



FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20463

June 10, 1999

CERTIFIED MAIL
RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

Ms. Sue Aleksich-Akey, Chairman
Montana Republican Party
1419 B Helena Avenue
Helena, MT 59601

RE: MUR 4794

Dear Ms. Aleksich-Akey:

On August 18, 1998, the Federal Election Commission received your complaint alleging certain violations of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended ("the Act").

After considering the circumstances of this matter, the Commission has determined to exercise its prosecutorial discretion and to take no action against the respondents. See attached narrative. Accordingly, the Commission closed its file in this matter on June 10, 1999. This matter will become part of the public record within 30 days.

The Act allows a complainant to seek judicial review of the Commission's dismissal of this action. See 2 U.S.C. § 437g(a)(8).

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "F. Andrew Turley", is written over a horizontal line.

F. Andrew Turley
Supervisory Attorney
Central Enforcement Docket

Attachment
Narrative

MUR 4794

DESCHAMPS FOR CONGRESS

Sue Aleksich-Akey, Chair of the Montana Republican Party, alleges that the Deschamps for Congress ("Deschamps") failed to timely file 48 Hour Notices for last minute contributions totaling \$18,000; incorrectly reported the amount of a contribution from the Association of Trial Lawyers of America ("ATLA") received within the 48 hour notice period; and did not properly account for the disposition of a \$5,000 loan to the campaign. She also alleges reporting discrepancies for an additional \$7,000 in contributions. Mr. Deschamps lost the 1998 General election for Montana's at-large House seat with 44% of the vote to Rick Hill's 53%.

Deschamps responds that it unintentionally failed to file six 48-hour notices, but corrected the error as soon as it was discovered. It also states that the \$3,000 reporting discrepancy involving the ATLA contribution resulted from a typographical error, and that the \$5,000 "loan" was in fact a line of credit that was properly reported in its FEC submissions. Deschamps asserts that it did not disclose the line of credit on reports filed after the original obligation was incurred because it did not draw on the line of credit during the reporting period and did not believe it needed to be reported.

This matter is less significant relative to other matters pending before the Commission.