, or in cooperation or in concert with, or at the request or suggestion of, a candidate or committee established to support or oppose a candidate but does not include an independent expenditure authorized by subdivision 3.

Contributions Made by an Unregistered Association Without Required Disclosure Statement

Minnesota Statutes section 10A.27, subdivision 13, clause (a), provides that a principal campaign committee “must not accept a contribution of more than \$200 from an association not registered under this chapter unless the contribution is accompanied by a statement that meets

the disclosure and reporting period requirements imposed by section 10A.20,” and the committee “that accepts the contribution must include a copy of the written statement or website with the report that discloses the contribution to the board.”

In this instance, the Board’s analysis of the prohibitions on corporate contributions and contributions in excess of \$200 from an unregistered association without a disclosure statement hinges on whether a contribution occurred. Therefore, the allegations as to each statute will be considered together.

Action 4 Liberty Emails

The original complaint contains evidence that the four emails designated as Exhibits E and F within the complaint were sent using NationBuilder, a commercial subscription-based software service utilized by Action 4 Liberty. The complaint also contains evidence that the emails were sent by Mr. Duesenberg who is the president of Action 4 Liberty and the chair of the Action 4 Liberty PAC. However, while the evidence in the record supports the conclusion that both the Shah emails and the Action 4 Liberty emails were sent using Action 4 Liberty’s NationBuilder account, the record does not contain evidence that the Action 4 Liberty emails were drafted or sent in coordination with the Shah committee. Without coordination the Action 4 Liberty emails are not an approved expenditure on behalf of the Shah committee or an in-kind contribution to the Shah committee. Therefore, with respect to the Action 4 Liberty emails designated as Exhibits E and F, the Board concludes that there is not probable cause to believe that Action 4 Liberty or the Shah committee violated the prohibition on corporate contributions or the prohibition on contributions in excess of \$200 made by an unregistered association without a disclosure statement.

Shah Emails

The original complaint contains evidence, and Action 4 Liberty and the Shah committee have acknowledged, that the eight emails designated as Exhibits D and G within the complaint were sent by or on behalf of the Shah committee using Action 4 Liberty’s NationBuilder account. The Shah committee and Action 4 Liberty have each argued that no contribution was made to the Shah committee because the Shah committee paid RPR Consultants for use of Action 4 Liberty’s NationBuilder account. Action 4 Liberty has further asserted that it was paid the fair market value of the goods or services it provided to RPR Consultants. The response Mr. Rosha provided on June 28, 2022, including unredacted copies of the invoices issued by Action 4 Liberty, shows that Action 4 Liberty was paid a total of \$2,191.10 for use of components of its NationBuilder account over an approximately three-month period.

While appearing before the Board on July 6, 2022, Mr. O’Brien stated that the price that RPR Consultants paid to Action 4 Liberty for use of its NationBuilder account was calculated as a percentage of the monthly fee that Action 4 Liberty pays to NationBuilder for its subscription. That calculation is not reflected in the invoices provided to the Board by Mr. Rosha, which instead show that Action 4 Liberty was paid a flat fee of \$100 per month for use of its email platform, a flat fee of \$500 per month for use of its phone list, and 10% of the contributions

raised by the Shah committee as a result of using Action 4 Liberty's NationBuilder account. Mr. O'Brien acknowledged that he had not been provided unredacted copies of the invoices that Action 4 Liberty issued to RPR Consultants. The fact that the Shah committee had its own NationBuilder account also indicates that the value of the services provided came not from the proportion of time that RPR Consultants used Action 4 Liberty's NationBuilder account on behalf of the Shah committee, but rather from the data to which RPR Consultants had access by virtue of renting Action 4 Liberty's NationBuilder account. The discrepancy between the explanation provided by Mr. O'Brien and the calculation reflected by the invoices warrants further investigation.

Action 4 Liberty and the Shah committee have each asserted that the price paid by RPR Consultants was negotiated between the parties and that it was an arms-length transaction. However, neither respondent has explained the method used to determine the fair market value of the services provided by Action 4 Liberty. A negotiated transaction does not in itself prevent a vendor providing goods or services to do so at a cost that is less than fair market value. If the cost paid for a service is less than fair market value the difference between what was paid and what the services would have cost on the open market represents a contribution to the committee that received the services. Here, there is evidence that the cost paid by the Shah committee reflects the amount of time its consultant was signed into the NationBuilder account, and not the value of the contact data that Action 4 Liberty made available through that account.

Therefore, with respect to the services that enabled the Shah emails designated as Exhibits D and G to be disseminated, the Board concludes that there has not been evidence provided to show that fair market value was paid for those services. The Board therefore concludes that there is probable cause to believe that Action 4 Liberty and the Shah committee violated the prohibition on corporate contributions and the prohibition on contributions in excess of \$200 made by an unregistered association without a disclosure statement.

Reporting

Minnesota Statutes section 10A.20, subdivision 3, requires a candidate committee to report all contributions received on its campaign finance reports. Minnesota Statutes section 10A.20, subdivision 3, also requires a candidate committee to itemize expenditures "in excess of \$200, together with the amount, date, and purpose of each expenditure, including an explanation of how the expenditure was used." The Shah committee's 2021 year-end report does not include any in-kind contributions received, does not explain that expenditures were made for services provided by Action 4 Liberty, and does not explain that expenditures were made for use of any NationBuilder account, including its own. For this reason, the Board concludes that there is probable cause to believe that the Shah committee violated the reporting requirements in Minnesota Statutes section 10A.20.

Minnesota Statutes section 10A.20, subdivision 3, requires political committees and funds to report "the name, address, and registration number if registered with the board of each . . . principal campaign committee . . . to which contributions have been made that aggregate in excess of \$200 within the year and the amount and date of each contribution." The complaint

alleges that the Action 4 Liberty PAC is controlled by Action 4 Liberty and notes that its 2021 year-end report did not disclose any activity. If the Board ultimately concludes that an in-kind contribution was made, it may also conclude that the Action 4 Liberty PAC was required to include that contribution on its 2021 year-end report, or that Action 4 Liberty was required to register a separate political committee or fund and file a 2021 year-end report disclosing that contribution. Therefore, the Board concludes that there is probable cause to believe that either Action 4 Liberty or the Action 4 Liberty PAC violated the reporting requirements in Minnesota Statutes section 10A.20.

Order:

1. Probable cause exists to believe that the price paid by the Shah committee for access to the Action 4 Liberty NationBuilder account was less than fair market value, and therefore represents a corporate contribution from Action 4 Liberty, and that the Dr. Neil Shah for Governor committee accepted that contribution in violation of Minnesota Statutes section 211B.15, subdivision 2.
2. Probable cause exists to believe that Action 4 Liberty made a contribution in excess of \$200 and that the Dr. Neil Shah for Governor committee accepted that contribution without a disclosure statement in violation of Minnesota Statutes section 10A.27, subdivision 13.
3. The allegation that the Action 4 Liberty emails were coordinated with the Shah committee, and therefore a contribution to the Shaw committee, is dismissed without prejudice because there is not probable cause to believe that coordination occurred.
4. Probable cause exists to believe that the Dr. Neil Shah for Governor committee violated the reporting requirements in Minnesota Statutes section 10A.20, subdivision 3.
5. Probable cause exists to believe that Action 4 Liberty or the Action 4 Liberty PAC violated the reporting requirements in Minnesota Statutes section 10A.20.



Faris Rashid, Chair
Campaign Finance and Public Disclosure Board

Date: July 12, 2022