

Sasha Linker

From: Richard Ewald <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Thursday, October 17, 2019 11:02 AM
To: CommAsst
Subject: Case 15/003

I would like to comment on the above case.

As I understand the facts, the candidate filled the information electronically in a timely manner and only the paper back up copies were late. We live in an electronic age. Everything is done electronically now, from depositing paychecks to paying bills. Ms Shelly submitted the information. You had it on time. To fine her for not getting the paper copies in before the deadline is just petty and unjust.

Even your enforcement division says she "substantially complied" which I take to mean, yes the data was supplied electronically, but we didn't have the paper copies. Since you had the electronic copies, why is paper even necessary? Is the paper requirement a hold over from before the electronic age? I feel the answer is yes. Well then why are you sticking with horse and buggy technology? It's time to move forward. Drop the fine and change the rules. As you had the info in your computers, there was no need for a paper copy. Paper copies take up space, they have to be filed and tracked and sooner or later get lost. Electronic copies are as close as your keyboard.

Also about the fine. \$12,500 for a late postmark? This is not a presidential election campaign with more money than God. This is a single individual who cares about our state and wants to participate in our political system. Leveling such a fine for a lone individual for a late postmark will send a chilling effect into California politics. Good people who could make excellent contributions to our government won't step up and run due to the potential financial downside if they break a needless rule.

I strongly urge you to reconsider the fine, and make it more in keeping with what is right. If you ask me, either the fine should be waived, or a minimal amount charged, say \$100.

Thank you for allowing me to comment.

Richard B. Ewald
[REDACTED]