



0000187137

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

COMMISSIONERS

Arizona Corporation Commission

TOM FORESE – Chairman
BOB BURNS
ANDY TOBIN
BOYD DUNN
JUSTIN OLSON

DOCKETED

APR 6 2018

DOCKETED BY

[Signature]

DOCKET NO. AU-00000E-17-0079

DECISION NO. 76640

IN THE MATTER OF THE
COMMISSION'S INVESTIGATION
AND PROMULGATION OF A CODE OF
ETHICS.

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
CODE OF ETHICS

BY THE COMMISSION:

PREAMBLE

The Arizona Corporation Commission is dedicated to ensuring the public trust. As members of a public body, the Commissioners should respect and comply with the law and should conduct themselves at all times in a manner that promotes public confidence in the integrity and impartiality of the Commission. This code of ethics is intended to recognize and establish the moral duties and obligations of Commissioners that involve not only obeying the law, but also performing their duties with the highest standards of ethical and professional conduct.

Source:¹ NARUC Code of Ethics, Canon I; Ariz. Code of Judicial Conduct, Canon I, Rule 1.2

I. GENERAL ETHICAL DUTIES

Rule 1.1 Commissioners shall discharge their duties in full compliance with applicable laws concerning ethical conduct.

¹ A full text copy, or link to a full text copy, of the sources cited herein may be found in the attached "Code of Ethics Appendix."

1 *Source:* 1992 Ariz. Sess. Laws, ch. 134 § 1; NARUC Code of Ethics, Canon I; Ariz. Code of
2 Judicial Conduct, Canon I, Rule 1.1

3
4 **II. PROPER PERFORMANCE OF COMMISSIONER DUTIES**

5 **Rule 2.1** The official duties of Commissioners take precedence over all other activities.

6 *Source:* NARUC Code of Ethics, Canon III; Ariz. Code of Judicial Conduct, Canon II, Rule 2.1

7
8 **Rule 2.2** Commissioners should be faithful to and constantly strive to improve their competence
9 in regulatory principles.

10 *Source:* NARUC Code of Ethics, Canon III; Ariz. Code of Judicial Conduct, Canon II, Rule 2.5

11
12 **Rule 2.3** Commissioners should maintain order and decorum in the proceedings before them.
13 Commissioners should be patient, dignified, and courteous to litigants, witnesses, lawyers, and others
14 with whom the Commission deals in an official capacity, and should require similar conduct of lawyers,
15 staff, and others subject to the Commissioners' direction and control. Commissioners should afford to
16 every person who is legally interested in a proceeding, or his or her lawyer, the full right to be heard
17 according to law.

18 *Source:* NARUC Code of Ethics, Canon III; Ariz. Code of Judicial Conduct, Canon II, Rule 2.8

19
20 **Rule 2.4** Commissioners should not perform an act in a private capacity that may be construed
21 as an official act.

22 *Source:* A.A.C. R2-5A-501

23
24 **Rule 2.5** Commissioners shall not with corrupt, malicious, unscrupulous, unethical, or
25 intimidating intent use their political influence or position to cause the firing, promotion, or demotion
26 of any Commission employee or the hiring or failure to hire any applicant for employment with the
27 Commission.

28 *Source:* A.R.S. §§ 1-215, 13-1202, 41-753; *Black's Law Dictionary* (10th ed. 2014)

1 the following are present: (i) the decision could affect, either positively or negatively, an interest of the
2 Commissioner or his/her relative; (ii) the interest is pecuniary or proprietary, such as a financial interest
3 or ownership interest; and (iii) the interest is not "remote" as defined by A.R.S. § 38-502(10).

4
5 **Rule. 4.2** Commissioners shall not be employed by, hold an official relation to, or own stocks or
6 bonds in, a corporation that is regulated by the Commission.

7 *Source:* A.R.S. § 40-101; NARUC Code of Ethics, Canon II

8 *Comment:* It is permissible for a Commissioner to be indirectly invested in the stock of a regulated
9 entity, provided such investment is through entities not regulated by the Commission. For example, it
10 is permissible for a Commissioner to be invested in a brokerage account that permits the broker to
11 invest the client's funds in various entities.

12
13 **Rule. 4.3** Commissioners shall not receive, or agree to receive, compensation other than as
14 provided by law, for any service rendered or to be rendered by the Commissioner, related to matters
15 pending before the Commission.

16 *Source:* A.R.S. § 38-505

17 *Comment:* Commissioners should not solicit or accept food, refreshments, or other items paid for
18 by members of the regulated community who have pending matters before the Commission. This
19 provision does not prohibit Commissioners from accepting food, refreshments, or unsolicited
20 advertising or promotional material of nominal value in other contexts, provided that the purpose of
21 the transaction is not, or does not appear to be, designed to influence official action.

22
23 **Rule 4.4** Commissioners shall not use their official position to secure any valuable thing or
24 valuable benefit that would not ordinarily be provided to the Commissioner in the performance of the
25 Commissioner's official duties, if the thing or benefit is of such a character as to manifest a substantial
26 and improper influence on the Commissioner.

27 *Source:* A.R.S. § 38-504

28

1 **Rule 5.2** A Commissioner shall not knowingly communicate with any person, representing an
2 industry or public service corporation whose interests will be affected by Commission decisions, and
3 whose intent is to influence any decision, legislation, policy, or rulemaking within the Commission's
4 jurisdiction, unless that person has registered as a lobbyist with the Commission prior to making or
5 attempting to make such communication. This registration requirement shall not apply to individuals
6 representing themselves, subject matter experts or other persons who answer technical questions or
7 who provide technical information at the request of a Commission lobbyist, or licensed attorneys whose
8 primary purpose in communicating with a Commissioner is to advocate on behalf of a party in the
9 course of Commission proceedings.

10 *Source:* A.R.S. § 41-1231, *et seq.*

11 *Comment:* Lobbyist registration is administered by the Commission and is separate from other
12 statutory lobbyist registration requirements. The Commission shall make lobbyist registration
13 information available on its website. The information provided shall be consistent with the lobbyist
14 registration form prescribed by the Arizona Secretary of State, which includes the lobbyist's current
15 and former list of clients. Commissioners are encouraged to access information regarding licensed
16 attorneys who have made an appearance on behalf of a party in the course of a Commission proceeding
17 through the Commission's e-docket system.

18
19 **Rule 5.3** Commissioners shall disclose on a quarterly basis any gifts or things of value received
20 directly from any person or entity affiliated with a public service corporation regulated by the
21 Commission. "Gifts or things of value" under this code shall be limited to those things or services with
22 a cash value of more than \$20.

23 *Source:* A.A.C. R2-5A-501; Ariz. Code of Judicial Conduct, Canon III, Rule 3.13

24 *Comment:* Commissioners should not accept any gifts or things of value from anyone when the
25 purpose is, or appears to be, designed to influence official action. Commissioners should likewise not
26 permit themselves to be placed under any kind of personal obligation that could lead a person to expect
27 official favors. Commissioners shall make these quarterly disclosures available to the public on the
28 Commission website.

VI. CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS

Rule 6.1 Commissioners receiving campaign contributions shall conduct all necessary due diligence to properly and accurately document those contributions, to fully comply with campaign finance reporting laws.

Source: A.R.S. §§ 16-926; 18-444; 38-541; 38-543–38-545; *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission*, 558 U.S. 310 (2010)

Comment: Commissioners who are running for re-election should remain actively involved in financially managing their own campaigns so that contributions can be properly recorded. Commissioners shall make these disclosures available to the public on the Commission website. To avoid any appearance of impropriety or conflict of interest in the Commissioner's official conduct, Commissioners should be particularly mindful of any campaign contributions received from regulated entities, or campaign contributions received from individuals or entities affiliated with regulated entities.

Commissioners are not expected to know or disclose the funding source of any independent expenditures, unless these funding sources are confirmed by the donors; however, Commissioners must continue to disclose any and all campaign contributions as required by Arizona law. Commissioners should educate themselves on the financial disclosure handbook and be familiar with the law, including any amendments or changes to the law regarding disclosure.

Rule 6.2 A Commissioner shall declare any known contributions to his or her candidate committee received after the effective date of this Code from a party of any proceeding that has been set for open meeting before the Commission. A Commissioner shall file a declaration in the docket for the proceeding as soon as practicable upon the open meeting being noticed and after the Commissioner knows that a declaration is required. The declaration shall identify the donor, the relationship to the party, the amount of the contribution, and note any contributions that were returned to the contributor.

A Commissioner shall also make a verbal declaration at open meeting immediately after the relevant agenda item is introduced for discussion. After a declaration is made at open meeting, any party to the proceeding shall be given the opportunity to be heard on the issue of recusal. Following

1 the opportunity to be heard, recusal is at the discretion of the Commissioner making the declaration.
2 Recusal is also subject to the doctrine of necessity.

3 *Source:* A.R.S. §§ 10-140, 16-901, 16-905, 16-911, 16-913, 16-916, 16-918, 16-922, 16-926;
4 A.A.C. R14-3-103; *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission*, 558 U.S. 310
5 (2010)

6 *Comment:* For the purposes of this Rule, a contribution means any money, advance, deposit, or
7 other thing of value that is made to a Commissioner's candidate committee for the purpose of
8 influencing an election but does not include contributions that have been returned to the donor. For the
9 purposes of this Rule only, a "party" is defined at A.A.C. R14-3-103 subject to the following: (1) when
10 the party is an entity, the obligations of this Rule extend to the entity, its owners, directors, employees,
11 and any political action committee registered by the entity; and (2) a "party" does not include
12 Commission staff. *See* A.R.S. § 10-140. A contributor's status as an owner, officer, director, or
13 employee is set at the time of making a contribution. This provision does not apply to contributions
14 transferred from a prior candidate committee under A.R.S. § 16-913.

15 16 **VII. PUBLIC ACCESS TO INFORMATION**

17 **Rule 7.1** Meetings involving a quorum of Commissioners, where legal action is discussed,
18 deliberated, proposed, or taken, shall be conducted in public and in accordance with Arizona Open
19 Meeting Law. The Arizona Open Meeting Law requires public notice of meetings, prohibits certain
20 discussions between public officers outside of those meetings, and limits discussion at public meetings
21 regarding official action to items related to the agenda.

22 *Source:* A.R.S. § 38-431, *et seq.*

23 *Comment:* Calls to the public are governed by different rules and allow the public to address the
24 Commission on any topics of concern within the Commission's jurisdiction, even if the topic is not
25 specifically on the agenda. During open calls to the public, a Commissioner may not dialogue with the
26 presenter if the topic is not on the agenda, however, the Commissioner may (i) respond to criticism;
27 (ii) ask staff to review an item; or (iii) ask that an item be placed on a future agenda. In addition, a
28 Commissioner who proposes that the Commission have the opportunity to consider an off-agenda

1 subject at a future public meeting, without more, does not violate the Arizona Open Meeting Law
2 because it does not propose legal action.

3
4 **Rule 7.2** The Commission shall designate from among existing employees a Public Records
5 Officer. The Public Records Officer shall be responsible for complying with public records requests as
6 required by Arizona law.

7 *Source:* A.R.S. §§ 39-121–39-161

8 *Comment:* Electronic messages sent or received by government-issued electronic devices that have
9 a substantial nexus to Commission activities are public records and subject to public inspection.
10 Commissioners likewise have a duty to reasonably account for official activity, even when that activity
11 is conducted on private devices or through private e-mail accounts. Commissioners cannot use private
12 devices and accounts for the purpose of concealing official conduct.

13 To ensure transparency and promote accountability to the public, Commissioners shall make
14 their official calendars available to the public on the Commission website on at least a quarterly basis.
15 Commissioners shall, at a minimum, disclose in accordance with the following schedule: Q1 (January,
16 February, and March) will be available on the Commission website beginning May 1; Q2 (April, May,
17 and June) will be available on the Commission website beginning August 1; Q3 (July, August, and
18 September) will be available on the Commission website beginning November 1; and, Q4 (October,
19 November, and December) will be available on the Commission website beginning February 1.

20
21 **Rule 7.3** Ex parte rules prohibit communications to or from a Commissioner, not on the public
22 record, concerning the substantive merits of a contested proceeding. The ex parte rules commence
23 when a matter is set for a public hearing and terminate once an application for rehearing has been
24 denied.

25 *Source:* A.A.C. R14-3-113

26 *Comment:* The ex parte rule similarly applies to communications to or from agents of the
27 Commissioner involved in the decision-making process, such as the Commissioner's policy advisors
28 and interns. The ex parte rule does not prohibit discussions about procedural matters or comments from

1 the public. For example, Commissioners can communicate or inquire about scheduling issues, docket
 2 filing issues, or other case administration issues, without violating the ex parte rule.

4 **VIII. ETHICS OFFICER**

5 **Rule 8.1** The Commission's Ethics Officer shall be the Commission's Chief Counsel (Director
 6 of the Commission's Legal Division). If the Commission determines (by a majority vote) or the Chief
 7 Counsel determines that the Chief Counsel is unable to perform the duties of Ethics Officer on a
 8 particular matter, the Commission's Assistant Chief Counsel shall be the Commission's Ethics Officer
 9 for that matter. The Ethics Officer shall provide an annual training to Commissioners to ensure
 10 familiarity with the Commission's Code of Ethics, applicable Arizona laws related to the conduct of
 11 public officials, public record laws, and open meeting laws. The Ethics Officer shall likewise be
 12 available to provide advice to the Commissioners on ethics issues as needed.

13 *Comment:* Any complaint alleging a violation of any provision of these rules should be submitted
 14 in writing and under oath to the Ethics Officer, who shall report such complaint to the Commissioners
 15 and the Executive Director. Commissioners are likewise expected to disclose any job-related illegal or
 16 unethical behavior on the part of any individual, including the Commissioner him/herself.

18 **IX. ENFORCEMENT**

19 **Rule 9.1** The Attorney General shall bring an action against any Commissioner who usurps,
 20 intrudes into or unlawfully holds or exercises that Commissioner's public office, when the Attorney
 21 General has reason to believe that that the Commissioner's public office is being usurped, intruded into
 22 or unlawfully held or exercised.

23 The Attorney General may also empanel a state grand jury to investigate and return indictments
 24 for knowing or corrupt misconduct involving Commissioners. Commissioners may be impeached for
 25 high crimes, misdemeanors or malfeasance in office, and/or recalled by the voters. Commissioners are
 26 also subject to the federal and state criminal laws.

27 *Source:* Ariz. Const. Art. VIII; A.R.S. §§ 12-2041 *et seq.*; 38-311–38-312; 38-441 *et seq.*;
 28 21-422(B)(1)

1 *Comment:* Violations of Arizona law by any Commissioner should be referred for review to the
2 Attorney General or the county attorney for the county where the events allegedly took place.

3
4 **X. ADOPTION OF CODE**


5 **Rule 10.1** With the exception of Section V, Rule 5.2, this Code of Ethics shall take effect
6 immediately upon approval of the Commission and shall be re-adopted at the swearing in of each new
7 Commissioner. Section V, Rule 5.2 shall take effect ninety (90) days from the effective date of this
8 Code of Ethics to allow parties time to register with the Commission. The Commissioners shall review
9 this Code of Ethics periodically to determine if any amendment is required.

10
11 

12 CHAIRMAN FORESE



COMMISSIONER DUNN

13
14 


15 COMMISSIONER TOBIN




COMMISSIONER OLSON



COMMISSIONER BURNS



IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I, TED VOGT, Executive Director of
the Arizona Corporation Commission, have hereunto, set my
hand and caused the official seal of this Commission to be affixed
at the Capitol, in the City of Phoenix, this 6TH day of
APRIL, 2018.



TED VOGT
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Code of Ethics Appendix

Table of Contents

Document Title	Page or Link
Cases	
<i>Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission</i> , 588 U.S. 310 (2010)	APP-001
United States Code	
Age Discrimination in Employment Act, 29 U.S.C. § 621, <i>et seq.</i> (with EEOC annotations)	https://www.eeoc.gov/laws/statutes/adea.cfm
Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e, <i>et seq.</i> (with EEOC annotations)	https://www.eeoc.gov/laws/statutes/titlevii.cfm
Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. § 12101, <i>et seq.</i> (with EEOC annotations)	https://www.eeoc.gov/laws/statutes/ada.cfm
Arizona Constitutional Provisions	
Ariz. Const. Art. VIII, Part 1, § 1	APP-079
Ariz. Const. Art. VIII, Part 1, § 2	APP-080
Ariz. Const. Art. VIII, Part 1, § 3	APP-081
Ariz. Const. Art. VIII, Part 1, § 4	APP-082
Ariz. Const. Art. VIII, Part 1, § 5	APP-083
Ariz. Const. Art. VIII, Part 1, § 6	APP-084
Ariz. Const. Art. VIII, Part 2, § 1	APP-085
Ariz. Const. Art. VIII, Part 2, § 2	APP-086
Arizona Statutes	
A.R.S. § 1-215	APP-087
A.R.S. § 10-140	APP-093
A.R.S. § 12-2041	APP-099
A.R.S. § 12-2042	APP-100
A.R.S. § 12-2043	APP-101
A.R.S. § 12-2044	APP-102
A.R.S. § 12-2045	APP-103
A.R.S. § 13-1202	APP-104
A.R.S. § 16-901	APP-105
A.R.S. § 16-905	APP-112
A.R.S. § 16-911	APP-114
A.R.S. § 16-913	APP-117
A.R.S. § 16-916	APP-119
A.R.S. § 16-918	APP-121
A.R.S. § 16-922	APP-122

Table of Contents

Document Title	Page or Link
A.R.S. § 16-926	APP-124
A.R.S. § 18-444	APP-128
A.R.S. § 21-422	APP-132
A.R.S. § 38-311	APP-134
A.R.S. § 38-312	APP-135
A.R.S. § 38-431	APP-136
A.R.S. § 38-431.01	APP-138
A.R.S. § 38-431.02	APP-141
A.R.S. § 38-431.03	APP-145
A.R.S. § 38-431.04	APP-147
A.R.S. § 38-431.05	APP-148
A.R.S. § 38-431.06	APP-149
A.R.S. § 38-431.07	APP-151
A.R.S. § 38-431.08	APP-152
A.R.S. § 38-431.09	APP-154
A.R.S. § 38-441	APP-155
A.R.S. § 38-442	APP-156
A.R.S. § 38-443	APP-157
A.R.S. § 38-444	APP-158
A.R.S. § 38-445	APP-159
A.R.S. § 38-446	APP-160
A.R.S. § 38-447	APP-161
A.R.S. § 38-448	APP-162
A.R.S. § 38-449	APP-164
A.R.S. § 38-450	APP-165
A.R.S. § 38-501	APP-166
A.R.S. § 38-502	APP-167
A.R.S. § 38-503	APP-170
A.R.S. § 38-504	APP-172
A.R.S. § 38-505	APP-173
A.R.S. § 38-506	APP-174
A.R.S. § 38-507	APP-175
A.R.S. § 38-508	APP-176
A.R.S. § 38-509	APP-177
A.R.S. § 38-510	APP-178

Table of Contents

Document Title	Page or Link
A.R.S. § 38-511	APP-179
A.R.S. § 38-541	APP-181
A.R.S. § 38-543	APP-183
A.R.S. § 38-544	APP-184
A.R.S. § 38-545	APP-185
A.R.S. § 39-121	APP-186
A.R.S. § 39-121.01	APP-187
A.R.S. § 39-121.02	APP-189
A.R.S. § 39-121.03	APP-190
A.R.S. § 39-121.04	APP-192
A.R.S. § 39-122	APP-193
A.R.S. § 39-123	APP-194
A.R.S. § 39-123.01	APP-197
A.R.S. § 39-124	APP-198
A.R.S. § 39-125	APP-200
A.R.S. § 39-126	APP-201
A.R.S. § 39-126.01	APP-202
A.R.S. § 39-127	APP-203
A.R.S. § 39-128	APP-204
A.R.S. § 39-141	APP-205
A.R.S. § 39-142	APP-206
A.R.S. § 39-143	APP-207
A.R.S. § 39-144	APP-208
A.R.S. § 39-145	APP-209
A.R.S. § 39-161	APP-210
A.R.S. § 40-101	APP-211
A.R.S. § 41-753	APP-212
A.R.S. § 41-1231	APP-214
A.R.S. § 41-1232	APP-219
A.R.S. § 41-1232.01	APP-221
A.R.S. § 41-1232.02	APP-223
A.R.S. § 41-1232.03	APP-226
A.R.S. § 41-1232.04	APP-229
A.R.S. § 41-1232.05	APP-231
A.R.S. § 41-1232.06	APP-232

Table of Contents

Document Title	Page or Link
A.R.S. § 41-1232.07	APP-233
A.R.S. § 41-1232.08	APP-234
A.R.S. § 41-1233	APP-236
A.R.S. § 41-1233.01	APP-237
A.R.S. § 41-1234	APP-238
A.R.S. § 41-1234.01	APP-239
A.R.S. § 41-1235	APP-240
A.R.S. § 41-1236	APP-241
A.R.S. § 41-1237	APP-242
A.R.S. § 41-1237.01	APP-243
A.R.S. § 41-1238	APP-244
A.R.S. § 41-1239	APP-245
Arizona Session Laws	
1992 Ariz. Sess. Law, ch. 134	APP-247
Arizona Administrative Code	
A.A.C. R2-5A-501	APP-252
A.A.C. R14-3-103	APP-254
A.A.C. R14-3-113	APP-255
Other	
NARUC Code of Ethics	APP-257
Arizona Code of Judicial Conduct	APP-260
<i>Black's Law Dictionary</i> (selections)	APP-314

130 S.Ct. 876
 Supreme Court of the United States

CITIZENS UNITED, Appellant,
 v.
 FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION.

No. 08–205.
 |
 Argued March 24, 2009.
 |
 Reargued Sept. 9, 2009.
 |
 Decided Jan. 21, 2010.

Synopsis

Background: Nonprofit corporation brought action against Federal Election Commission (FEC) for declaratory and injunctive relief, asserting that it feared it could be subject to civil and criminal penalties if it made through video-on-demand, within 30 days of primary elections, a film regarding a candidate seeking nomination as a political party's candidate in the next Presidential election. The United States District Court for the District of Columbia, *A. Raymond Randolph*, Circuit Judge, and *Royce C. Lamberth* and *Richard W. Roberts*, District Judges, 2008 WL 2788753, denied corporation's motion for preliminary injunction and granted summary judgment to Commission. Probable jurisdiction was noted.

Holdings: The Supreme Court, Justice *Kennedy*, held that:

[1] government may not, under the First Amendment, suppress political speech on the basis of the speaker's corporate identity, overruling *Austin v. Michigan Chamber of Commerce*, 494 U.S. 652, 110 S.Ct. 1391, 108 L.Ed.2d 652;

[2] federal statute barring independent corporate expenditures for electioneering communications violated First Amendment, overruling *McConnell v. Federal Election Com'n*, 540 U.S. 93, 124 S.Ct. 619, 157 L.Ed.2d 491;

[3] disclaimer and disclosure provisions of Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 2002 did not violate First

Amendment, as applied to nonprofit corporation's film and three advertisements for the film.

Affirmed in part, reversed in part, and remanded.

Justice *Thomas* joined as to all of Justice *Kennedy's* opinion except for Part IV.

Justices *Stevens*, *Ginsburg*, *Breyer*, and *Sotomayor, JJ.*, joined as to Part IV of Justice *Kennedy's* opinion.

Chief Justice *Roberts* filed a concurring opinion, in which Justice *Alito* joined.

Justice *Scalia* filed a concurring opinion, in which Justice *Alito* joined and Justice *Thomas* joined in part.

Justice *Stevens* filed an opinion concurring in part and dissenting in part, in which Justices *Ginsburg*, *Breyer*, and *Sotomayor*, joined.

Justice *Thomas* filed an opinion concurring in part and dissenting in part.

West Codenotes

Held Unconstitutional
 2 U.S.C.A. § 441b

Prior Version Recognized as Unconstitutional
 18 U.S.C.A. § 608(e)

****880 *310 Syllabus***

As amended by § 203 of the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 2002 (BCRA), federal law prohibits corporations and unions from using their general treasury ****881** funds to make independent expenditures for speech that is an "electioneering communication" or for speech that expressly advocates the election or defeat of a candidate. 2 U.S.C. § 441b. An electioneering communication is "any broadcast, cable, or satellite communication" that "refers to a clearly identified candidate for Federal office" and is made within 30 days of a primary election, § 434(f)(3) (A), and that is "publicly distributed," 11 CFR § 100.29(a) (2), which in "the case of a candidate for nomination for President ... means" that the communication "[c]an be received by 50,000 or more persons in a State where

a primary election ... is being held within 30 days," § 100.29(b)(3)(ii). Corporations and unions may establish a political action committee (PAC) for express advocacy or electioneering communications purposes. 2 U.S.C. § 441b(b)(2). In *McConnell v. Federal Election Comm'n*, 540 U.S. 93, 203–209, 124 S.Ct. 619, 157 L.Ed.2d 491, this Court upheld limits on electioneering communications in a facial challenge, relying on the holding in *Austin v. Michigan Chamber of Commerce*, 494 U.S. 652, 110 S.Ct. 1391, 108 L.Ed.2d 652, that political speech may be banned based on the speaker's corporate identity.

In January 2008, appellant Citizens United, a nonprofit corporation, released a documentary (hereinafter *Hillary*) critical of then-Senator Hillary Clinton, a candidate for her party's Presidential nomination. Anticipating that it would make *Hillary* available on cable television through video-on-demand within 30 days of primary elections, Citizens United produced television ads to run on broadcast and cable television. Concerned about possible civil and criminal penalties for violating § 441b, it sought declaratory and injunctive relief, arguing that (1) § 441b is unconstitutional as applied to *Hillary*; and (2) BCRA's disclaimer, disclosure, and reporting requirements, BCRA §§ 201 and 311, were unconstitutional as applied to *Hillary* and the ads. The District Court denied Citizens United a preliminary injunction and granted appellee Federal Election Commission (FEC) summary judgment.

***311 Held:**

1. Because the question whether § 441b applies to *Hillary* cannot be resolved on other, narrower grounds without chilling political speech, this Court must consider the continuing effect of the speech suppression upheld in *Austin*. Pp. 888 – 896.

(a) Citizen United's narrower arguments—that *Hillary* is not an "electioneering communication" covered by § 441b because it is not "publicly distributed" under 11 CFR § 100.29(a)(2); that § 441b may not be applied to *Hillary* under *Federal Election Comm'n v. Wisconsin Right to Life, Inc.*, 551 U.S. 449, 127 S.Ct. 2652, 168 L.Ed.2d 329 (*WRTL*), which found § 441b unconstitutional as applied to speech that was not "express advocacy or its functional equivalent," *id.*, at 481, 127 S.Ct. 2652 (opinion of ROBERTS, C.J.), determining that a communication "is the functional equivalent of express advocacy only if [it] is susceptible of no reasonable interpretation other than

as an appeal to vote for or against a specific candidate," *id.*, at 469–470, 127 S.Ct. 2652; that § 441b should be invalidated as applied to movies shown through video-on-demand because this delivery system has a lower risk of distorting the political process than do television ads; and that there should be an exception to § 441b's ban for nonprofit corporate political speech funded overwhelming by individuals—are not sustainable under a fair reading of the statute. Pp. 888 – 892.

(b) Thus, this case cannot be resolved on a narrower ground without chilling political ****882** speech, speech that is central to the First Amendment's meaning and purpose. Citizens United did not waive this challenge to *Austin* when it stipulated to dismissing the facial challenge below, since (1) even if such a challenge could be waived, this Court may reconsider *Austin* and § 441b's facial validity here because the District Court "passed upon" the issue, *Lebron v. National Railroad Passenger Corporation*, 513 U.S. 374, 379, 115 S.Ct. 961, 130 L.Ed.2d 902; (2) throughout the litigation, Citizens United has asserted a claim that the FEC has violated its right to free speech; and (3) the parties cannot enter into a stipulation that prevents the Court from considering remedies necessary to resolve a claim that has been preserved. Because Citizen United's narrower arguments are not sustainable, this Court must, in an exercise of its judicial responsibility, consider § 441b's facial validity. Any other course would prolong the substantial, nationwide chilling effect caused by § 441b's corporate expenditure ban. This conclusion is further supported by the following: (1) the uncertainty caused by the Government's litigating position; (2) substantial time would be required to clarify § 441b's application on the points raised by the Government's position in order to avoid any chilling effect caused by an improper interpretation; and (3) because speech itself is of primary importance to the integrity of the election process, any speech arguably within the reach of rules created for regulating ***312** political speech is chilled. The regulatory scheme at issue may not be a prior restraint in the strict sense. However, given its complexity and the deference courts show to administrative determinations, a speaker wishing to avoid criminal liability threats and the heavy costs of defending against FEC enforcement must ask a governmental agency for prior permission to speak. The restrictions thus function as the equivalent of a prior restraint, giving the FEC power analogous to the type of government practices that the First Amendment was drawn to prohibit. The ongoing chill on speech makes it

130 S.Ct. 876, 187 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 2961, 175 L.Ed.2d 753, 78 USLW 4078...

necessary to invoke the earlier precedents that a statute that chills speech can and must be invalidated where its facial invalidity has been demonstrated. Pp. 892 – 896.

2. *Austin* is overruled, and thus provides no basis for allowing the Government to limit corporate independent expenditures. Hence, § 441b's restrictions on such expenditures are invalid and cannot be applied to *Hillary*. Given this conclusion, the part of *McConnell* that upheld BCRA § 203's extension of § 441b's restrictions on independent corporate expenditures is also overruled. Pp. 896 – 914.

(a) Although the First Amendment provides that “Congress shall make no law ... abridging the freedom of speech,” § 441b's prohibition on corporate independent expenditures is an outright ban on speech, backed by criminal sanctions. It is a ban notwithstanding the fact that a PAC created by a corporation can still speak, for a PAC is a separate association from the corporation. Because speech is an essential mechanism of democracy—it is the means to hold officials accountable to the people—political speech must prevail against laws that would suppress it by design or inadvertence. Laws burdening such speech are subject to strict scrutiny, which requires the Government to prove that the restriction “furthers a compelling interest and is narrowly tailored to achieve that interest.” *WRTL*, 551 U.S., at 464, 127 S.Ct. 2652. This language provides a sufficient framework for protecting the interests in this case. Premised on mistrust of governmental power, the First Amendment stands against attempts to disfavor certain subjects or viewpoints or to distinguish among different speakers, which **883 may be a means to control content. The Government may also commit a constitutional wrong when by law it identifies certain preferred speakers. There is no basis for the proposition that, in the political speech context, the Government may impose restrictions on certain disfavored speakers. Both history and logic lead to this conclusion. Pp. 896 – 899.

(b) The Court has recognized that the First Amendment applies to corporations, e.g., *First Nat. Bank of Boston v. Bellotti*, 435 U.S. 765, 778, n. 14, 98 S.Ct. 1407, 55 L.Ed.2d 707, and extended this protection to the context of political speech, see, e.g., *NAACP v. Button*, 371 U.S. 415, 428–429, 83 S.Ct. 328, 9 L.Ed.2d 405. Addressing challenges to the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, the *Buckley* Court *313 upheld limits on

direct contributions to candidates, 18 U.S.C. § 608(b), recognizing a governmental interest in preventing *quid pro quo* corruption. 424 U.S., at 25–26, 96 S.Ct. 612. However, the Court invalidated § 608(e)'s expenditure ban, which applied to individuals, corporations, and unions, because it “fail[ed] to serve any substantial governmental interest in stemming the reality or appearance of corruption in the electoral process,” *id.*, at 47–48, 96 S.Ct. 612. While *Buckley* did not consider a separate ban on corporate and union independent expenditures found in § 610, had that provision been challenged in *Buckley*'s wake, it could not have been squared with the precedent's reasoning and analysis. The *Buckley* Court did not invoke the overbreadth doctrine to suggest that § 608(e)'s expenditure ban would have been constitutional had it applied to corporations and unions but not individuals. Notwithstanding this precedent, Congress soon recodified § 610's corporate and union expenditure ban at 2 U.S.C. § 441b, the provision at issue. Less than two years after *Buckley*, *Bellotti* reaffirmed the First Amendment principle that the Government lacks the power to restrict political speech based on the speaker's corporate identity. 435 U.S., at 784–785, 98 S.Ct. 1407. Thus the law stood until *Austin* upheld a corporate independent expenditure restriction, bypassing *Buckley* and *Bellotti* by recognizing a new governmental interest in preventing “the corrosive and distorting effects of immense aggregations of [corporate] wealth ... that have little or no correlation to the public's support for the corporation's political ideas.” 494 U.S., at 660, 110 S.Ct. 1391. Pp. 899 – 903.

(c) This Court is confronted with conflicting lines of precedent: a pre-*Austin* line forbidding speech restrictions based on the speaker's corporate identity and a post-*Austin* line permitting them. Neither *Austin*'s antidistortion rationale nor the Government's other justifications support § 441b's restrictions. Pp. 903 – 911.

(1) The First Amendment prohibits Congress from fining or jailing citizens, or associations of citizens, for engaging in political speech, but *Austin*'s antidistortion rationale would permit the Government to ban political speech because the speaker is an association with a corporate form. Political speech is “indispensable to decisionmaking in a democracy, and this is no less true because the speech comes from a corporation.” *Bellotti, supra*, at 777, 98 S.Ct. 1407 (footnote omitted). This protection is inconsistent with *Austin*'s rationale, which is meant to prevent

corporations from obtaining “ ‘an unfair advantage in the political marketplace’ ” by using “ ‘resources amassed in the economic marketplace.’ ” 494 U.S. at 659, 110 S.Ct. 1391. First Amendment protections do not depend on the speaker’s “financial ability to engage in public discussion.” *Buckley*, *supra*, at 49, 96 S.Ct. 612. These conclusions were reaffirmed when the Court invalidated ****884** a BCRA provision that increased the cap on contributions to one candidate if the opponent made certain expenditures from personal funds. *Davis v. Federal Election Comm’n*, 554 U.S. 724, —, 128 S.Ct. 2759, 171 L.Ed.2d 737. Distinguishing wealthy individuals from corporations based on the latter’s special advantages of, *e.g.*, limited liability, does not suffice to allow laws prohibiting speech. It is irrelevant for First Amendment purposes that corporate funds may “have little or no correlation to the public’s support for the corporation’s political ideas.” *Austin*, *supra*, at 660, 110 S.Ct. 1391. All speakers, including individuals and the media, use money amassed from the economic marketplace to fund their speech, and the First Amendment protects the resulting speech. Under the antidistortion rationale, Congress could also ban political speech of media corporations. Although currently exempt from § 441b, they accumulate wealth with the help of their corporate form, may have aggregations of wealth, and may express views “hav[ing] little or no correlation to the public’s support” for those views. Differential treatment of media corporations and other corporations cannot be squared with the First Amendment, and there is no support for the view that the Amendment’s original meaning would permit suppressing media corporations’ political speech. *Austin* interferes with the “open marketplace” of ideas protected by the First Amendment. *New York State Bd. of Elections v. Lopez Torres*, 552 U.S. 196, 208, 128 S.Ct. 791, 169 L.Ed.2d 665. Its censorship is vast in its reach, suppressing the speech of both for-profit and nonprofit, both small and large, corporations. Pp. 903 – 908.

(2) This reasoning also shows the invalidity of the Government’s other arguments. It reasons that corporate political speech can be banned to prevent corruption or its appearance. The *Buckley* Court found this rationale “sufficiently important” to allow contribution limits but refused to extend that reasoning to expenditure limits, 424 U.S. at 25, 96 S.Ct. 612, and the Court does not do so here. While a single *Bellotti* footnote purported to leave the question open, 435 U.S. at 788, n. 26, 98 S.Ct. 1407, this Court now concludes that independent expenditures,

including those made by corporations, do not give rise to corruption or the appearance of corruption. That speakers may have influence over or access to elected officials does not mean that those officials are corrupt. And the appearance of influence or access will not cause the electorate to lose faith in this democracy. *Caperton v. A.T. Massey Coal Co.*, 556 U.S. 868, 129 S.Ct. 2252, 173 L.Ed.2d 1208, distinguished. Pp. 908 – 911.

(3) The Government’s asserted interest in protecting shareholders from being compelled to fund corporate speech, like the antidistortion rationale, would allow the Government to ban political speech even of media corporations. The statute is underinclusive; it only protects a dissenting shareholder’s interests in certain media for 30 or 60 days before an election when such interests would be implicated in any media at any time. It is also overinclusive because it covers all corporations, including those with one shareholder. P. 911.

***315** (4) Because § 441b is not limited to corporations or associations created in foreign countries or funded predominately by foreign shareholders, it would be overbroad even if the Court were to recognize a compelling governmental interest in limiting foreign influence over the Nation’s political process. P. 911.

(d) The relevant factors in deciding whether to adhere to *stare decisis*, beyond workability—the precedent’s antiquity, the reliance interests at stake, and whether ****885** the decision was well reasoned—counsel in favor of abandoning *Austin*, which itself contravened the precedents of *Buckley* and *Bellotti*. As already explained, *Austin* was not well reasoned. It is also undermined by experience since its announcement. Political speech is so ingrained in this country’s culture that speakers find ways around campaign finance laws. Rapid changes in technology—and the creative dynamic inherent in the concept of free expression—counsel against upholding a law that restricts political speech in certain media or by certain speakers. In addition, no serious reliance issues are at stake. Thus, due consideration leads to the conclusion that *Austin* should be overruled. The Court returns to the principle established in *Buckley* and *Bellotti* that the Government may not suppress political speech based on the speaker’s corporate identity. No sufficient governmental interest justifies limits on the political speech of nonprofit or for-profit corporations. Pp. 911 – 913.

3. BCRA §§ 201 and 311 are valid as applied to the ads for *Hillary* and to the movie itself. Pp. 913 – 917.

(a) Disclaimer and disclosure requirements may burden the ability to speak, but they “impose no ceiling on campaign-related activities,” *Buckley*, 424 U.S., at 64, 96 S.Ct. 612, or “ ‘prevent anyone from speaking,’ ” *McCormell*, *supra*, at 201, 124 S.Ct. 619. The *Buckley* Court explained that disclosure can be justified by a governmental interest in providing “the electorate with information” about election-related spending sources. The *McCormell* Court applied this interest in rejecting facial challenges to §§ 201 and 311, 540 U.S., at 196, 124 S.Ct. 619. However, the Court acknowledged that as-applied challenges would be available if a group could show a “ ‘reasonable probability’ ” that disclosing its contributors’ names would “ ‘subject them to threats, harassment, or reprisals from either Government officials or private parties.’ ” *Id.*, at 198, 124 S.Ct. 619. Pp. 913 – 914.

(b) The disclaimer and disclosure requirements are valid as applied to Citizens United’s ads. They fall within BCRA’s “electioneering communication” definition: They referred to then-Senator Clinton by name shortly before a primary and contained pejorative references to her candidacy. Section 311 disclaimers provide information to the electorate, *McCormell*, *supra*, at 196, 124 S.Ct. 619, and “insure that the voters are fully informed” about who is speaking, *Buckley*, *supra*, at 76, 96 S.Ct. 612. At the very *316 least, they avoid confusion by making clear that the ads are not funded by a candidate or political party. Citizens United’s arguments that § 311 is underinclusive because it requires disclaimers for broadcast advertisements but not for print or Internet advertising and that § 311 decreases the quantity and effectiveness of the group’s speech were rejected in *McCormell*. This Court also rejects their contention that § 201’s disclosure requirements must be confined to speech that is the functional equivalent of express advocacy under *WRTL*’s test for restrictions on independent expenditures, 551 U.S., at 469–476, 127 S.Ct. 2652 (opinion of ROBERTS, C.J.). Disclosure is the less-restrictive alternative to more comprehensive speech regulations. Such requirements have been upheld in *Buckley* and *McCormell*. Citizens United’s argument that no informational interest justifies applying § 201 to its ads is similar to the argument this Court rejected with

regard to disclaimers. Citizens United finally claims that disclosure requirements can chill donations by exposing donors to retaliation, but offers no evidence that its members face the type of threats, harassment, or reprisals that might make § 201 unconstitutional as applied. Pp. 914 – 916.

****886** (c) For these same reasons, this Court affirms the application of the §§ 201 and 311 disclaimer and disclosure requirements to *Hillary*. Pp. 916 – 917.

Reversed in part, affirmed in part, and remanded.

KENNEDY, J., delivered the opinion of the Court, in which ROBERTS, C.J., and SCALIA and ALITO, JJ., joined, in which THOMAS, J., joined as to all but Part IV, and in which STEVENS, GINSBURG, BREYER, and SOTOMAYOR, JJ., joined as to Part IV. ROBERTS, C.J., filed a concurring opinion, in which ALITO, J., joined. SCALIA, J., filed a concurring opinion, in which ALITO, J., joined, and in which THOMAS, J., joined in part. STEVENS, J., filed an opinion concurring in part and dissenting in part, in which GINSBURG, BREYER, and SOTOMAYOR, JJ., joined. THOMAS, J., filed an opinion concurring in part and dissenting in part.

Attorneys and Law Firms

Theodore B. Olson, for Appellant.

Floyd Abrams, for Senator Mitch McConnell as amicus curiae, by special leave of the Court, supporting the Appellant.

Elena Kagan, Solicitor General, Washington, D.C., for Respondent.

Seth P. Waxman, for Senator John McCain, as amicus curiae, by special leave of the Court, supporting the Appellee.

Michael Boos, Fairfax, VA, Theodore B. Olson, Matthew D. McGill, Amir C. Tayrani, Justin S. Herring, Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP, Washington, D.C., for Appellant.

Opinion

Justice KENNEDY delivered the opinion of the Court.

*318 Federal law prohibits corporations and unions from using their general treasury funds to make

independent expenditures *319 for speech defined as an “electioneering communication” or for speech expressly advocating the election or defeat of a candidate. 2 U.S.C. § 441b. Limits on electioneering communications were upheld in *McConnell v. Federal Election Comm'n*, 540 U.S. 93, 203–209, 124 S.Ct. 619, 157 L.Ed.2d 491 (2003). The holding of *McConnell* rested to a large extent on an earlier case, *Austin v. Michigan Chamber of Commerce*, 494 U.S. 652, 110 S.Ct. 1391, 108 L.Ed.2d 652 (1990). *Austin* had held that political speech may be banned based on the speaker’s corporate identity.

In this case we are asked to reconsider *Austin* and, in effect, *McConnell*. It has been noted that “*Austin* was a significant departure from ancient First Amendment principles,” *Federal Election Comm'n v. Wisconsin Right to Life, Inc.*, 551 U.S. 449, 490, 127 S.Ct. 2652, 168 L.Ed.2d 329 (2007) (*WRTL*) (SCALIA, J., concurring in part and concurring in judgment). We agree with that conclusion and hold that *stare decisis* does not compel the continued acceptance of *Austin*. The Government may regulate corporate political speech through disclaimer and disclosure requirements, but it may not suppress that speech altogether. We turn to the case now before us.

I

A

Citizens United is a nonprofit corporation. It brought this action in the United States District Court for the District of **887 Columbia. A three-judge court later convened to hear the cause. The resulting judgment gives rise to this appeal.

Citizens United has an annual budget of about \$12 million. Most of its funds are from donations by individuals; but, in addition, it accepts a small portion of its funds from for-profit corporations.

In January 2008, Citizens United released a film entitled *Hillary: The Movie*. We refer to the film as *Hillary*. It is a 90-minute documentary about then-Senator Hillary Clinton, who was a candidate in the Democratic Party’s 2008 Presidential primary elections. *Hillary* mentions Senator *320 Clinton by name and depicts interviews with political commentators and other persons, most of them quite critical of Senator Clinton. *Hillary* was released

in theaters and on DVD, but Citizens United wanted to increase distribution by making it available through video-on-demand.

Video-on-demand allows digital cable subscribers to select programming from various menus, including movies, television shows, sports, news, and music. The viewer can watch the program at any time and can elect to rewind or pause the program. In December 2007, a cable company offered, for a payment of \$1.2 million, to make *Hillary* available on a video-on-demand channel called “Elections ’08.” App. 255a–257a. Some video-on-demand services require viewers to pay a small fee to view a selected program, but here the proposal was to make *Hillary* available to viewers free of charge.

To implement the proposal, Citizens United was prepared to pay for the video-on-demand; and to promote the film, it produced two 10-second ads and one 30-second ad for *Hillary*. Each ad includes a short (and, in our view, pejorative) statement about Senator Clinton, followed by the name of the movie and the movie’s Website address. *Id.*, at 26a–27a. Citizens United desired to promote the video-on-demand offering by running advertisements on broadcast and cable television.

B

Before the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 2002 (BCRA), federal law prohibited—and still does prohibit—corporations and unions from using general treasury funds to make direct contributions to candidates or independent expenditures that expressly advocate the election or defeat of a candidate, through any form of media, in connection with certain qualified federal elections. 2 U.S.C. § 441b (2000 ed.); see *McConnell, supra*, at 204, and n. 87, 124 S.Ct. 619; *Federal Election Comm'n v. Massachusetts Citizens for Life, Inc.*, 479 U.S. 238, 249, 107 S.Ct. 616, 93 L.Ed.2d 539 (1986) (*MCFL*). BCRA § 203 amended *321 § 441b to prohibit any “electioneering communication” as well. 2 U.S.C. § 441b(b) (2) (2006 ed.). An electioneering communication is defined as “any broadcast, cable, or satellite communication” that “refers to a clearly identified candidate for Federal office” and is made within 30 days of a primary or 60 days of a general election. § 434(f)(3)(A). The Federal Election Commission’s (FEC) regulations further define an electioneering communication as a communication

that is “publicly distributed.” 11 CFR § 100.29(a)(2) (2009). “In the case of a candidate for nomination for President ... *publicly distributed* means” that the communication “[c]an be received by 50,000 or more persons in a State where a primary election ... is being held within 30 days.” § 100.29(b)(3)(ii). Corporations and unions are barred from using their general treasury funds for express advocacy or electioneering communications. They may establish, however, a “separate segregated fund” (known as a political action committee, or PAC) for these purposes. **888 2 U.S.C. § 441b(b)(2). The moneys received by the segregated fund are limited to donations from stockholders and employees of the corporation or, in the case of unions, members of the union. *Ibid.*

C

Citizens United wanted to make *Hillary* available through video-on-demand within 30 days of the 2008 primary elections. It feared, however, that both the film and the ads would be covered by § 441b's ban on corporate-funded independent expenditures, thus subjecting the corporation to civil and criminal penalties under § 437g. In December 2007, Citizens United sought declaratory and injunctive relief against the FEC. It argued that (1) § 441b is unconstitutional as applied to *Hillary*; and (2) BCRA's disclaimer and disclosure requirements, BCRA §§ 201 and 311, are unconstitutional as applied to *Hillary* and to the three ads for the movie.

*322 The District Court denied Citizens United's motion for a preliminary injunction, 530 F.Supp.2d 274 (D.D.C.2008) (*per curiam*), and then granted the FEC's motion for summary judgment, App. 261a–262a. See *id.*, at 261a (“Based on the reasoning of our prior opinion, we find that the [FEC] is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. See *Citizen[s] United v. FEC*, 530 F.Supp.2d 274 (D.D.C.2008) (denying Citizens United's request for a preliminary injunction”). The court held that § 441b was facially constitutional under *McConnell*, and that § 441b was constitutional as applied to *Hillary* because it was “susceptible of no other interpretation than to inform the electorate that Senator Clinton is unfit for office, that the United States would be a dangerous place in a President Hillary Clinton world, and that viewers should vote against her.” 530 F.Supp.2d, at 279. The court also rejected Citizens United's challenge to BCRA's disclaimer and disclosure requirements. It noted that “the

Supreme Court has written approvingly of disclosure provisions triggered by political speech even though the speech itself was constitutionally protected under the First Amendment.” *Id.*, at 281.

We noted probable jurisdiction. 555 U.S. —, 128 S.Ct. 1471, 170 L.Ed.2d 294 (2008). The case was reargued in this Court after the Court asked the parties to file supplemental briefs addressing whether we should overrule either or both *Austin* and the part of *McConnell* which addresses the facial validity of 2 U.S.C. § 441b. See 557 U.S. —, 128 S.Ct. 1732, 170 L.Ed.2d 511 (2009).

II

Before considering whether *Austin* should be overruled, we first address whether Citizens United's claim that § 441b cannot be applied to *Hillary* may be resolved on other, narrower grounds.

A

[1] [2] Citizens United contends that § 441b does not cover *Hillary*, as a matter of statutory interpretation, because the film *323 does not qualify as an “electioneering communication.” § 441b(b)(2). Citizens United raises this issue for the first time before us, but we consider the issue because “it was addressed by the court below.” *Lebron v. National Railroad Passenger Corporation*, 513 U.S. 374, 379, 115 S.Ct. 961, 130 L.Ed.2d 902 (1995); see 530 F.Supp.2d, at 277, n. 6. Under the definition of electioneering communication, the video-on-demand showing of *Hillary* on cable television would have been a “cable ... communication” that “refer[red] to a clearly identified candidate for Federal office” and that was made within 30 days of a primary election. 2 U.S.C. § 434(f)(3)(A)(i). Citizens United, however, argues that *Hillary* was not “publicly **889 distributed,” because a single video-on-demand transmission is sent only to a requesting cable converter box and each separate transmission, in most instances, will be seen by just one household—not 50,000 or more persons. 11 CFR § 100.29(a)(2); see § 100.29(b)(3)(ii).

This argument ignores the regulation's instruction on how to determine whether a cable transmission “[c]an be received by 50,000 or more persons.” § 100.29(b)(3)

(ii). The regulation provides that the number of people who can receive a cable transmission is determined by the number of cable subscribers in the relevant area. §§ 100.29(b)(7)(i)(G). (ii). Here, Citizens United wanted to use a cable video-on-demand system that had 34.5 million subscribers nationwide. App. 256a. Thus, *Hillary* could have been received by 50,000 persons or more.

One *amici* brief asks us, alternatively, to construe the condition that the communication “[c]an be received by 50,000 or more persons,” § 100.29(b)(3)(ii)(A), to require “a plausible likelihood that the communication will be viewed by 50,000 or more potential voters”—as opposed to requiring only that the communication is “technologically capable” of being seen by that many people. Brief for Former Officials of the American Civil Liberties Union as *Amici Curiae* 5. Whether the population and demographic statistics in a proposed viewing area consisted *324 of 50,000 registered voters—but not “infants, pre-teens, or otherwise electorally ineligible recipients”—would be a required determination, subject to judicial challenge and review, in any case where the issue was in doubt. *Id.*, at 6.

[3] In our view the statute cannot be saved by limiting the reach of 2 U.S.C. § 441b through this suggested interpretation. In addition to the costs and burdens of litigation, this result would require a calculation as to the number of people a particular communication is likely to reach, with an inaccurate estimate potentially subjecting the speaker to criminal sanctions. The First Amendment does not permit laws that force speakers to retain a campaign finance attorney, conduct demographic marketing research, or seek declaratory rulings before discussing the most salient political issues of our day. Prolix laws chill speech for the same reason that vague laws chill speech: People “of common intelligence must necessarily guess at [the law’s] meaning and differ as to its application.” *Connally v. General Constr. Co.*, 269 U.S. 385, 391, 46 S.Ct. 126, 70 L.Ed. 322 (1926). The Government may not render a ban on political speech constitutional by carving out a limited exemption through an amorphous regulatory interpretation. We must reject the approach suggested by the *amici*. Section 441b covers *Hillary*.

B

[4] [5] Citizens United next argues that § 441b may not be applied to *Hillary* under the approach taken in *WRTL*. *McConnell* decided that § 441b(b)(2)’s definition of an “electioneering communication” was facially constitutional insofar as it restricted speech that was “the functional equivalent of express advocacy” for or against a specific candidate. 540 U.S., at 206, 124 S.Ct. 619. *WRTL* then found an unconstitutional application of § 441b where the speech was not “express advocacy or its functional equivalent.” 551 U.S., at 481, 127 S.Ct. 2652 (opinion of ROBERTS, C. J.). As explained by THE CHIEF JUSTICE’s controlling opinion in *WRTL*, the functional-equivalent test is objective: “a court should find that [a communication] is *325 the functional equivalent of express advocacy only if [it] is susceptible of no reasonable interpretation other than as an appeal **890 to vote for or against a specific candidate.” *Id.*, at 469–470, 127 S.Ct. 2652.

Under this test, *Hillary* is equivalent to express advocacy. The movie, in essence, is a feature-length negative advertisement that urges viewers to vote against Senator Clinton for President. In light of historical footage, interviews with persons critical of her, and voiceover narration, the film would be understood by most viewers as an extended criticism of Senator Clinton’s character and her fitness for the office of the Presidency. The narrative may contain more suggestions and arguments than facts, but there is little doubt that the thesis of the film is that she is unfit for the Presidency. The movie concentrates on alleged wrongdoing during the Clinton administration, Senator Clinton’s qualifications and fitness for office, and policies the commentators predict she would pursue if elected President. It calls Senator Clinton “Machiavellian,” App. 64a, and asks whether she is “the most qualified to hit the ground running if elected President,” *id.*, at 88a. The narrator reminds viewers that “Americans have never been keen on dynasties” and that “a vote for Hillary is a vote to continue 20 years of a Bush or a Clinton in the White House,” *id.*, at 143a–144a.

Citizens United argues that *Hillary* is just “a documentary film that examines certain historical events.” Brief for Appellant 35. We disagree. The movie’s consistent emphasis is on the relevance of these events to Senator Clinton’s candidacy for President. The narrator begins by asking “could [Senator Clinton] become the first female President in the history of the United States?” App. 35a.

And the narrator reiterates the movie's message in his closing line: "Finally, before America decides on our next president, voters should need no reminders of ... what's at stake—the well being and prosperity of our nation." *Id.*, at 144a–145a.

***326** As the District Court found, there is no reasonable interpretation of *Hillary* other than as an appeal to vote against Senator Clinton. Under the standard stated in *McConnell* and further elaborated in *WRTL*, the film qualifies as the functional equivalent of express advocacy.

C

Citizens United further contends that § 441b should be invalidated as applied to movies shown through video-on-demand, arguing that this delivery system has a lower risk of distorting the political process than do television ads. Cf. *McConnell*, *supra*, at 207, 124 S.Ct. 619. On what we might call conventional television, advertising spots reach viewers who have chosen a channel or a program for reasons unrelated to the advertising. With video-on-demand, by contrast, the viewer selects a program after taking "a series of affirmative steps": subscribing to cable; navigating through various menus; and selecting the program. See *Reno v. American Civil Liberties Union*, 521 U.S. 844, 867, 117 S.Ct. 2329, 138 L.Ed.2d 874 (1997).

While some means of communication may be less effective than others at influencing the public in different contexts, any effort by the Judiciary to decide which means of communications are to be preferred for the particular type of message and speaker would raise questions as to the courts' own lawful authority. Substantial questions would arise if courts were to begin saying what means of speech should be preferred or disfavored. And in all events, those differentiations might soon prove to be irrelevant or outdated by technologies that are in rapid flux. See *Turner Broadcasting System, Inc. v. FCC*, 512 U.S. 622, 639, 114 S.Ct. 2445, 129 L.Ed.2d 497 (1994).

****891 [6]** Courts, too, are bound by the First Amendment. We must decline to draw, and then redraw, constitutional lines based on the particular media or technology used to disseminate political speech from a particular speaker. It must be noted, moreover, that this undertaking would require substantial litigation over an extended time, all to interpret a ***327** law that

beyond doubt discloses serious First Amendment flaws. The interpretive process itself would create an inevitable, pervasive, and serious risk of chilling protected speech pending the drawing of fine distinctions that, in the end, would themselves be questionable. First Amendment standards, however, "must give the benefit of any doubt to protecting rather than stifling speech." *WRTL*, 551 U.S., at 469, 127 S.Ct. 2652 (opinion of ROBERTS, C.J.) (citing *New York Times Co. v. Sullivan*, 376 U.S. 254, 269–270, 84 S.Ct. 710, 11 L.Ed.2d 686 (1964)).

D

Citizens United also asks us to carve out an exception to § 441b's expenditure ban for nonprofit corporate political speech funded overwhelmingly by individuals. As an alternative to reconsidering *Austin*, the Government also seems to prefer this approach. This line of analysis, however, would be unavailing.

In *MCFL*, the Court found unconstitutional § 441b's restrictions on corporate expenditures as applied to nonprofit corporations that were formed for the sole purpose of promoting political ideas, did not engage in business activities, and did not accept contributions from for-profit corporations or labor unions. 479 U.S., at 263–264, 107 S.Ct. 616; see also 11 CFR § 114.10. BCRA's so-called Wellstone Amendment applied § 441b's expenditure ban to all nonprofit corporations. See 2 U.S.C. § 441b(c)(6); *McConnell*, 540 U.S., at 209, 124 S.Ct. 619. *McConnell* then interpreted the Wellstone Amendment to retain the *MCFL* exemption to § 441b's expenditure prohibition. 540 U.S., at 211, 124 S.Ct. 619. Citizens United does not qualify for the *MCFL* exemption, however, since some funds used to make the movie were donations from for-profit corporations.

The Government suggests we could find BCRA's Wellstone Amendment unconstitutional, sever it from the statute, and hold that Citizens United's speech is exempt from § 441b's ban under BCRA's Snowe–Jeffords Amendment, § 441b(c)(2). See Tr. of Oral Arg. 37–38 (Sept. 9, 2009). The Snowe–Jeffords Amendment operates as a backup provision that ***328** only takes effect if the Wellstone Amendment is invalidated. See *McConnell*, *supra*, at 339, 124 S.Ct. 619 (KENNEDY, J., concurring in judgment in part and dissenting in part). The Snowe–Jeffords Amendment would exempt from § 441b'

s expenditure ban the political speech of certain nonprofit corporations if the speech were funded “exclusively” by individual donors and the funds were maintained in a segregated account. § 441b(c)(2). Citizens United would not qualify for the Snowe–Jeffords exemption, under its terms as written, because *Hillary* was funded in part with donations from for-profit corporations.

Consequently, to hold for Citizens United on this argument, the Court would be required to revise the text of *MCFL*, sever BCRA's Wellstone Amendment, § 441b(c)(6), and ignore the plain text of BCRA's Snowe–Jeffords Amendment, § 441b(c)(2). If the Court decided to create a *de minimis* exception to *MCFL* or the Snowe–Jeffords Amendment, the result would be to allow for-profit corporate general treasury funds to be spent for independent expenditures that support candidates. There is no principled basis **892 for doing this without rewriting *Austin's* holding that the Government can restrict corporate independent expenditures for political speech.

Though it is true that the Court should construe statutes as necessary to avoid constitutional questions, the series of steps suggested would be difficult to take in view of the language of the statute. In addition to those difficulties the Government's suggestion is troubling for still another reason. The Government does not say that it agrees with the interpretation it wants us to consider. See Supp. Brief for Appellee 3, n. 1 (“Some courts” have implied a *de minimis* exception, and “appellant would appear to be covered by these decisions”). Presumably it would find textual difficulties in this approach too. The Government, like any party, can make arguments in the alternative; but it ought to say if there is merit to an alternative proposal instead of *329 merely suggesting it. This is especially true in the context of the First Amendment. As the Government stated, this case “would require a remand” to apply a *de minimis* standard. Tr. of Oral Arg. 39 (Sept. 9, 2009). Applying this standard would thus require case-by-case determinations. But archetypical political speech would be chilled in the meantime. “‘First Amendment freedoms need breathing space to survive.’” *WRTL*, *supra*, at 468–469, 127 S.Ct. 2652 (opinion of ROBERTS, C.J.) (quoting *NAACP v. Button*, 371 U.S. 415, 433, 83 S.Ct. 328, 9 L.Ed.2d 405 (1963)). We decline to adopt an interpretation that requires intricate case-by-case determinations to verify whether political speech is banned, especially if we are convinced that, in the end,

this corporation has a constitutional right to speak on this subject.

E

As the foregoing analysis confirms, the Court cannot resolve this case on a narrower ground without chilling political speech, speech that is central to the meaning and purpose of the First Amendment. See *Morse v. Frederick*, 551 U.S. 393, 403, 127 S.Ct. 2618, 168 L.Ed.2d 290 (2007). It is not judicial restraint to accept an unsound, narrow argument just so the Court can avoid another argument with broader implications. Indeed, a court would be remiss in performing its duties were it to accept an unsound principle merely to avoid the necessity of making a broader ruling. Here, the lack of a valid basis for an alternative ruling requires full consideration of the continuing effect of the speech suppression upheld in *Austin*.

[7] Citizens United stipulated to dismissing count 5 of its complaint, which raised a facial challenge to § 441b, even though count 3 raised an as-applied challenge. See App. 23a (count 3: “As applied to *Hillary*, [§ 441b] is unconstitutional under the First Amendment guarantees of free expression and association”). The Government argues that Citizens United waived its challenge to *Austin* by dismissing count 5. We disagree.

[8] *330 First, even if a party could somehow waive a facial challenge while preserving an as-applied challenge, that would not prevent the Court from reconsidering *Austin* or addressing the facial validity of § 441b in this case. “Our practice ‘permit[s] review of an issue not pressed [below] so long as it has been passed upon....’” *Lebron*, 513 U.S., at 379, 115 S.Ct. 961 (quoting *United States v. Williams*, 504 U.S. 36, 41, 112 S.Ct. 1735, 118 L.Ed.2d 352 (1992); first alteration in original). And here, the District Court addressed Citizens United's facial challenge. See 530 F.Supp.2d, at 278 (“Citizens wants us to enjoin the operation of BCRA § 203 as a facially unconstitutional burden on the First Amendment right to **893 freedom of speech”). In rejecting the claim, it noted that it “would have to overrule *McConnell*” for Citizens United to prevail on its facial challenge and that “[o]nly the Supreme Court may overrule its decisions.” *Ibid.* (citing *Rodriguez de Quijas v. Shearson American Express, Inc.*, 490 U.S. 477, 484, 109 S.Ct.

130 S.Ct. 876, 187 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 2961, 175 L.Ed.2d 753, 78 USLW 4078...

1917, 104 L.Ed.2d 526 (1989)). The District Court did not provide much analysis regarding the facial challenge because it could not ignore the controlling Supreme Court decisions in *Austin* or *McConnell*. Even so, the District Court did “‘pas[s] upon’” the issue. *Lebron, supra*, at 379, 115 S.Ct. 961. Furthermore, the District Court’s later opinion, which granted the FEC summary judgment, was “[b]ased on the reasoning of [its] prior opinion,” which included the discussion of the facial challenge. App. 261a (citing 530 F.Supp.2d 274). After the District Court addressed the facial validity of the statute, Citizens United raised its challenge to *Austin* in this Court. See Brief for Appellant 30 (“*Austin* was wrongly decided and should be overruled”); *id.*, at 30–32. In these circumstances, it is necessary to consider Citizens United’s challenge to *Austin* and the facial validity of § 441b’s expenditure ban.

[9] Second, throughout the litigation, Citizens United has asserted a claim that the FEC has violated its First Amendment right to free speech. All concede that this claim is properly before us. And “‘[o]nce a federal claim is properly *331 presented, a party can make any argument in support of that claim; parties are not limited to the precise arguments they made below.’” *Lebron, supra*, at 379, 115 S.Ct. 961 (quoting *Yee v. Escondido*, 503 U.S. 519, 534, 112 S.Ct. 1522, 118 L.Ed.2d 153 (1992); alteration in original). Citizens United’s argument that *Austin* should be overruled is “not a new claim.” *Lebron*, 513 U.S., at 379, 115 S.Ct. 961. Rather, it is—at most—“a new argument to support what has been [a] consistent claim: that [the FEC] did not accord [Citizens United] the rights it was obliged to provide by the First Amendment.” *Ibid.*

[10] Third, the distinction between facial and as-applied challenges is not so well defined that it has some automatic effect or that it must always control the pleadings and disposition in every case involving a constitutional challenge. The distinction is both instructive and necessary, for it goes to the breadth of the remedy employed by the Court, not what must be pleaded in a complaint. See *United States v. Treasury Employees*, 513 U.S. 454, 477–478, 115 S.Ct. 1003, 130 L.Ed.2d 964 (1995) (contrasting “a facial challenge” with “a narrower remedy”). The parties cannot enter into a stipulation that prevents the Court from considering certain remedies if those remedies are necessary to resolve a claim that has been preserved. Citizens United has preserved its First Amendment challenge to § 441b as applied to the facts of its case; and given all the circumstances, we cannot

easily address that issue without assuming a premise—the permissibility of restricting corporate political speech—that is itself in doubt. See Fallon, *As–Applied and Facial Challenges and Third–Party Standing*, 113 Harv. L.Rev. 1321, 1339 (2000) (“[O]nce a case is brought, no general categorical line bars a court from making broader pronouncements of invalidity in properly ‘as-applied’ cases”); *id.*, at 1327–1328. As our request for supplemental briefing implied, Citizens United’s claim implicates the validity of *Austin*, which in turn implicates the facial validity of § 441b.

When the statute now at issue came before the Court in *McConnell*, both the majority and the dissenting opinions *332 considered the question of its facial validity. The holding and validity of *Austin* were **894 essential to the reasoning of the *McConnell* majority opinion, which upheld BCRA’s extension of § 441b. See 540 U.S., at 205, 124 S.Ct. 619 (quoting *Austin*, 494 U.S., at 660, 110 S.Ct. 1391). *McConnell* permitted federal felony punishment for speech by all corporations, including nonprofit ones, that speak on prohibited subjects shortly before federal elections. See 540 U.S., at 203–209, 124 S.Ct. 619. Four Members of the *McConnell* Court would have overruled *Austin*, including Chief Justice Rehnquist, who had joined the Court’s opinion in *Austin* but reconsidered that conclusion. See 540 U.S., at 256–262, 124 S.Ct. 619 (SCALIA, J., concurring in part, concurring in judgment in part, and dissenting in part); *id.*, at 273–275, 124 S.Ct. 619 (THOMAS, J., concurring in part, concurring in result in part, concurring in judgment in part, and dissenting in part); *id.*, at 322–338, 124 S.Ct. 619 (opinion of KENNEDY, J., joined by Rehnquist, C.J., and Scalia, J.). That inquiry into the facial validity of the statute was facilitated by the extensive record, which was “over 100,000 pages” long, made in the three-judge District Court. *McConnell v. Federal Election Comm’n*, 251 F.Supp.2d 176, 209 (D.D.C.2003) (*per curiam*) (*McConnell I*). It is not the case, then, that the Court today is premature in interpreting § 441b “‘on the basis of [a] factually barebones recor[d].’” *Washington State Grange v. Washington State Republican Party*, 552 U.S. 442, 450, 128 S.Ct. 1184, 170 L.Ed.2d 151 (2008) (quoting *Sabri v. United States*, 541 U.S. 600, 609, 124 S.Ct. 1941, 158 L.Ed.2d 891 (2004)).

The *McConnell* majority considered whether the statute was facially invalid. An as-applied challenge was brought in *Wisconsin Right to Life, Inc. v. Federal Election Comm’n*,

546 U.S. 410, 411–412, 126 S.Ct. 1016, 163 L.Ed.2d 990 (2006) (*per curiam*), and the Court confirmed that the challenge could be maintained. Then, in *WRTL*, the controlling opinion of the Court not only entertained an as-applied challenge but also sustained it. Three Justices noted that they would continue to maintain the position that the record in *McConnell* demonstrated the invalidity of the Act on its face. 551 U.S., at 485–504, 127 S.Ct. 2652 (opinion of *333 SCALIA, J.). The controlling opinion in *WRTL*, which refrained from holding the statute invalid except as applied to the facts then before the Court, was a careful attempt to accept the essential elements of the Court's opinion in *McConnell*, while vindicating the First Amendment arguments made by the *WRTL* parties. 551 U.S., at 482, 127 S.Ct. 2652 (opinion of ROBERTS, C.J.).

As noted above, Citizens United's narrower arguments are not sustainable under a fair reading of the statute. In the exercise of its judicial responsibility, it is necessary then for the Court to consider the facial validity of § 441b. Any other course of decision would prolong the substantial, nationwide chilling effect caused by § 441b's prohibitions on corporate expenditures. Consideration of the facial validity of § 441b is further supported by the following reasons.

First is the uncertainty caused by the litigating position of the Government. As discussed above, see Part II–D, *supra*, the Government suggests, as an alternative argument, that an as-applied challenge might have merit. This argument proceeds on the premise that the nonprofit corporation involved here may have received only *de minimis* donations from for-profit corporations and that some nonprofit corporations may be exempted from the operation of the statute. The Government also suggests that an as-applied challenge to § 441b's ban on books may be successful, although it would defend § 441b's ban as applied to almost every other form of media **895 including pamphlets. See Tr. of Oral Arg. 65–66 (Sept. 9, 2009). The Government thus, by its own position, contributes to the uncertainty that § 441b causes. When the Government holds out the possibility of ruling for Citizens United on a narrow ground yet refrains from adopting that position, the added uncertainty demonstrates the necessity to address the question of statutory validity.

Second, substantial time would be required to bring clarity to the application of the statutory provision on these points *334 in order to avoid any chilling effect caused by some improper interpretation. See Part II–C, *supra*. It is well known that the public begins to concentrate on elections only in the weeks immediately before they are held. There are short timeframes in which speech can have influence. The need or relevance of the speech will often first be apparent at this stage in the campaign. The decision to speak is made in the heat of political campaigns, when speakers react to messages conveyed by others. A speaker's ability to engage in political speech that could have a chance of persuading voters is stifled if the speaker must first commence a protracted lawsuit. By the time the lawsuit concludes, the election will be over and the litigants in most cases will have neither the incentive nor, perhaps, the resources to carry on, even if they could establish that the case is not moot because the issue is “capable of repetition, yet evading review.” *WRTL, supra*, at 462, 126 S.Ct. 1016 (opinion of ROBERTS, C.J.) (citing *Los Angeles v. Lyons*, 461 U.S. 95, 109, 103 S.Ct. 1660, 75 L.Ed.2d 675 (1983); *Southern Pacific Terminal Co. v. ICC*, 219 U.S. 498, 515, 31 S.Ct. 279, 55 L.Ed. 310 (1911)). Here, Citizens United decided to litigate its case to the end. Today, Citizens United finally learns, two years after the fact, whether it could have spoken during the 2008 Presidential primary—long after the opportunity to persuade primary voters has passed.

Third is the primary importance of speech itself to the integrity of the election process. As additional rules are created for regulating political speech, any speech arguably within their reach is chilled. See Part II–A, *supra*. Campaign finance regulations now impose “unique and complex rules” on “71 distinct entities.” Brief for Seven Former Chairmen of FEC et al. as *Amici Curiae* 11–12. These entities are subject to separate rules for 33 different types of political speech. *Id.*, at 14–15, n. 10. The FEC has adopted 568 pages of regulations, 1,278 pages of explanations and justifications for those regulations, and 1,771 advisory opinions since 1975. See *id.*, at 6, n. 7. In fact, after this Court in *335 *WRTL* adopted an objective “appeal to vote” test for determining whether a communication was the functional equivalent of express advocacy, 551 U.S., at 470, 127 S.Ct. 2652 (opinion of ROBERTS, C. J.), the FEC adopted a two-part, 11-factor balancing test to implement *WRTL*'s ruling. See 11 CFR § 114.15; Brief for Wyoming Liberty Group et al. as *Amici Curiae* 17–27 (filed Jan. 15, 2009).

This regulatory scheme may not be a prior restraint on speech in the strict sense of that term, for prospective speakers are not compelled by law to seek an advisory opinion from the FEC before the speech takes place. Cf. *Near v. Minnesota ex rel. Olson*, 283 U.S. 697, 712–713, 51 S.Ct. 625, 75 L.Ed. 1357 (1931). As a practical matter, however, given the complexity of the regulations and the deference courts show to administrative determinations, a speaker who wants to avoid threats of criminal liability and the heavy costs of defending against FEC enforcement must ask a governmental agency for prior permission to speak. See 2 U.S.C. § 437f; 11 CFR § 112.1. These onerous ****896** restrictions thus function as the equivalent of prior restraint by giving the FEC power analogous to licensing laws implemented in 16th- and 17th-century England, laws and governmental practices of the sort that the First Amendment was drawn to prohibit. See *Thomas v. Chicago Park Dist.*, 534 U.S. 316, 320, 122 S.Ct. 775, 151 L.Ed.2d 783 (2002); *Lovell v. City of Griffin*, 303 U.S. 444, 451–452, 58 S.Ct. 666, 82 L.Ed. 949 (1938); *Near*, *supra*, at 713–714, 51 S.Ct. 625. Because the FEC's “business is to censor, there inheres the danger that [it] may well be less responsive than a court—part of an independent branch of government—to the constitutionally protected interests in free expression.” *Freedman v. Maryland*, 380 U.S. 51, 57–58, 85 S.Ct. 734, 13 L.Ed.2d 649 (1965). When the FEC issues advisory opinions that prohibit speech, “[m]any persons, rather than undertake the considerable burden (and sometimes risk) of vindicating their rights through case-by-case litigation, will choose simply to abstain from protected speech—harming not only themselves but society as a whole, which is deprived of an uninhibited marketplace of ideas.” ***336** *Virginia v. Hicks*, 539 U.S. 113, 119, 123 S.Ct. 2191, 156 L.Ed.2d 148 (2003) (citation omitted). Consequently, “the censor's determination may in practice be final.” *Freedman*, *supra*, at 58, 85 S.Ct. 734.

This is precisely what *WRTL* sought to avoid. *WRTL* said that First Amendment standards “must eschew ‘the open-ended rough-and-tumble of factors,’ which ‘invit[es] complex argument in a trial court and a virtually inevitable appeal.’ ” 551 U.S., at 469, 127 S.Ct. 2652 (opinion of ROBERTS, C.J.) (quoting *Jerome B. Grubart, Inc. v. Great Lakes Dredge & Dock Co.*, 513 U.S. 527, 547, 115 S.Ct. 1043, 130 L.Ed.2d 1024 (1995); alteration in original). Yet, the FEC has created a regime that allows it to select what political speech is safe for public consumption by applying ambiguous tests. If parties want

to avoid litigation and the possibility of civil and criminal penalties, they must either refrain from speaking or ask the FEC to issue an advisory opinion approving of the political speech in question. Government officials pore over each word of a text to see if, in their judgment, it accords with the 11-factor test they have promulgated. This is an unprecedented governmental intervention into the realm of speech.

The ongoing chill upon speech that is beyond all doubt protected makes it necessary in this case to invoke the earlier precedents that a statute which chills speech can and must be invalidated where its facial invalidity has been demonstrated. See *WRTL*, *supra*, at 482–483, 127 S.Ct. 2652 (ALITO, J., concurring); *Thornhill v. Alabama*, 310 U.S. 88, 97–98, 60 S.Ct. 736, 84 L.Ed. 1093 (1940). For these reasons we find it necessary to reconsider *Austin*.

III

The First Amendment provides that “Congress shall make no law ... abridging the freedom of speech.” Laws enacted to control or suppress speech may operate at different points in the speech process. The following are just a few examples of restrictions that have been attempted at different stages of the speech process—all laws found to be invalid: restrictions requiring a permit at the outset, *Watchtower *337 Bible & Tract Soc. of N.Y., Inc. v. Village of Stratton*, 536 U.S. 150, 153, 122 S.Ct. 2080, 153 L.Ed.2d 205 (2002); imposing a burden by impounding proceeds on receipts or royalties, *Simon & Schuster, Inc. v. Members of N.Y. State Crime Victims Bd.*, 502 U.S. 105, 108, 123 S.Ct. 501, 116 L.Ed.2d 476 (1991); seeking to exact a cost after the speech occurs, *New York Times Co. v. Sullivan*, 376 U.S., at 267, 84 S.Ct. 710; and subjecting the speaker to ****897** criminal penalties, *Brandenburg v. Ohio*, 395 U.S. 444, 445, 89 S.Ct. 1827, 23 L.Ed.2d 430 (1969) (*per curiam*).

The law before us is an outright ban, backed by criminal sanctions. Section 441b makes it a felony for all corporations—including nonprofit advocacy corporations—either to expressly advocate the election or defeat of candidates or to broadcast electioneering communications within 30 days of a primary election and 60 days of a general election. Thus, the following acts would all be felonies under § 441b: The Sierra Club runs an ad, within the crucial phase of 60 days before the

general election, that exhorts the public to disapprove of a Congressman who favors logging in national forests; the National Rifle Association publishes a book urging the public to vote for the challenger because the incumbent U.S. Senator supports a handgun ban; and the American Civil Liberties Union creates a Web site telling the public to vote for a Presidential candidate in light of that candidate's defense of free speech. These prohibitions are classic examples of censorship.

Section 441b is a ban on corporate speech notwithstanding the fact that a PAC created by a corporation can still speak. See *McCormell*, 540 U.S., at 330–333, 124 S.Ct. 619 (opinion of KENNEDY, J.). A PAC is a separate association from the corporation. So the PAC exemption from § 441b's expenditure ban, § 441b(b)(2), does not allow corporations to speak. Even if a PAC could somehow allow a corporation to speak—and it does not—the option to form PACs does not alleviate the First Amendment problems with § 441b. PACs are burdensome alternatives; they are expensive to administer and subject to extensive regulations. For example, every PAC *338 must appoint a treasurer, forward donations to the treasurer promptly, keep detailed records of the identities of the persons making donations, preserve receipts for three years, and file an organization statement and report changes to this information within 10 days. See *id.*, at 330–332, 124 S.Ct. 619 (quoting *MCFL*, 479 U.S., at 253–254, 107 S.Ct. 616).

And that is just the beginning. PACs must file detailed monthly reports with the FEC, which are due at different times depending on the type of election that is about to occur:

“ These reports must contain information regarding the amount of cash on hand; the total amount of receipts, detailed by 10 different categories; the identification of each political committee and candidate's authorized or affiliated committee making contributions, and any persons making loans, providing rebates, refunds, dividends, or interest or any other offset to operating expenditures in an aggregate amount over \$200; the total amount of all disbursements, detailed by 12 different categories; the names of all authorized or affiliated committees to whom expenditures aggregating over \$200 have been made; persons to whom loan repayments or refunds have been made; the total sum of all contributions, operating expenses, outstanding debts and obligations, and the settlement terms of the retirement of any debt or

obligation.” 540 U.S., at 331–332, 124 S.Ct. 619 (quoting *MCFL*, *supra*, at 253–254, 107 S.Ct. 616).

PACs have to comply with these regulations just to speak. This might explain why fewer than 2,000 of the millions of corporations in this country have PACs. See Brief for Seven Former Chairmen of FEC et al. as *Amici Curiae* 11 (citing FEC, Summary of PAC Activity 1990–2006, online at <http://www.fec.gov/press/press2007/20071009pac/sumhistory.pdf> (as visited Jan. 18, 2010, and available in Clerk of Courts case file)); IRS, Statistics of Income: 2006, Corporation **898 Income *339 Tax Returns 2 (2009) (hereinafter Statistics of Income) (5.8 million for-profit corporations filed 2006 tax returns). PACs, furthermore, must exist before they can speak. Given the onerous restrictions, a corporation may not be able to establish a PAC in time to make its views known regarding candidates and issues in a current campaign.

Section 441b's prohibition on corporate independent expenditures is thus a ban on speech. As a “restriction on the amount of money a person or group can spend on political communication during a campaign,” that statute “necessarily reduces the quantity of expression by restricting the number of issues discussed, the depth of their exploration, and the size of the audience reached.” *Buckley v. Valeo*, 424 U.S. 1, 19, 96 S.Ct. 612, 46 L.Ed.2d 659 (1976) (*per curiam*). Were the Court to uphold these restrictions, the Government could repress speech by silencing certain voices at any of the various points in the speech process. See *McCormell*, *supra*, at 251, 124 S.Ct. 619 (opinion of SCALIA, J.) (Government could repress speech by “attacking all levels of the production and dissemination of ideas,” for “effective public communication requires the speaker to make use of the services of others”). If § 441b applied to individuals, no one would believe that it is merely a time, place, or manner restriction on speech. Its purpose and effect are to silence entities whose voices the Government deems to be suspect.

[11] Speech is an essential mechanism of democracy, for it is the means to hold officials accountable to the people. See *Buckley*, *supra*, at 14–15, 96 S.Ct. 612 (“In a republic where the people are sovereign, the ability of the citizenry to make informed choices among candidates for office is essential”). The right of citizens to inquire, to hear, to speak, and to use information to reach consensus is a precondition to enlightened self-government and a necessary means to protect it. The First Amendment “

'has its fullest and most urgent application' to speech uttered during a campaign for political office." *340 *Eu v. San Francisco County Democratic Central Comm.*, 489 U.S. 214, 223, 109 S.Ct. 1013, 103 L.Ed.2d 271 (1989) (quoting *Monitor Patriot Co. v. Roy*, 401 U.S. 265, 272, 91 S.Ct. 621, 28 L.Ed.2d 35 (1971)); see *Buckley*, *supra*, at 14, 96 S.Ct. 612 ("Discussion of public issues and debate on the qualifications of candidates are integral to the operation of the system of government established by our Constitution").

[12] For these reasons, political speech must prevail against laws that would suppress it, whether by design or inadvertence. Laws that burden political speech are "subject to strict scrutiny," which requires the Government to prove that the restriction "furthers a compelling interest and is narrowly tailored to achieve that interest." *WRTL*, 551 U.S., at 464, 127 S.Ct. 2652 (opinion of ROBERTS, C.J.). While it might be maintained that political speech simply cannot be banned or restricted as a categorical matter, see *Simon & Schuster*, 502 U.S., at 124, 112 S.Ct. 501 (KENNEDY, J., concurring in judgment), the quoted language from *WRTL* provides a sufficient framework for protecting the relevant First Amendment interests in this case. We shall employ it here.

[13] Premised on mistrust of governmental power, the First Amendment stands against attempts to disfavor certain subjects or viewpoints. See, e.g., *United States v. Playboy Entertainment Group, Inc.*, 529 U.S. 803, 813, 120 S.Ct. 1878, 146 L.Ed.2d 865 (2000) (striking down content-based restriction). Prohibited, too, are restrictions distinguishing among different speakers, allowing speech by some but not others. See *First Nat. Bank of Boston v. Bellotti*, 435 U.S. 765, 784, 98 S.Ct. 1407, 55 L.Ed.2d 707 (1978). As instruments to censor, these categories are interrelated: Speech restrictions based on the identity of the speaker are all too often simply a means to control content.

Quite apart from the purpose or effect of regulating content, moreover, the Government may commit a constitutional wrong when by law it identifies certain preferred speakers. By taking the right to speak from some and giving it to others, the Government deprives the disadvantaged person or class of the right to use speech to strive to establish worth, *341 standing, and respect for the speaker's voice. The Government may not by these

means deprive the public of the right and privilege to determine for itself what speech and speakers are worthy of consideration. The First Amendment protects speech and speaker, and the ideas that flow from each.

The Court has upheld a narrow class of speech restrictions that operate to the disadvantage of certain persons, but these rulings were based on an interest in allowing governmental entities to perform their functions. See, e.g., *Bethel School Dist. No. 403 v. Fraser*, 478 U.S. 675, 683, 106 S.Ct. 3159, 92 L.Ed.2d 549 (1986) (protecting the "function of public school education"); *Jones v. North Carolina Prisoners' Labor Union, Inc.*, 433 U.S. 119, 129, 97 S.Ct. 2532, 53 L.Ed.2d 629 (1977) (furthering "the legitimate penological objectives of the corrections system" (internal quotation marks omitted)); *Parker v. Levy*, 417 U.S. 733, 759, 94 S.Ct. 2547, 41 L.Ed.2d 439 (1974) (ensuring "the capacity of the Government to discharge its [military] responsibilities" (internal quotation marks omitted)); *Civil Service Comm'n v. Letter Carriers*, 413 U.S. 548, 557, 93 S.Ct. 2880, 37 L.Ed.2d 796 (1973) ("[F]ederal service should depend upon meritorious performance rather than political service"). The corporate independent expenditures at issue in this case, however, would not interfere with governmental functions, so these cases are inapposite. These precedents stand only for the proposition that there are certain governmental functions that cannot operate without some restrictions on particular kinds of speech. By contrast, it is inherent in the nature of the political process that voters must be free to obtain information from diverse sources in order to determine how to cast their votes. At least before *Austin*, the Court had not allowed the exclusion of a class of speakers from the general public dialogue.

We find no basis for the proposition that, in the context of political speech, the Government may impose restrictions on certain disfavored speakers. Both history and logic lead us to this conclusion.

*342 A

1

The Court has recognized that First Amendment protection extends to corporations. *Bellotti*, *supra*, at 778, n. 14, 98 S.Ct. 1407 (citing *Linmark Associates, Inc. v. Willingboro*, 431 U.S. 85, 97 S.Ct. 1614, 52 L.Ed.2d 155

Citizens United v. Federal Election Com'n, 558 U.S. 310 (2010)

130 S.Ct. 876, 187 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 2961, 175 L.Ed.2d 753, 78 USLW 4078...

(1977); *Time, Inc. v. Firestone*, 424 U.S. 448, 96 S.Ct. 958, 47 L.Ed.2d 154 (1976); *Doran v. Salem Inn, Inc.*, 422 U.S. 922, 95 S.Ct. 2561, 45 L.Ed.2d 648 (1975); *Southeastern Promotions, Ltd. v. Conrad*, 420 U.S. 546, 95 S.Ct. 1239, 43 L.Ed.2d 448 (1975); *Cox Broadcasting Corp. v. Cohn*, 420 U.S. 469, 95 S.Ct. 1029, 43 L.Ed.2d 328 (1975); *Miami Herald Publishing Co. v. Tornillo*, 418 U.S. 241, 94 S.Ct. 2831, 41 L.Ed.2d 730 (1974); *New York Times Co. v. United States*, 403 U.S. 713, 91 S.Ct. 2140, 29 L.Ed.2d 822 (1971) (*per curiam*); *Time, Inc. v. Hill*, 385 U.S. 374, 87 S.Ct. 534, 17 L.Ed.2d 456 (1967); *New York Times Co. v. Sullivan*, 376 U.S. 254, 84 S.Ct. 710, 11 L.Ed.2d 686; *Kingsley Int'l Pictures Corp. v. Regents of Univ. of N. Y.*, 360 U.S. 684, 79 S.Ct. 1362, 3 L.Ed.2d 1512 (1959); *Joseph Burstyn, Inc. v. Wilson*, 343 U.S. 495, 72 S.Ct. 777, 96 L.Ed. 1098 (1952)); see, e.g., *Turner Broadcasting System, Inc. v. FCC*, 520 U.S. 180, 117 S.Ct. 1174, 137 L.Ed.2d 369 (1997); *Denver Area Ed. Telecommunications Consortium, Inc. v. FCC*, 518 U.S. 727, 116 S.Ct. 2374, 135 L.Ed.2d 888 (1996); *Turner*, 512 U.S. 622, 114 S.Ct. 2445, 129 L.Ed.2d 497; *Simon & Schuster*, 502 U.S. 105, 112 S.Ct. 501, 116 L.Ed.2d 476; *Sable Communications of Cal., Inc. v. FCC*, 492 U.S. 115, 109 S.Ct. 2829, 106 L.Ed.2d 93 (1989); *Florida Star v. B.J. F.*, 491 U.S. 524, 109 S.Ct. 2603, 105 L.Ed.2d 443 (1989); *Philadelphia Newspapers, Inc. v. Hepps*, 475 U.S. 767, 106 S.Ct. 1558, 89 L.Ed.2d 783 (1986); *Landmark Communications, Inc. v. Virginia*, 435 U.S. 829, 98 S.Ct. 1535, 56 L.Ed.2d 1 (1978); *Young v. American Mini Theatres, Inc.*, 427 U.S. 50, 96 S.Ct. 2440, 49 L.Ed.2d 310 (1976); *Gertz v. Robert Welch, Inc.*, 418 U.S. 323, 94 S.Ct. 2997, 41 L.Ed.2d 789 (1974); *Greenbelt Cooperative Publishing Assn., Inc. v. Bresler*, 398 U.S. 6, 90 S.Ct. 1537, 26 L.Ed.2d 6 (1970).

[14] This protection has been extended by explicit holdings to the context of political speech. See, e.g., *Button*, 371 U.S., at 428–429, 83 S.Ct. 328; *Grosjean v. American Press Co.*, 297 U.S. 233, 244, 56 S.Ct. 444, 80 L.Ed. 660 (1936). Under the rationale of these precedents, political speech does not lose First Amendment protection “simply because its source is a corporation.” *Bellotti*, *supra*, at 784, 98 S.Ct. 1407; see *Pacific Gas & Elec. Co. v. Public Util. Comm'n of Cal.*, 475 U.S. 1, 8, 106 S.Ct. 903, 89 L.Ed.2d 1 (1986) (plurality opinion) (“The identity of the speaker is not decisive in determining whether speech is protected. *343 Corporations and other associations, like individuals, contribute to the ‘discussion, debate, and the dissemination of information and ideas’ that the First Amendment seeks to foster” (quoting *Bellotti*, 435 U.S.,

at 783, 98 S.Ct. 1407)). The Court has thus rejected the argument that political speech of corporations or other associations should be treated differently under the First Amendment simply because such associations are not “natural persons.” *Id.*, at 776, 98 S.Ct. 1407; see *id.*, at 780, n. 16, 98 S.Ct. 1407. Cf. *id.*, at 828, 98 S.Ct. 1407 (Rehnquist, J., dissenting).

At least since the latter part of the 19th century, the laws of some States and of the United States imposed a ban on corporate direct contributions to candidates. See B. Smith, *Unfree Speech: The Folly of Campaign Finance Reform* 23 (2001). Yet not until 1947 did Congress first prohibit independent expenditures by corporations and labor unions in § 304 of the Labor Management Relations Act 1947, 61 Stat. 159 (codified at 2 U.S.C. § 251 (1946 ed., Supp. 1)). In passing this Act Congress overrode the veto of President Truman, who warned that the expenditure ban was a “dangerous intrusion on free speech.” Message from the President of the United States, H.R. Doc. No. 334, 89th Cong., 1st Sess., 9 (1947).

For almost three decades thereafter, the Court did not reach the question whether restrictions on corporate and union expenditures are constitutional. See *WRTL*, 551 U.S., at 502, 127 S.Ct. 2652 (opinion of SCALIA, J.). The question was in the background of *United States v. CIO*, 335 U.S. 106, 68 S.Ct. 1349, 92 L.Ed. 1849 (1948). There, a labor union endorsed a congressional candidate in its weekly periodical. The Court stated that “the gravest doubt would arise in our minds as to [the federal expenditure prohibition’s] constitutionality” if it were construed to suppress that writing. *Id.*, at 121, 68 S.Ct. 1349. The Court engaged in statutory interpretation **901 and found the statute did not cover the publication. *Id.*, at 121–122, and n. 20, 68 S.Ct. 1349. Four Justices, however, said they would reach the constitutional question and invalidate the Labor Management Relations Act’s expenditure *344 ban. *Id.*, at 155, 68 S.Ct. 1349 (Rutledge, J., joined by Black, Douglas, and Murphy, JJ., concurring in result). The concurrence explained that any “ ‘undue influence’ ” generated by a speaker’s “large expenditures” was outweighed “by the loss for democratic processes resulting from the restrictions upon free and full public discussion.” *Id.*, at 143, 68 S.Ct. 1349.

In *United States v. Automobile Workers*, 352 U.S. 567, 77 S.Ct. 529, 1 L.Ed.2d 563 (1957), the Court again

encountered the independent expenditure ban, which had been recodified at 18 U.S.C. § 610 (1952 ed.). See 62 Stat. 723–724. After holding only that a union television broadcast that endorsed candidates was covered by the statute, the Court “[r]efus[ed] to anticipate constitutional questions” and remanded for the trial to proceed. 352 U.S., at 591, 77 S.Ct. 529. Three Justices dissented, arguing that the Court should have reached the constitutional question and that the ban on independent expenditures was unconstitutional:

“Under our Constitution it is We The People who are sovereign. The people have the final say. The legislators are their spokesmen. The people determine through their votes the destiny of the nation. It is therefore important—vitaly important—that all channels of communications be open to them during every election, that no point of view be restrained or barred, and that the people have access to the views of every group in the community.” *Id.*, at 593, 77 S.Ct. 529 (opinion of Douglas, J., joined by Warren, C.J., and Black, J.).

The dissent concluded that deeming a particular group “too powerful” was not a “justificatio[n] for withholding First Amendment rights from any group—labor or corporate.” *Id.*, at 597, 77 S.Ct. 529. The Court did not get another opportunity to consider the constitutional question in that case; for after a remand, a jury found the defendants not guilty. See Hayward, *Revisiting the Fable of Reform*, 45 Harv. J. Legis. 421, 463 (2008).

*345 Later, in *Pipefitters v. United States*, 407 U.S. 385, 400–401, 92 S.Ct. 2247, 33 L.Ed.2d 11 (1972), the Court reversed a conviction for expenditure of union funds for political speech—again without reaching the constitutional question. The Court would not resolve that question for another four years.

2

In *Buckley*, 424 U.S. 1, 96 S.Ct. 612, 46 L.Ed.2d 659, the Court addressed various challenges to the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (FECA) as amended in 1974. These amendments created 18 U.S.C. § 608(e) (1970 ed., Supp. V), see 88 Stat. 1265, an independent expenditure ban separate from § 610 that applied to individuals as well as corporations and labor unions, *Buckley*, 424 U.S., at 23, 39, and n. 45, 96 S.Ct. 612.

Before addressing the constitutionality of § 608(e)'s independent expenditure ban, *Buckley* first upheld § 608(b), FECA's limits on direct contributions to candidates. The *Buckley* Court recognized a “sufficiently important” governmental interest in “the prevention of corruption and the appearance of corruption.” *Id.*, at 25, 96 S.Ct. 612; see *id.*, at 26, 96 S.Ct. 612. This followed from the Court's concern that large contributions could be given “to secure a political *quid pro quo*.” *Ibid.*

The *Buckley* Court explained that the potential for *quid pro quo* corruption distinguished **902 direct contributions to candidates from independent expenditures. The Court emphasized that “the independent expenditure ceiling ... fails to serve any substantial governmental interest in stemming the reality or appearance of corruption in the electoral process,” *id.*, at 47–48, 96 S.Ct. 612, because “[t]he absence of prearrangement and coordination ... alleviates the danger that expenditures will be given as a *quid pro quo* for improper commitments from the candidate,” *id.*, at 47, 96 S.Ct. 612. *Buckley* invalidated § 608(e)'s restrictions on independent expenditures, with only one Justice dissenting. See *Federal Election Comm'n v. National Conservative Political Action Comm.*, 470 U.S. 480, 491, 105 S.Ct. 1459, 84 L.Ed.2d 455, n. 3 (1985) (*NCPAC*).

*346 *Buckley* did not consider § 610's separate ban on corporate and union independent expenditures, the prohibition that had also been in the background in *CIO, Automobile Workers*, and *Pipefitters*. Had § 610 been challenged in the wake of *Buckley*, however, it could not have been squared with the reasoning and analysis of that precedent. See *WRTL*, *supra*, at 487, 127 S.Ct. 2652 (opinion of SCALIA, J.) (“*Buckley* might well have been the last word on limitations on independent expenditures”); *Austin*, 494 U.S., at 683, 110 S.Ct. 1391 (SCALIA, J., dissenting). The expenditure ban invalidated in *Buckley*, § 608(e), applied to corporations and unions, 424 U.S., at 23, 39, n. 45, 96 S.Ct. 612; and some of the prevailing plaintiffs in *Buckley* were corporations, *id.*, at 8., 96 S.Ct. 612. The *Buckley* Court did not invoke the First Amendment's overbreadth doctrine, see *Broadrick v. Oklahoma*, 413 U.S. 601, 615, 93 S.Ct. 2908, 37 L.Ed.2d 830 (1973), to suggest that § 608(e)'s expenditure ban would have been constitutional if it had applied only to corporations and not to individuals, 424 U.S., at 50, 96 S.Ct. 612. *Buckley* cited with approval the *Automobile Workers* dissent, which argued that § 610 was

130 S.Ct. 876, 187 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 2961, 175 L.Ed.2d 753, 78 USLW 4078...

unconstitutional. 424 U.S., at 43, 96 S.Ct. 612 (citing 352 U.S., at 595–596, 77 S.Ct. 529 (opinion of Douglas, J.)).

Notwithstanding this precedent, Congress recodified § 610's corporate and union expenditure ban at 2 U.S.C. § 441b four months after *Buckley* was decided. See 90 Stat. 490. Section 441b is the independent expenditure restriction challenged here.

Less than two years after *Buckley*, *Bellotti*, 435 U.S. 765, 98 S.Ct. 1407, 55 L.Ed.2d 707, reaffirmed the First Amendment principle that the Government cannot restrict political speech based on the speaker's corporate identity. *Bellotti* could not have been clearer when it struck down a state-law prohibition on corporate independent expenditures related to referenda issues:

“We thus find no support in the First ... Amendment, or in the decisions of this Court, for the proposition that speech that otherwise would be within the protection of the First Amendment loses that protection simply because *347 its source is a corporation that cannot prove, to the satisfaction of a court, a material effect on its business or property.... [That proposition] amounts to an impermissible legislative prohibition of speech based on the identity of the interests that spokesmen may represent in public debate over controversial issues and a requirement that the speaker have a sufficiently great interest in the subject to justify communication.

* * * * *

“In the realm of protected speech, the legislature is constitutionally disqualified from dictating the subjects about which persons may speak and the speakers who may address a public issue.” *Id.*, at 784–785, 98 S.Ct. 1407.

**903 It is important to note that the reasoning and holding of *Bellotti* did not rest on the existence of a viewpoint-discriminatory statute. It rested on the principle that the Government lacks the power to ban corporations from speaking.

Bellotti did not address the constitutionality of the State's ban on corporate independent expenditures to support candidates. In our view, however, that restriction would have been unconstitutional under *Bellotti*'s central principle: that the First Amendment does not allow

political speech restrictions based on a speaker's corporate identity. See *ibid.*

3

Thus the law stood until *Austin*. *Austin* “up[h]eld] a direct restriction on the independent expenditure of funds for political speech for the first time in [this Court's] history.” 494 U.S., at 695, 110 S.Ct. 1391 (KENNEDY, J., dissenting). There, the Michigan Chamber of Commerce sought to use general treasury funds to run a newspaper ad supporting a specific candidate. Michigan law, however, prohibited corporate independent expenditures that supported or opposed any candidate for state office. A violation of the law was punishable as a felony. The Court sustained the speech prohibition.

*348 To bypass *Buckley* and *Bellotti*, the *Austin* Court identified a new governmental interest in limiting political speech: an antidistortion interest. *Austin* found a compelling governmental interest in preventing “the corrosive and distorting effects of immense aggregations of wealth that are accumulated with the help of the corporate form and that have little or no correlation to the public's support for the corporation's political ideas.” 494 U.S., at 660, 110 S.Ct. 1391; see *id.*, at 659, 110 S.Ct. 1391 (citing *MCFL*, 479 U.S., at 257, 107 S.Ct. 616; *NCPAC*, 470 U.S., at 500–501, 105 S.Ct. 1459).

B

The Court is thus confronted with conflicting lines of precedent: a pre-*Austin* line that forbids restrictions on political speech based on the speaker's corporate identity and a post-*Austin* line that permits them. No case before *Austin* had held that Congress could prohibit independent expenditures for political speech based on the speaker's corporate identity. Before *Austin* Congress had enacted legislation for this purpose, and the Government urged the same proposition before this Court. See *MCFL*, *supra*, at 257, 107 S.Ct. 616 (FEC posited that Congress intended to “curb the political influence of ‘those who exercise control over large aggregations of capital’ ” (quoting *Automobile Workers*, *supra*, at 585, 77 S.Ct. 529)); *California Medical Assn. v. Federal Election Comm'n*, 453 U.S. 182, 201, 101 S.Ct. 2712, 69 L.Ed.2d 567 (1981) (Congress believed that “differing structures and purposes” of corporations

and unions “may require different forms of regulation in order to protect the integrity of the electoral process”). In neither of these cases did the Court adopt the proposition.

In its defense of the corporate-speech restrictions in § 441b, the Government notes the antidistortion rationale on which *Austin* and its progeny rest in part, yet it all but abandons reliance upon it. It argues instead that two other compelling interests support *Austin*'s holding that corporate expenditure restrictions are constitutional: an anticorruption interest, see 494 U.S., at 678, 110 S.Ct. 1391 (STEVENS, J., concurring), and a *349 shareholder-protection interest, see *id.* at 674–675, 110 S.Ct. 1391 (Brennan, J., concurring). We consider the three points in turn.

**904 1

As for *Austin*'s antidistortion rationale, the Government does little to defend it. See Tr. of Oral Arg. 45–48 (Sept. 9, 2009). And with good reason, for the rationale cannot support § 441b.

If the First Amendment has any force, it prohibits Congress from fining or jailing citizens, or associations of citizens, for simply engaging in political speech. If the antidistortion rationale were to be accepted, however, it would permit Government to ban political speech simply because the speaker is an association that has taken on the corporate form. The Government contends that *Austin* permits it to ban corporate expenditures for almost all forms of communication stemming from a corporation. See Part II–E, *supra*; Tr. of Oral Arg. 66 (Sept. 9, 2009); see also *id.*, at 26–31 (Mar. 24, 2009). If *Austin* were correct, the Government could prohibit a corporation from expressing political views in media beyond those presented here, such as by printing books. The Government responds “that the FEC has never applied this statute to a book,” and if it did, “there would be quite [a] good as-applied challenge.” Tr. of Oral Arg. 65 (Sept. 9, 2009). This troubling assertion of brooding governmental power cannot be reconciled with the confidence and stability in civic discourse that the First Amendment must secure.

Political speech is “indispensable to decisionmaking in a democracy, and this is no less true because the speech comes from a corporation rather than an individual.”

Bellotti, 435 U.S., at 777, 98 S.Ct. 1407 (footnote omitted); see *ibid.* (the worth of speech “does not depend upon the identity of its source, whether corporation, association, union, or individual”); *Buckley*, 424 U.S., at 48–49, 96 S.Ct. 612 (“[T]he concept that government may restrict the speech of some elements of our society in order to enhance *350 the relative voice of others is wholly foreign to the First Amendment”); *Automobile Workers*, 352 U.S., at 597, 77 S.Ct. 529 (Douglas, J., dissenting); *CIO*, 335 U.S., at 154–155, 68 S.Ct. 1349 (Rutledge, J., concurring in result). This protection for speech is inconsistent with *Austin*'s antidistortion rationale. *Austin* sought to defend the antidistortion rationale as a means to prevent corporations from obtaining “‘an unfair advantage in the political marketplace’” by using “‘resources amassed in the economic marketplace.’” 494 U.S., at 659, 110 S.Ct. 1391 (quoting *MCFL*, *supra*, at 257, 107 S.Ct. 616). But *Buckley* rejected the premise that the Government has an interest “in equalizing the relative ability of individuals and groups to influence the outcome of elections.” 424 U.S., at 48, 96 S.Ct. 612; see *Bellotti*, *supra*, at 791, n. 30, 98 S.Ct. 1407. *Buckley* was specific in stating that “the skyrocketing cost of political campaigns” could not sustain the governmental prohibition. 424 U.S., at 26, 96 S.Ct. 612. The First Amendment's protections do not depend on the speaker's “financial ability to engage in public discussion.” *Id.*, at 49, 96 S.Ct. 612.

The Court reaffirmed these conclusions when it invalidated the BCRA provision that increased the cap on contributions to one candidate if the opponent made certain expenditures from personal funds. See *Davis v. Federal Election Comm'n*, 554 U.S. 724, —, 128 S.Ct. 2759, 2774, 171 L.Ed.2d 737 (2008) (“Leveling electoral opportunities means making and implementing judgments about which strengths should be permitted to contribute to the outcome of an election. The Constitution, however, confers upon voters, not Congress, the power to choose the Members of the House of Representatives, Art. I, § 2, and it is a dangerous business for Congress to use the election laws to influence **905 the voters' choices”). The rule that political speech cannot be limited based on a speaker's wealth is a necessary consequence of the premise that the First Amendment generally prohibits the suppression of political speech based on the speaker's identity.

Either as support for its antidistortion rationale or as a further argument, the *Austin* majority undertook to

distinguish *351 wealthy individuals from corporations on the ground that “[s]tate law grants corporations special advantages—such as limited liability, perpetual life, and favorable treatment of the accumulation and distribution of assets.” 494 U.S., at 658–659, 110 S.Ct. 1391. This does not suffice, however, to allow laws prohibiting speech. “It is rudimentary that the State cannot exact as the price of those special advantages the forfeiture of First Amendment rights.” *Id.*, at 680, 110 S.Ct. 1391 (SCALIA, J., dissenting).

It is irrelevant for purposes of the First Amendment that corporate funds may “have little or no correlation to the public’s support for the corporation’s political ideas.” *Id.*, at 660, 110 S.Ct. 1391 (majority opinion). All speakers, including individuals and the media, use money amassed from the economic marketplace to fund their speech. The First Amendment protects the resulting speech, even if it was enabled by economic transactions with persons or entities who disagree with the speaker’s ideas. See *id.*, at 707, 110 S.Ct. 1391 (KENNEDY, J., dissenting) (“Many persons can trace their funds to corporations, if not in the form of donations, then in the form of dividends, interest, or salary”).

Austin’s antidistortion rationale would produce the dangerous, and unacceptable, consequence that Congress could ban political speech of media corporations. See *McConnell*, 540 U.S., at 283, 124 S.Ct. 619 (opinion of THOMAS, J.) (“The chilling endpoint of the Court’s reasoning is not difficult to foresee: outright regulation of the press”). Cf. *Tornillo*, 418 U.S., at 250, 94 S.Ct. 2831 (alleging the existence of “vast accumulations of unreviewable power in the modern media empires”). Media corporations are now exempt from § 441b’s ban on corporate expenditures. See 2 U.S.C. §§ 431(9)(B)(i), 434(f)(3)(B)(i). Yet media corporations accumulate wealth with the help of the corporate form, the largest media corporations have “immense aggregations of wealth,” and the views expressed by media corporations often “have little or no correlation to the public’s support” for those views. *Austin*, 494 U.S., at 660, 110 S.Ct. 1391. *352 Thus, under the Government’s reasoning, wealthy media corporations could have their voices diminished to put them on par with other media entities. There is no precedent for permitting this under the First Amendment.

The media exemption discloses further difficulties with the law now under consideration. There is no precedent

supporting laws that attempt to distinguish between corporations which are deemed to be exempt as media corporations and those which are not. “We have consistently rejected the proposition that the institutional press has any constitutional privilege beyond that of other speakers.” *Id.*, at 691, 110 S.Ct. 1391 (SCALIA, J., dissenting) (citing *Bellotti*, 435 U.S., at 782, 98 S.Ct. 1407); see *Dun & Bradstreet, Inc. v. Greenmoss Builders, Inc.*, 472 U.S. 749, 784, 105 S.Ct. 2939, 86 L.Ed.2d 593 (1985) (Brennan, J., joined by Marshall, Blackmun, and STEVENS, JJ., dissenting); *id.*, at 773, 105 S.Ct. 2939 (White, J., concurring in judgment). With the advent of the Internet and the decline of print and broadcast media, moreover, the line between the media and others who wish to **906 comment on political and social issues becomes far more blurred.

The law’s exception for media corporations is, on its own terms, all but an admission of the invalidity of the antidistortion rationale. And the exemption results in a further, separate reason for finding this law invalid: Again by its own terms, the law exempts some corporations but covers others, even though both have the need or the motive to communicate their views. The exemption applies to media corporations owned or controlled by corporations that have diverse and substantial investments and participate in endeavors other than news. So even assuming the most doubtful proposition that a news organization has a right to speak when others do not, the exemption would allow a conglomerate that owns both a media business and an unrelated business to influence or control the media in order to advance its overall business interest. At the same time, some other corporation, with an identical business interest but no media outlet in its ownership structure, would be forbidden to speak or *353 inform the public about the same issue. This differential treatment cannot be squared with the First Amendment.

There is simply no support for the view that the First Amendment, as originally understood, would permit the suppression of political speech by media corporations. The Framers may not have anticipated modern business and media corporations. See *McIntyre v. Ohio Elections Comm’n*, 514 U.S. 334, 360–361, 115 S.Ct. 1511, 131 L.Ed.2d 426 (1995) (Thomas, J., concurring in judgment). Yet television networks and major newspapers owned by media corporations have become the most important means of mass communication in modern times. The First

Amendment was certainly not understood to condone the suppression of political speech in society's most salient media. It was understood as a response to the repression of speech and the press that had existed in England and the heavy taxes on the press that were imposed in the colonies. See *McCormell*, 540 U.S., at 252–253, 124 S.Ct. 619 (opinion of SCALIA, J.); *Grosjean*, 297 U.S., at 245–248, 56 S.Ct. 444; *Near*, 283 U.S., at 713–714, 51 S.Ct. 625. The great debates between the Federalists and the Anti-Federalists over our founding document were published and expressed in the most important means of mass communication of that era—newspapers owned by individuals. See *McIntyre*, 514 U.S., at 341–343, 115 S.Ct. 1511; *id.*, at 367, 115 S.Ct. 1511 (THOMAS, J., concurring in judgment). At the founding, speech was open, comprehensive, and vital to society's definition of itself; there were no limits on the sources of speech and knowledge. See B. Bailyn, *Ideological Origins of the American Revolution* 5 (1967) (“Any number of people could join in such proliferating polemics, and rebuttals could come from all sides”); G. Wood, *Creation of the American Republic 1776–1787*, p. 6 (1969) (“[I]t is not surprising that the intellectual sources of [the Americans] Revolutionary thought were profuse and various”). The Framers may have been unaware of certain types of speakers or forms of communication, but that does not mean that those speakers and media are entitled to less First Amendment protection than those types of speakers *354 and media that provided the means of communicating political ideas when the Bill of Rights was adopted.

Austin interferes with the “open marketplace” of ideas protected by the First Amendment. *New York State Bd. of Elections v. Lopez Torres*, 552 U.S. 196, 208, 128 S.Ct. 791, 169 L.Ed.2d 665 (2008); see *ibid.* (ideas “may compete” in this marketplace “without government interference”); *McCormell*, *supra*, at 274, 124 S.Ct. 619 (opinion of THOMAS, J.). It permits the **907 Government to ban the political speech of millions of associations of citizens. See *Statistics of Income* 2 (5.8 million for-profit corporations filed 2006 tax returns). Most of these are small corporations without large amounts of wealth. See Supp. Brief for Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America as *Amicus Curiae* 1, 3 (96% of the 3 million businesses that belong to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce have fewer than 100 employees); M. Keightley, *Congressional Research Service Report for Congress, Business Organizational Choices: Taxation*

and Responses to Legislative Changes 10 (2009) (more than 75% of corporations whose income is taxed under federal law, see 26 U.S.C. § 301, have less than \$1 million in receipts per year). This fact belies the Government's argument that the statute is justified on the ground that it prevents the “distorting effects of immense aggregations of wealth.” *Austin*, 494 U.S., at 660, 110 S.Ct. 1391. It is not even aimed at amassed wealth.

The censorship we now confront is vast in its reach. The Government has “muffle[d] the voices that best represent the most significant segments of the economy.” *McCormell*, *supra*, at 257–258, 124 S.Ct. 619 (opinion of SCALIA, J.). And “the electorate [has been] deprived of information, knowledge and opinion vital to its function.” *CIO*, 335 U.S., at 144, 68 S.Ct. 1349 (Rutledge, J., concurring in result). By suppressing the speech of manifold corporations, both for-profit and nonprofit, the Government prevents their voices and viewpoints from reaching the public and advising voters on which persons or entities are hostile to their interests. Factions will necessarily form in our Republic, but the remedy of “destroying the liberty” of *355 some factions is “worse than the disease.” *The Federalist* No. 10, p. 130 (B. Wright ed. 1961) (J. Madison). Factions should be checked by permitting them all to speak, see *ibid.*, and by entrusting the people to judge what is true and what is false.

[15] The purpose and effect of this law is to prevent corporations, including small and nonprofit corporations, from presenting both facts and opinions to the public. This makes *Austin's* antidistortion rationale all the more an aberration. “[T]he First Amendment protects the right of corporations to petition legislative and administrative bodies.” *Bellotti*, 435 U.S., at 792, n. 31, 98 S.Ct. 1407 (citing *California Motor Transport Co. v. Trucking Unlimited*, 404 U.S. 508, 510–511, 92 S.Ct. 609, 30 L.Ed.2d 642 (1972); *Eastern Railroad Presidents Conference v. Noerr Motor Freight, Inc.*, 365 U.S. 127, 137–138, 81 S.Ct. 523, 5 L.Ed.2d 464 (1961)). Corporate executives and employees counsel Members of Congress and Presidential administrations on many issues, as a matter of routine and often in private. An *amici* brief filed on behalf of Montana and 25 other States notes that lobbying and corporate communications with elected officials occur on a regular basis. Brief for State of Montana et al. as *Amici Curiae* 19. When that phenomenon is coupled with § 441b, the result is that smaller or nonprofit corporations cannot raise a voice to object when other corporations, including those

with vast wealth, are cooperating with the Government. That cooperation may sometimes be voluntary, or it may be at the demand of a Government official who uses his or her authority, influence, and power to threaten corporations to support the Government's policies. Those kinds of interactions are often unknown and unseen. The speech that § 441b forbids, though, is public, and all can judge its content and purpose. References to massive corporate treasuries should not mask the real operation of this law. Rhetoric ought not obscure reality.

****908** Even if § 441b's expenditure ban were constitutional, wealthy corporations could still lobby elected officials, although ***356** smaller corporations may not have the resources to do so. And wealthy individuals and unincorporated associations can spend unlimited amounts on independent expenditures. See, e.g., *WRTL*, 551 U.S., at 503–504, 127 S.Ct. 2652 (opinion of SCALIA, J.) (“In the 2004 election cycle, a mere 24 individuals contributed an astounding total of \$142 million to [26 U.S.C. § 527 organizations]”). Yet certain disfavored associations of citizens—those that have taken on the corporate form—are penalized for engaging in the same political speech.

When Government seeks to use its full power, including the criminal law, to command where a person may get his or her information or what distrusted source he or she may not hear, it uses censorship to control thought. This is unlawful. The First Amendment confirms the freedom to think for ourselves.

2

What we have said also shows the invalidity of other arguments made by the Government. For the most part relinquishing the antidistortion rationale, the Government falls back on the argument that corporate political speech can be banned in order to prevent corruption or its appearance. In *Buckley*, the Court found this interest “sufficiently important” to allow limits on contributions but did not extend that reasoning to expenditure limits. 424 U.S., at 25, 96 S.Ct. 612. When *Buckley* examined an expenditure ban, it found “that the governmental interest in preventing corruption and the appearance of corruption [was] inadequate to justify [the ban] on independent expenditures.” *Id.*, at 45, 96 S.Ct. 612.

With regard to large direct contributions, *Buckley* reasoned that they could be given “to secure a political *quid pro quo*,” *id.*, at 26, 96 S.Ct. 612, and that “the scope of such pernicious practices can never be reliably ascertained,” *id.*, at 27, 96 S.Ct. 612. The practices *Buckley* noted would be covered by bribery laws, see, e.g., 18 U.S.C. § 201, if a *quid pro quo* arrangement were proved. See *Buckley*, *supra*, at 27, and n. 28, 96 S.Ct. 612 (citing ***357** *Buckley v. Valeo*, 519 F.2d 821, 839–840, and nn. 36–38 (CA DC 1975) (en banc) (*per curiam*)). The Court, in consequence, has noted that restrictions on direct contributions are preventative, because few if any contributions to candidates will involve *quid pro quo* arrangements. *MCFL*, 479 U.S., at 260, 107 S.Ct. 616; *NCPAC*, 470 U.S., at 500, 105 S.Ct. 1459; *Federal Election Comm'n v. National Right to Work Comm.*, 459 U.S. 197, 210, 103 S.Ct. 552, 74 L.Ed.2d 364 (1982) (*NRWC*). The *Buckley* Court, nevertheless, sustained limits on direct contributions in order to ensure against the reality or appearance of corruption. That case did not extend this rationale to independent expenditures, and the Court does not do so here.

“The absence of prearrangement and coordination of an expenditure with the candidate or his agent not only undermines the value of the expenditure to the candidate, but also alleviates the danger that expenditures will be given as a *quid pro quo* for improper commitments from the candidate.” *Buckley*, 424 U.S., at 47, 96 S.Ct. 612; see *ibid.* (independent expenditures have a “substantially diminished potential for abuse”). Limits on independent expenditures, such as § 441b, have a chilling effect extending well beyond the Government's interest in preventing *quid pro quo* corruption. The anticorruption interest is not sufficient to displace the speech here in question. Indeed, 26 States do not restrict independent expenditures ****909** by for-profit corporations. The Government does not claim that these expenditures have corrupted the political process in those States. See Supp. Brief for Appellee 18, n. 3; Supp. Brief for Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America as *Amicus Curiae* 8–9, n. 5.

A single footnote in *Bellotti* purported to leave open the possibility that corporate independent expenditures could be shown to cause corruption. 435 U.S., at 788, n. 26, 98 S.Ct. 1407. For the reasons explained above, we now conclude that independent expenditures,

Citizens United v. Federal Election Com'n, 558 U.S. 310 (2010)

130 S.Ct. 876, 187 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 2961, 175 L.Ed.2d 753, 78 USLW 4078...

including those made by corporations, do not give rise to corruption or the appearance of corruption. Dicta in *Bellotti's* footnote suggested that “a corporation’s right to speak on issues of general public interest implies no *358 comparable right in the quite different context of participation in a political campaign for election to public office.” *Ibid.* Citing the portion of *Buckley* that invalidated the federal independent expenditure ban, 424 U.S., at 46, 96 S.Ct. 612, and a law review student comment, *Bellotti* surmised that “Congress might well be able to demonstrate the existence of a danger of real or apparent corruption in independent expenditures by corporations to influence candidate elections.” 435 U.S., at 788, n. 26, 98 S.Ct. 1407. *Buckley*, however, struck down a ban on independent expenditures to support candidates that covered corporations, 424 U.S., at 23, 39, n. 45, 96 S.Ct. 612, and explained that “the distinction between discussion of issues and candidates and advocacy of election or defeat of candidates may often dissolve in practical application,” *id.*, at 42, 96 S.Ct. 612. *Bellotti's* dictum is thus supported only by a law review student comment, which misinterpreted *Buckley*. See Comment, *The Regulation of Union Political Activity: Majority and Minority Rights and Remedies*, 126 U. Pa. L.Rev. 386, 408 (1977) (suggesting that “corporations and labor unions should be held to different and more stringent standards than an individual or other associations under a regulatory scheme for campaign financing”).

Seizing on this aside in *Bellotti's* footnote, the Court in *NRWC* did say there is a “sufficient” governmental interest in “ensur[ing] that substantial aggregations of wealth amassed” by corporations would not “be used to incur political debts from legislators who are aided by the contributions.” 459 U.S., at 207–208, 103 S.Ct. 552 (citing *Automobile Workers*, 352 U.S., at 579, 77 S.Ct. 529); see 459 U.S., at 210, and n. 7, 103 S.Ct. 552; *NCPAC*, *supra*, at 500–501, 105 S.Ct. 1459 (*NRWC* suggested a governmental interest in restricting “the influence of political war chests funneled through the corporate form”). *NRWC*, however, has little relevance here. *NRWC* decided no more than that a restriction on a corporation’s ability to solicit funds for its segregated PAC, which made direct contributions to candidates, did not violate the *359 First Amendment, 459 U.S., at 206, 103 S.Ct. 552. *NRWC* thus involved contribution limits, see *NCPAC*, *supra*, at 495–496, 105 S.Ct. 1459, which, unlike limits on independent expenditures, have been an accepted means to prevent *quid pro quo* corruption, see

McConnell, 540 U.S., at 136–138, and n. 40, 124 S.Ct. 619; *MCFL*, *supra*, at 259–260, 107 S.Ct. 616. Citizens United has not made direct contributions to candidates, and it has not suggested that the Court should reconsider whether contribution limits should be subjected to rigorous First Amendment scrutiny.

When *Buckley* identified a sufficiently important governmental interest in preventing corruption or the appearance of corruption, that interest was limited to *quid pro quo* corruption. See *McConnell*, *supra*, at 296–298, 124 S.Ct. 619 (opinion of **910 KENNEDY, J.) (citing *Buckley*, *supra*, at 26–28, 30, 46–48, 96 S.Ct. 612); *NCPAC*, 470 U.S., at 497, 105 S.Ct. 1459 (“The hallmark of corruption is the financial *quid pro quo*: dollars for political favors”); *id.*, at 498, 105 S.Ct. 1459. The fact that speakers may have influence over or access to elected officials does not mean that these officials are corrupt:

“Favoritism and influence are not ... avoidable in representative politics. It is in the nature of an elected representative to favor certain policies, and, by necessary corollary, to favor the voters and contributors who support those policies. It is well understood that a substantial and legitimate reason, if not the only reason, to cast a vote for, or to make a contribution to, one candidate over another is that the candidate will respond by producing those political outcomes the supporter favors. Democracy is premised on responsiveness.” *McConnell*, 540 U.S., at 297, 124 S.Ct. 619 (opinion of KENNEDY, J.).

Reliance on a “generic favoritism or influence theory ... is at odds with standard First Amendment analyses because it is unbounded and susceptible to no limiting principle.” *Id.*, at 296, 124 S.Ct. 619.

*360 The appearance of influence or access, furthermore, will not cause the electorate to lose faith in our democracy. By definition, an independent expenditure is political speech presented to the electorate that is not coordinated with a candidate. See *Buckley*, *supra*, at 46, 96 S.Ct. 612. The fact that a corporation, or any other speaker, is willing to spend money to try to persuade voters presupposes that the people have the ultimate influence over elected officials. This is inconsistent with any suggestion that the electorate will refuse “to take part in democratic governance” because of additional political speech made by a corporation or any other speaker. *McConnell*, *supra*, at 144, 124 S.Ct. 619 (quoting *Nixon v. Shrink Missouri*

130 S.Ct. 876, 187 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 2961, 175 L.Ed.2d 753, 78 USLW 4078...

Government PAC, 528 U.S. 377, 390, 120 S.Ct. 897, 145 L.Ed.2d 886 (2000).

Caperton v. A.T. Massey Coal Co., 556 U.S. 868, 129 S.Ct. 2252, 173 L.Ed.2d 1208 (2009), is not to the contrary. *Caperton* held that a judge was required to recuse himself “when a person with a personal stake in a particular case had a significant and disproportionate influence in placing the judge on the case by raising funds or directing the judge’s election campaign when the case was pending or imminent.” *Id.*, at —, 129 S.Ct., at 2263–2264. The remedy of recusal was based on a litigant’s due process right to a fair trial before an unbiased judge. See *Withrow v. Larkin*, 421 U.S. 35, 46, 95 S.Ct. 1456, 43 L.Ed.2d 712 (1975). *Caperton*’s holding was limited to the rule that the judge must be recused, not that the litigant’s political speech could be banned.

The *McConnell* record was “over 100,000 pages” long. *McConnell I*, 251 F.Supp.2d, at 209, yet it “does not have any direct examples of votes being exchanged for ... expenditures,” *id.*, at 560 (opinion of Kollar-Kotelly, J.). This confirms *Buckley*’s reasoning that independent expenditures do not lead to, or create the appearance of, *quid pro quo* corruption. In fact, there is only scant evidence that independent expenditures even ingratiate. See 251 F.Supp.2d, at 555–557 (opinion of Kollar-Kotelly, J.). Ingratiation and access, in any event, are not corruption. The BCRA record establishes that certain donations to political parties, called “soft *361 money,” were made to gain access to elected officials. *McConnell*, *supra*, at 125, 130–131, 146–152, 124 S.Ct. 619; see *McConnell I*, 251 F.Supp.2d, at 471–481, 491–506 (opinion of Kollar-Kotelly, J.); *id.*, at 842–843, 858–859 (opinion of Leon, J.). This case, however, is about **911 independent expenditures, not soft money. When Congress finds that a problem exists, we must give that finding due deference; but Congress may not choose an unconstitutional remedy. If elected officials succumb to improper influences from independent expenditures; if they surrender their best judgment; and if they put expediency before principle, then surely there is cause for concern. We must give weight to attempts by Congress to seek to dispel either the appearance or the reality of these influences. The remedies enacted by law, however, must comply with the First Amendment; and, it is our law and our tradition that more speech, not less, is the governing rule. An outright ban on corporate political speech during the critical preelection period is not a permissible remedy.

Here Congress has created categorical bans on speech that are asymmetrical to preventing *quid pro quo* corruption.

3

The Government contends further that corporate independent expenditures can be limited because of its interest in protecting dissenting shareholders from being compelled to fund corporate political speech. This asserted interest, like *Austin*’s antidistortion rationale, would allow the Government to ban the political speech even of media corporations. See *supra*, at 905 – 906. Assume, for example, that a shareholder of a corporation that owns a newspaper disagrees with the political views the newspaper expresses. See *Austin*, 494 U.S., at 687, 110 S.Ct. 1391 (SCALIA, J., dissenting). Under the Government’s view, that potential disagreement could give the Government the authority to restrict the media corporation’s political speech. The First Amendment does not allow that power. There is, furthermore, little evidence of *362 abuse that cannot be corrected by shareholders “through the procedures of corporate democracy.” *Bellotti*, 435 U.S., at 794, 98 S.Ct. 1407; see *id.*, at 794, n. 34, 98 S.Ct. 1407.

Those reasons are sufficient to reject this shareholder-protection interest; and, moreover, the statute is both underinclusive and overinclusive. As to the first, if Congress had been seeking to protect dissenting shareholders, it would not have banned corporate speech in only certain media within 30 or 60 days before an election. A dissenting shareholder’s interests would be implicated by speech in any media at any time. As to the second, the statute is overinclusive because it covers all corporations, including nonprofit corporations and for-profit corporations with only single shareholders. As to other corporations, the remedy is not to restrict speech but to consider and explore other regulatory mechanisms. The regulatory mechanism here, based on speech, contravenes the First Amendment.

4

We need not reach the question whether the Government has a compelling interest in preventing foreign individuals or associations from influencing our Nation’s political process. Cf. 2 U.S.C. § 441e (contribution and expenditure

ban applied to “foreign national[s]”). Section 441b is not limited to corporations or associations that were created in foreign countries or funded predominately by foreign shareholders. Section 441b therefore would be overbroad even if we assumed, *arguendo*, that the Government has a compelling interest in limiting foreign influence over our political process. See *Broadrick*, 413 U.S., at 615, 93 S.Ct. 2908.

C

[16] [17] Our precedent is to be respected unless the most convincing of reasons demonstrates that adherence to it puts us **912 on a course that is sure error. “Beyond workability, the relevant factors in deciding whether to adhere to the principle of *stare* *363 *decisis* include the antiquity of the precedent, the reliance interests at stake, and of course whether the decision was well reasoned.” *Montejo v. Louisiana*, 556 U.S. 778, —, 129 S.Ct. 2079, 2088–2089, 173 L.Ed.2d 955 (2009) (overruling *Michigan v. Jackson*, 475 U.S. 625, 106 S.Ct. 1404, 89 L.Ed.2d 631 (1986)). We have also examined whether “experience has pointed up the precedent’s shortcomings.” *Pearson v. Callahan*, 555 U.S. 223, —, 129 S.Ct. 808, 816, 172 L.Ed.2d 565 (2009) (overruling *Saucier v. Katz*, 533 U.S. 194, 121 S.Ct. 2151, 150 L.Ed.2d 272 (2001)).

[18] These considerations counsel in favor of rejecting *Austin*, which itself contravened this Court’s earlier precedents in *Buckley* and *Bellotti*. “This Court has not hesitated to overrule decisions offensive to the First Amendment.” *WRTL*, 551 U.S., at 500, 127 S.Ct. 2652 (opinion of SCALIA, J.). “[S]*tare decisis* is a principle of policy and not a mechanical formula of adherence to the latest decision.” *Helvering v. Hallock*, 309 U.S. 106, 119, 60 S.Ct. 444, 84 L.Ed. 604 (1940).

[19] For the reasons above, it must be concluded that *Austin* was not well reasoned. The Government defends *Austin*, relying almost entirely on “the quid pro quo interest, the corruption interest or the shareholder interest,” and not *Austin*’s expressed antidistortion rationale. Tr. of Oral Arg. 48 (Sept. 9, 2009); see *id.*, at 45–46. When neither party defends the reasoning of a precedent, the principle of adhering to that precedent through *stare decisis* is diminished. *Austin* abandoned First Amendment principles, furthermore, by relying on language in some of our precedents that traces back to the

Automobile Workers Court’s flawed historical account of campaign finance laws, see Brief for Campaign Finance Scholars as *Amici Curiae*; Hayward, 45 *Harv. J. Legis.* 421; R. Mutch, *Campaigns, Congress, and Courts* 33–35, 153–157 (1988). See *Austin*, *supra*, at 659, 110 S.Ct. 1391 (quoting *MCFL*, 479 U.S., at 257–258, 107 S.Ct. 616; *NCPAC*, 470 U.S., at 500–501, 105 S.Ct. 1459); *MCFL*, *supra*, at 257, 107 S.Ct. 616 (quoting *Automobile Workers*, 352 U.S., at 585, 77 S.Ct. 529); *NCPAC*, *supra*, at 500, 105 S.Ct. 1459 (quoting *NRWC*, 459 U.S., at 210, 103 S.Ct. 552); *id.*, at 208, 103 S.Ct. 552 (“The history of the movement to regulate the political contributions and expenditures of corporations *364 and labor unions is set forth in great detail in [*Automobile Workers*], *supra*, at 570–584, 77 S.Ct. 529, and we need only summarize the development here”).

Austin is undermined by experience since its announcement. Political speech is so ingrained in our culture that speakers find ways to circumvent campaign finance laws. See, e.g., *McConnell*, 540 U.S., at 176–177, 124 S.Ct. 619 (“Given BCRA’s tighter restrictions on the raising and spending of soft money, the incentives ... to exploit [26 U.S.C. § 527] organizations will only increase”). Our Nation’s speech dynamic is changing, and informative voices should not have to circumvent onerous restrictions to exercise their First Amendment rights. Speakers have become adept at presenting citizens with sound bites, talking points, and scripted messages that dominate the 24-hour news cycle. Corporations, like individuals, do not have monolithic views. On certain topics corporations may possess valuable expertise, leaving them the best equipped to point out errors or fallacies in speech of all sorts, including the speech of candidates and elected officials.

Rapid changes in technology—and the creative dynamic inherent in the concept of **913 free expression—counsel against upholding a law that restricts political speech in certain media or by certain speakers. See Part II–C, *supra*. Today, 30-second television ads may be the most effective way to convey a political message. See *McConnell*, *supra*, at 261, 124 S.Ct. 619 (opinion of SCALIA, J.). Soon, however, it may be that Internet sources, such as blogs and social networking Web sites, will provide citizens with significant information about political candidates and issues. Yet, § 441b would seem to ban a blog post expressly advocating the election or defeat of a candidate if that blog were created with corporate

funds. See 2 U.S.C. § 441b(a); *MCFL*, *supra*, at 249, 107 S.Ct. 616. The First Amendment does not permit Congress to make these categorical distinctions based on the corporate identity of the speaker and the content of the political speech.

[20] *365 No serious reliance interests are at stake. As the Court stated in *Payne v. Tennessee*, 501 U.S. 808, 828, 111 S.Ct. 2597, 115 L.Ed.2d 720 (1991), reliance interests are important considerations in property and contract cases, where parties may have acted in conformance with existing legal rules in order to conduct transactions. Here, though, parties have been prevented from acting—corporations have been banned from making independent expenditures. Legislatures may have enacted bans on corporate expenditures believing that those bans were constitutional. This is not a compelling interest for *stare decisis*. If it were, legislative acts could prevent us from overruling our own precedents, thereby interfering with our duty “to say what the law is.” *Marbury v. Madison*, 1 Cranch 137, 177, 2 L.Ed. 60 (1803).

[21] Due consideration leads to this conclusion: *Austin*, 494 U.S. 652, 110 S.Ct. 1391, 108 L.Ed.2d 652, should be and now is overruled. We return to the principle established in *Buckley* and *Bellotti* that the Government may not suppress political speech on the basis of the speaker's corporate identity. No sufficient governmental interest justifies limits on the political speech of nonprofit or for-profit corporations.

D

[22] *Austin* is overruled, so it provides no basis for allowing the Government to limit corporate independent expenditures. As the Government appears to concede, overruling *Austin* “effectively invalidate[s] not only BCRA Section 203, but also 2 U.S.C. 441b's prohibition on the use of corporate treasury funds for express advocacy.” Brief for Appellee 33, n. 12. Section 441b's restrictions on corporate independent expenditures are therefore invalid and cannot be applied to *Hillary*.

Given our conclusion we are further required to overrule the part of *McConnell* that upheld BCRA § 203's extension of § 441b's restrictions on corporate independent expenditures. See 540 U.S., at 203–209, 124 S.Ct. 619. The *McConnell* Court relied on *366 the

antidistortion interest recognized in *Austin* to uphold a greater restriction on speech than the restriction upheld in *Austin*, see 540 U.S., at 205, 124 S.Ct. 619, and we have found this interest unconvincing and insufficient. This part of *McConnell* is now overruled.

IV

A

[23] Citizens United next challenges BCRA's disclaimer and disclosure provisions as applied to *Hillary* and the three advertisements for the movie. Under BCRA § 311, televised electioneering communications funded by anyone other than a candidate must include a disclaimer that **914 “ ‘ _____ is responsible for the content of this advertising.’ ” 2 U.S.C. § 441d(d)(2). The required statement must be made in a “clearly spoken manner,” and displayed on the screen in a “clearly readable manner” for at least four seconds. *Ibid*. It must state that the communication “is not authorized by any candidate or candidate's committee”; it must also display the name and address (or Web site address) of the person or group that funded the advertisement. § 441d(a)(3). Under BCRA § 201, any person who spends more than \$10,000 on electioneering communications within a calendar year must file a disclosure statement with the FEC. 2 U.S.C. § 434(f)(1). That statement must identify the person making the expenditure, the amount of the expenditure, the election to which the communication was directed, and the names of certain contributors. § 434(f)(2).

Disclaimer and disclosure requirements may burden the ability to speak, but they “impose no ceiling on campaign-related activities,” *Buckley*, 424 U.S., at 64, 96 S.Ct. 612, and “do not prevent anyone from speaking,” *McConnell*, *supra*, at 201, 124 S.Ct. 619 (internal quotation marks and brackets omitted). The Court has subjected these requirements to “exacting scrutiny,” which requires a “substantial relation” between the disclosure requirement and a “sufficiently important” governmental *367 interest. *Buckley*, *supra*, at 64, 66, 96 S.Ct. 612 (internal quotation marks omitted); see *McConnell*, *supra*, at 231–232, 124 S.Ct. 619.

In *Buckley*, the Court explained that disclosure could be justified based on a governmental interest in “provid[ing] the electorate with information” about the sources of

election-related spending. 424 U.S., at 66. 96 S.Ct. 612. The *McConnell* Court applied this interest in rejecting facial challenges to BCRA §§ 201 and 311. 540 U.S., at 196. 124 S.Ct. 619. There was evidence in the record that independent groups were running election-related advertisements “ ‘while hiding behind dubious and misleading names.’ ” *Id.*, at 197. 124 S.Ct. 619 (quoting *McConnell I*, 251 F.Supp.2d, at 237). The Court therefore upheld BCRA §§ 201 and 311 on the ground that they would help citizens “ ‘make informed choices in the political marketplace.’ ” 540 U.S., at 197. 124 S.Ct. 619 (quoting *McConnell I*, *supra*, at 237); see 540 U.S., at 231. 124 S.Ct. 619.

Although both provisions were facially upheld, the Court acknowledged that as-applied challenges would be available if a group could show a “ ‘reasonable probability’ ” that disclosure of its contributors’ names “ ‘will subject them to threats, harassment, or reprisals from either Government officials or private parties.’ ” *Id.*, at 198. 124 S.Ct. 619 (quoting *Buckley*, *supra*, at 74, 96 S.Ct. 612).

For the reasons stated below, we find the statute valid as applied to the ads for the movie and to the movie itself.

B

Citizens United sought to broadcast one 30-second and two 10-second ads to promote *Hillary*. Under FEC regulations, a communication that “[p]roposes a commercial transaction” was not subject to 2 U.S.C. § 441b’s restrictions on corporate or union funding of electioneering communications. 11 CFR § 114.15(b)(3) (ii). The regulations, however, do not exempt those communications from the disclaimer and disclosure requirements in BCRA §§ 201 and 311. See 72 Fed.Reg. 72901 (2007).

[24] *368 Citizens United argues that the disclaimer requirements in § 311 are unconstitutional as applied to its ads. It contends that the governmental interest in providing information to the electorate does not justify requiring disclaimers for **915 any commercial advertisements, including the ones at issue here. We disagree. The ads fall within BCRA’s definition of an “electioneering communication”: They referred to then-Senator Clinton by name shortly before a primary and

contained pejorative references to her candidacy. See 530 F.Supp.2d, at 276, nn. 2–4. The disclaimers required by § 311 “provid[e] the electorate with information,” *McConnell*, *supra*, at 196. 124 S.Ct. 619, and “insure that the voters are fully informed” about the person or group who is speaking, *Buckley*, *supra*, at 76, 96 S.Ct. 612; see also *Bellotti*, 435 U.S., at 792, n. 32, 98 S.Ct. 1407 (“Identification of the source of advertising may be required as a means of disclosure, so that the people will be able to evaluate the arguments to which they are being subjected”). At the very least, the disclaimers avoid confusion by making clear that the ads are not funded by a candidate or political party.

Citizens United argues that § 311 is underinclusive because it requires disclaimers for broadcast advertisements but not for print or Internet advertising. It asserts that § 311 decreases both the quantity and effectiveness of the group’s speech by forcing it to devote four seconds of each advertisement to the spoken disclaimer. We rejected these arguments in *McConnell*, *supra*, at 230–231. 124 S.Ct. 619. And we now adhere to that decision as it pertains to the disclosure provisions.

As a final point, Citizens United claims that, in any event, the disclosure requirements in § 201 must be confined to speech that is the functional equivalent of express advocacy. The principal opinion in *WRTL* limited 2 U.S.C. § 441b’s restrictions on independent expenditures to express advocacy and its functional equivalent. 551 U.S., at 469–476. 127 S.Ct. 2652 (opinion of ROBERTS, C.J.). Citizens United seeks to import a similar *369 distinction into BCRA’s disclosure requirements. We reject this contention.

The Court has explained that disclosure is a less restrictive alternative to more comprehensive regulations of speech. See, e.g., *MCFL*, 479 U.S., at 262. 107 S.Ct. 616. In *Buckley*, the Court upheld a disclosure requirement for independent expenditures even though it invalidated a provision that imposed a ceiling on those expenditures. 424 U.S., at 75–76. 96 S.Ct. 612. In *McConnell*, three Justices who would have found § 441b to be unconstitutional nonetheless voted to uphold BCRA’s disclosure and disclaimer requirements. 540 U.S., at 321. 124 S.Ct. 619 (opinion of KENNEDY, J., joined by Rehnquist, C.J., and SCALIA, J.). And the Court has upheld registration and disclosure requirements on lobbyists, even though Congress has no power to ban

lobbying itself. *United States v. Harriss*, 347 U.S. 612, 625, 74 S.Ct. 808, 98 L.Ed. 989 (1954) (Congress “has merely provided for a modicum of information from those who for hire attempt to influence legislation or who collect or spend funds for that purpose”). For these reasons, we reject Citizens United’s contention that the disclosure requirements must be limited to speech that is the functional equivalent of express advocacy.

Citizens United also disputes that an informational interest justifies the application of § 201 to its ads, which only attempt to persuade viewers to see the film. Even if it disclosed the funding sources for the ads, Citizens United says, the information would not help viewers make informed choices in the political marketplace. This is similar to the argument rejected above with respect to disclaimers. Even if the ads only pertain to a commercial transaction, the public has an interest in knowing who is speaking about a candidate shortly before an election. Because the informational **916 interest alone is sufficient to justify application of § 201 to these ads, it is not necessary to consider the Government’s other asserted interests.

***370** Last, Citizens United argues that disclosure requirements can chill donations to an organization by exposing donors to retaliation. Some *amici* point to recent events in which donors to certain causes were blacklisted, threatened, or otherwise targeted for retaliation. See Brief for Institute for Justice as *Amicus Curiae* 13–16; Brief for Alliance Defense Fund as *Amicus Curiae* 16–22. In *McConnell*, the Court recognized that § 201 would be unconstitutional as applied to an organization if there were a reasonable probability that the group’s members would face threats, harassment, or reprisals if their names were disclosed. 540 U.S., at 198, 124 S.Ct. 619. The examples cited by *amici* are cause for concern. Citizens United, however, has offered no evidence that its members may face similar threats or reprisals. To the contrary, Citizens United has been disclosing its donors for years and has identified no instance of harassment or retaliation.

Shareholder objections raised through the procedures of corporate democracy, see *Bellotti*, *supra*, at 794, and n. 34, 98 S.Ct. 1407, can be more effective today because modern technology makes disclosures rapid and informative. A campaign finance system that pairs corporate independent expenditures with effective disclosure has not existed

before today. It must be noted, furthermore, that many of Congress’ findings in passing BCRA were premised on a system without adequate disclosure. See *McConnell*, 540 U.S., at 128, 124 S.Ct. 619 (“[T]he public may not have been fully informed about the sponsorship of so-called issue ads”); *id.*, at 196–197, 124 S.Ct. 619 (quoting *McConnell I*, 251 F.Supp.2d, at 237). With the advent of the Internet, prompt disclosure of expenditures can provide shareholders and citizens with the information needed to hold corporations and elected officials accountable for their positions and supporters. Shareholders can determine whether their corporation’s political speech advances the corporation’s interest in making profits, and citizens can see whether elected officials are “‘in the pocket’ of so-called moneyed interests.” 540 U.S., at 259, 124 S.Ct. 619 (opinion of SCALIA, J.); see ***371** *MCFL*, *supra*, at 261, 107 S.Ct. 616. The First Amendment protects political speech; and disclosure permits citizens and shareholders to react to the speech of corporate entities in a proper way. This transparency enables the electorate to make informed decisions and give proper weight to different speakers and messages.

C

For the same reasons we uphold the application of BCRA §§ 201 and 311 to the ads, we affirm their application to *Hillary*. We find no constitutional impediment to the application of BCRA’s disclaimer and disclosure requirements to a movie broadcast via video-on-demand. And there has been no showing that, as applied in this case, these requirements would impose a chill on speech or expression.

V

When word concerning the plot of the movie *Mr. Smith Goes to Washington* reached the circles of Government, some officials sought, by persuasion, to discourage its distribution. See Smoodin, “Compulsory” Viewing for Every Citizen: *Mr. Smith* and the Rhetoric of Reception, 35 Cinema Journal 3, 19, and n. 52 (Winter 1996) (citing Mr. Smith Riles Washington, *Time*, Oct. 30, 1939, p. 49); Nugent, *Capra’s Capitol Offense*, *N.Y. Times*, Oct. 29, 1939, p. X5. Under *Austin*, though, officials could have done more than discourage ****917** its distribution—they

could have banned the film. After all, it, like *Hillary*, was speech funded by a corporation that was critical of Members of Congress. *Mr. Smith Goes to Washington* may be fiction and caricature; but fiction and caricature can be a powerful force.

Modern day movies, television comedies, or skits on Youtube.com might portray public officials or public policies in unflattering ways. Yet if a covered transmission during the blackout period creates the background for candidate endorsement or opposition, a felony occurs solely because a corporation, other than an exempt media corporation, has made *372 the “purchase, payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value” in order to engage in political speech. 2 U.S.C. § 431(9)(A)(i). Speech would be suppressed in the realm where its necessity is most evident: in the public dialogue preceding a real election. Governments are often hostile to speech, but under our law and our tradition it seems stranger than fiction for our Government to make this political speech a crime. Yet this is the statute’s purpose and design.

Some members of the public might consider *Hillary* to be insightful and instructive; some might find it to be neither high art nor a fair discussion on how to set the Nation’s course; still others simply might suspend judgment on these points but decide to think more about issues and candidates. Those choices and assessments, however, are not for the Government to make. “The First Amendment underwrites the freedom to experiment and to create in the realm of thought and speech. Citizens must be free to use new forms, and new forums, for the expression of ideas. The civic discourse belongs to the people, and the Government may not prescribe the means used to conduct it.” *McConnell, supra*, at 341. 124 S.Ct. 619 (opinion of KENNEDY, J.).

The judgment of the District Court is reversed with respect to the constitutionality of 2 U.S.C. § 441b’s restrictions on corporate independent expenditures. The judgment is affirmed with respect to BCRA’s disclaimer and disclosure requirements. The case is remanded for further proceedings consistent with this opinion.

It is so ordered.

Chief Justice ROBERTS, with whom Justice ALITO joins, concurring.

The Government urges us in this case to uphold a direct prohibition on political speech. It asks us to embrace a theory of the First Amendment that would allow censorship not only of television and radio broadcasts, but of pamphlets, *373 posters, the Internet, and virtually any other medium that corporations and unions might find useful in expressing their views on matters of public concern. Its theory, if accepted, would empower the Government to prohibit newspapers from running editorials or opinion pieces supporting or opposing candidates for office, so long as the newspapers were owned by corporations—as the major ones are. First Amendment rights could be confined to individuals, subverting the vibrant public discourse that is at the foundation of our democracy.

The Court properly rejects that theory, and I join its opinion in full. The First Amendment protects more than just the individual on a soapbox and the lonely pamphleteer. I write separately to address the important principles of judicial restraint and *stare decisis* implicated in this case.

I

Judging the constitutionality of an Act of Congress is “the gravest and most delicate duty that this Court is called upon to **918 perform.” *Blodgett v. Holden*, 275 U.S. 142, 147–148, 48 S.Ct. 105, 72 L.Ed. 206 (1927) (Holmes, J., concurring). Because the stakes are so high, our standard practice is to refrain from addressing constitutional questions except when necessary to rule on particular claims before us. See *Ashwander v. TVA*, 297 U.S. 288, 346–348, 56 S.Ct. 466, 80 L.Ed. 688 (1936) (Brandeis, J., concurring). This policy underlies both our willingness to construe ambiguous statutes to avoid constitutional problems and our practice “ ‘never to formulate a rule of constitutional law broader than is required by the precise facts to which it is to be applied.’ ” *United States v. Raimes*, 362 U.S. 17, 21, 80 S.Ct. 519, 4 L.Ed.2d 524 (1960) (quoting *Liverpool, New York & Philadelphia S.S. Co. v. Commissioners of Emigration*, 113 U.S. 33, 39, 5 S.Ct. 352, 28 L.Ed. 899 (1885)).

The majority and dissent are united in expressing allegiance to these principles. *Ante*, at 892; *post*, at 936 – 937 (STEVENS, J., concurring in part and dissenting in part). *374 But I cannot agree with my dissenting colleagues on how these principles apply in this case.

The majority's step-by-step analysis accords with our standard practice of avoiding broad constitutional questions except when necessary to decide the case before us. The majority begins by addressing—and quite properly rejecting—Citizens United's statutory claim that 2 U.S.C. § 441b does not actually cover its production and distribution of *Hillary: The Movie* (hereinafter *Hillary*). If there were a valid basis for deciding this statutory claim in Citizens United's favor (and thereby avoiding constitutional adjudication), it would be proper to do so. Indeed, that is precisely the approach the Court took just last Term in *Northwest Austin Municipal Util. Dist. No. One v. Holder*, 557 U.S. 193, 129 S.Ct. 2504, 174 L.Ed.2d 140 (2009), when eight Members of the Court agreed to decide the case on statutory grounds instead of reaching the appellant's broader argument that the Voting Rights Act is unconstitutional.

It is only because the majority rejects Citizens United's statutory claim that it proceeds to consider the group's various constitutional arguments, beginning with its narrowest claim (that *Hillary* is not the functional equivalent of express advocacy) and proceeding to its broadest claim (that *Austin v. Michigan Chamber of Commerce*, 494 U.S. 652, 110 S.Ct. 1391, 108 L.Ed.2d 652 (1990) should be overruled). This is the same order of operations followed by the controlling opinion in *Federal Election Comm'n v. Wisconsin Right to Life, Inc.*, 551 U.S. 449, 127 S.Ct. 2652, 168 L.Ed.2d 329 (2007) (*WRTL*). There the appellant was able to prevail on its narrowest constitutional argument because its broadcast ads did not qualify as the functional equivalent of express advocacy; there was thus no need to go on to address the broader claim that *McConnell v. Federal Election Comm'n*, 540 U.S. 93, 124 S.Ct. 619, 157 L.Ed.2d 491 (2003), should be overruled. *WRTL*, 551 U.S., at 482, 127 S.Ct. 2652; *id.*, at 482–483, 127 S.Ct. 2652 (ALITO, J., concurring). This case is different—not, as the dissent suggests, because the approach taken in *WRTL* has been deemed a “failure,” *post*, at 935, *375 but because, in the absence of any valid narrower ground of decision, there is no way to avoid Citizens United's broader constitutional argument.

The dissent advocates an approach to addressing Citizens United's claims that I find quite perplexing. It presumably agrees with the majority that Citizens United's narrower statutory and constitutional arguments lack merit—otherwise its conclusion that the group should lose this case would make no sense. Despite agreeing **919 that these narrower arguments fail, however, the dissent argues that the majority should nonetheless latch on to one of them in order to avoid reaching the broader constitutional question of whether *Austin* remains good law. It even suggests that the Court's failure to adopt one of these concededly meritless arguments is a sign that the majority is not “serious about judicial restraint.” *Post*, at 938.

This approach is based on a false premise: that our practice of avoiding unnecessary (and unnecessarily broad) constitutional holdings somehow trumps our obligation faithfully to interpret the law. It should go without saying, however, that we cannot embrace a narrow ground of decision simply because it is narrow; it must also be right. Thus while it is true that “[i]f it is not necessary to decide more, it is necessary not to decide more,” *post*, at 937 (internal quotation marks omitted), sometimes it is necessary to decide more. There is a difference between judicial restraint and judicial abdication. When constitutional questions are “indispensably necessary” to resolving the case at hand, “the court must meet and decide them.” *Ex parte Randolph*, 20 F. Cas. 242, 254 (No. 11, 558) (CC Va. 1833) (Marshall, C.J.).

Because it is necessary to reach Citizens United's broader argument that *Austin* should be overruled, the debate over whether to consider this claim on an as-applied or facial basis strikes me as largely beside the point. Citizens United has standing—it is being injured by the Government's enforcement of the Act. Citizens United has a constitutional *376 claim—the Act violates the First Amendment, because it prohibits political speech. The Government has a defense—the Act may be enforced, consistent with the First Amendment, against corporations. Whether the claim or the defense prevails is the question before us.

Given the nature of that claim and defense, it makes no difference of any substance whether this case is resolved by invalidating the statute on its face or only as applied to Citizens United. Even if considered in as-applied terms, a holding in this case that the Act may not be

applied to Citizens United—because corporations as well as individuals enjoy the pertinent First Amendment rights—would mean that any other corporation raising the same challenge would also win. Likewise, a conclusion that the Act may be applied to Citizens United—because it is constitutional to prohibit corporate political speech—would similarly govern future cases. Regardless whether we label Citizens United's claim a “facial” or “as-applied” challenge, the consequences of the Court's decision are the same.¹

II

The text and purpose of the First Amendment point in the same direction: Congress may not prohibit political speech, even if the speaker is a corporation or union. What makes this case difficult is the need to confront our prior decision in *Austin*.

This is the first case in which we have been asked to overrule *Austin*, and thus it is also the first in which we have had reason to consider how much weight to give *stare decisis* in assessing its continued validity. The dissent erroneously *377 declares **920 that the Court “reaffirmed” *Austin*'s holding in subsequent cases—namely, *Federal Election Comm'n v. Beaumont*, 539 U.S. 146, 123 S.Ct. 2200, 156 L.Ed.2d 179 (2003); *McConnell*; and *WRTL*. *Post*, at 956–957. Not so. Not a single party in any of those cases asked us to overrule *Austin*, and as the dissent points out, *post*, at 931–932, the Court generally does not consider constitutional arguments that have not properly been raised. *Austin*'s validity was therefore not directly at issue in the cases the dissent cites. The Court's unwillingness to overturn *Austin* in those cases cannot be understood as a *reaffirmation* of that decision.

A

Fidelity to precedent—the policy of *stare decisis*—is vital to the proper exercise of the judicial function. “*Stare decisis* is the preferred course because it promotes the evenhanded, predictable, and consistent development of legal principles, fosters reliance on judicial decisions, and contributes to the actual and perceived integrity of the judicial process.” *Payne v. Tennessee*, 501 U.S. 808, 827, 111 S.Ct. 2597, 115 L.Ed.2d 720 (1991). For these reasons, we have long recognized that departures from

precedent are inappropriate in the absence of a “special justification.” *Arizona v. Rumsey*, 467 U.S. 203, 212, 104 S.Ct. 2305, 81 L.Ed.2d 164 (1984).

At the same time, *stare decisis* is neither an “inexorable command,” *Lawrence v. Texas*, 539 U.S. 558, 577, 123 S.Ct. 2472, 156 L.Ed.2d 508 (2003), nor “a mechanical formula of adherence to the latest decision,” *Helvering v. Hallock*, 309 U.S. 106, 119, 60 S.Ct. 444, 84 L.Ed. 604 (1940), especially in constitutional cases, see *United States v. Scott*, 437 U.S. 82, 101, 98 S.Ct. 2187, 57 L.Ed.2d 65 (1978). If it were, segregation would be legal, minimum wage laws would be unconstitutional, and the Government could wiretap ordinary criminal suspects without first obtaining warrants. See *Plessy v. Ferguson*, 163 U.S. 537, 16 S.Ct. 1138, 41 L.Ed. 256 (1896), overruled by *Brown v. Board of Education*, 347 U.S. 483, 74 S.Ct. 686, 98 L.Ed. 873 (1954); *Adkins v. Children's Hospital of D. C.*, 261 U.S. 525, 43 S.Ct. 394, 67 L.Ed. 785 (1923), overruled by *West Coast Hotel Co. v. Parrish*, 300 U.S. 379, 57 S.Ct. 578, 81 L.Ed. 703 (1937); *Olmstead v. United States*, 277 U.S. 438, 48 S.Ct. 564, 72 L.Ed. 944 (1928), overruled by *378 *Katz v. United States*, 389 U.S. 347, 88 S.Ct. 507, 19 L.Ed.2d 576 (1967). As the dissent properly notes, none of us has viewed *stare decisis* in such absolute terms. *Post*, at 938–939; see also, e.g., *Randall v. Sorrell*, 548 U.S. 230, 274–281, 126 S.Ct. 2479, 165 L.Ed.2d 482 (2006) (STEVENS, J., dissenting) (urging the Court to overrule its invalidation of limits on independent expenditures on political speech in *Buckley v. Valeo*, 424 U.S. 1, 96 S.Ct. 612, 46 L.Ed.2d 659 (1976) (*per curiam*)).

Stare decisis is instead a “principle of policy.” *Helvering*, *supra*, at 119, 60 S.Ct. 444. When considering whether to reexamine a prior erroneous holding, we must balance the importance of having constitutional questions *decided* against the importance of having them *decided right*. As Justice Jackson explained, this requires a “sober appraisal of the disadvantages of the innovation as well as those of the questioned case, a weighing of practical effects of one against the other.” Jackson, *Decisional Law and Stare Decisis*, 30 A.B.A.J. 334 (1944).

In conducting this balancing, we must keep in mind that *stare decisis* is not an end in itself. It is instead “the means by which we ensure that the law will not merely change erratically, but will develop in a principled and intelligible fashion.” **921 *Vasquez v. Hillery*, 474 U.S. 254, 265, 106 S.Ct. 617, 88 L.Ed.2d 598 (1986). Its greatest

130 S.Ct. 876, 187 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 2961, 175 L.Ed.2d 753, 78 USLW 4078...

purpose is to serve a constitutional ideal—the rule of law. It follows that in the unusual circumstance when fidelity to any particular precedent does more to damage this constitutional ideal than to advance it, we must be more willing to depart from that precedent.

Thus, for example, if the precedent under consideration itself departed from the Court's jurisprudence, returning to the “‘intrinsically sounder’ doctrine established in prior cases” may “better serv[e] the values of *stare decisis* than would following [the] more recently decided case inconsistent with the decisions that came before it.” *Adarand Constructors, Inc. v. Peña*, 515 U.S. 200, 231, 115 S.Ct. 2097, 132 L.Ed.2d 158 (1995); see also *Helvering, supra*, at 119, 60 S.Ct. 444; *Randall, supra*, at 274, 126 S.Ct. 2479 (STEVENS, J., dissenting). Abrogating the errant precedent, rather than *379 reaffirming or extending it, might better preserve the law's coherence and curtail the precedent's disruptive effects.

Likewise, if adherence to a precedent actually impedes the stable and orderly adjudication of future cases, its *stare decisis* effect is also diminished. This can happen in a number of circumstances, such as when the precedent's validity is so hotly contested that it cannot reliably function as a basis for decision in future cases, when its rationale threatens to upend our settled jurisprudence in related areas of law, and when the precedent's underlying reasoning has become so discredited that the Court cannot keep the precedent alive without jury-rigging new and different justifications to shore up the original mistake. See, e.g., *Pearson v. Callahan*, 555 U.S. 223, —, 129 S.Ct. 808, 817, 172 L.Ed.2d 565 (2009); *Montejo v. Louisiana*, 556 U.S. 778, —, 129 S.Ct. 2079, 2088–2089, 173 L.Ed.2d 955 (2009) (*stare decisis* does not control when adherence to the prior decision requires “fundamentally revising its theoretical basis”).

B

These considerations weigh against retaining our decision in *Austin*. First, as the majority explains, that decision was an “aberration” insofar as it departed from the robust protections we had granted political speech in our earlier cases. *Ante*, at 907; see also *Buckley, supra*; *First Nat. Bank of Boston v. Bellotti*, 435 U.S. 765, 98 S.Ct. 1407, 55 L.Ed.2d 707 (1978). *Austin* undermined the careful line that *Buckley* drew to distinguish limits on contributions

to candidates from limits on independent expenditures on speech. *Buckley* rejected the asserted government interest in regulating independent expenditures, concluding that “restrict[ing] the speech of some elements of our society in order to enhance the relative voice of others is wholly foreign to the First Amendment.” 424 U.S., at 48–49, 96 S.Ct. 612; see also *Bellotti, supra*, at 790–791, 98 S.Ct. 1407; *Citizens Against Rent Control/Coalition for Fair Housing v. Berkeley*, 454 U.S. 290, 295, 102 S.Ct. 434, 70 L.Ed.2d 492 (1981). *Austin*, however, allowed the Government to prohibit these same expenditures out of concern for “the corrosive and distorting effects of immense aggregations *380 of wealth” in the marketplace of ideas. 494 U.S., at 660, 110 S.Ct. 1391. *Austin*'s reasoning was—and remains—inconsistent with *Buckley*'s explicit repudiation of any government interest in “equalizing the relative ability of individuals and groups to influence the outcome of elections.” 424 U.S., at 48–49, 96 S.Ct. 612.

Austin was also inconsistent with *Bellotti*'s clear rejection of the idea that “speech that otherwise would be within the protection of the First Amendment loses that **922 protection simply because its source is a corporation.” 435 U.S., at 784, 98 S.Ct. 1407. The dissent correctly points out that *Bellotti* involved a referendum rather than a candidate election, and that *Bellotti* itself noted this factual distinction, *id.*, at 788, n. 26, 98 S.Ct. 1407; *post*, at 958. But this distinction does not explain why corporations may be subject to prohibitions on speech in candidate elections when individuals may not.

Second, the validity of *Austin*'s rationale—itsself adopted over two “spirited dissents,” *Payne*, 501 U.S., at 829, 111 S.Ct. 2597—has proved to be the consistent subject of dispute among Members of this Court ever since. See, e.g., *WRTL*, 551 U.S., at 483, 127 S.Ct. 2652 (SCALIA, J., joined by KENNEDY and THOMAS, JJ., concurring in part and concurring in judgment); *McConnell*, 540 U.S., at 247, 264, 286, 124 S.Ct. 619 (opinions of SCALIA, THOMAS, and KENNEDY, JJ.); *Beaumont*, 539 U.S., at 163, 164, 123 S.Ct. 2200 (opinions of KENNEDY and THOMAS, JJ.). The simple fact that one of our decisions remains controversial is, of course, insufficient to justify overruling it. But it does undermine the precedent's ability to contribute to the stable and orderly development of the law. In such circumstances, it is entirely appropriate for the Court—which in this case is squarely asked to reconsider *Austin*'s validity for the first time—to address

130 S.Ct. 876, 187 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 2961, 175 L.Ed.2d 753, 78 USLW 4078...

the matter with a greater willingness to consider new approaches capable of restoring our doctrine to sounder footing.

Third, the *Austin* decision is uniquely destabilizing because it threatens to subvert our Court's decisions even outside the particular context of corporate express advocacy. *381 The First Amendment theory underlying *Austin's* holding is extraordinarily broad. *Austin's* logic would authorize government prohibition of political speech by a category of speakers in the name of equality—a point that most scholars acknowledge (and many celebrate), but that the dissent denies. Compare, e.g., Garrett, *New Voices in Politics: Justice Marshall's Jurisprudence on Law and Politics*, 52 *Howard L.J.* 655, 669 (2009) (*Austin* “has been understood by most commentators to be an opinion driven by equality considerations, albeit disguised in the language of ‘political corruption’”) with *post*, at 970 (*Austin's* rationale “is manifestly not just an ‘equalizing’ ideal in disguise”).²

It should not be surprising, then, that Members of the Court have relied on *Austin's* expansive logic to justify greater incursions on the First Amendment, even outside the original context of corporate advocacy on behalf of candidates running for office. See, e.g., *Davis v. Federal Election Comm'n*, 554 U.S. 724, —, 128 S.Ct. 2759, 2780, 171 L.Ed.2d 737 (2008) (STEVENS, J., concurring in part and dissenting in part) (relying on *Austin* and other cases to justify restrictions on campaign spending by individual candidates, explaining that “there is no reason that their logic—specifically, their concerns about the corrosive and distorting effects of wealth on our political process—is not **923 equally applicable in the context of individual wealth”); *McConnell, supra*, at 203–209, 124 S.Ct. 619 (extending *Austin* beyond its original context to cover not only the “functional equivalent” of express advocacy by corporations, but also *382 electioneering speech conducted by labor unions). The dissent in this case succumbs to the same temptation, suggesting that *Austin* justifies prohibiting corporate speech because such speech might unduly influence “the market for legislation.” *Post*, at 975. The dissent reads *Austin* to permit restrictions on corporate speech based on nothing more than the fact that the corporate form may help individuals coordinate and present their views more effectively. *Post*, at 975. A speaker's ability to persuade, however, provides no basis

for government regulation of free and open public debate on what the laws should be.

If taken seriously, *Austin's* logic would apply most directly to newspapers and other media corporations. They have a more profound impact on public discourse than most other speakers. These corporate entities are, for the time being, not subject to § 441b's otherwise generally applicable prohibitions on corporate political speech. But this is simply a matter of legislative grace. The fact that the law currently grants a favored position to media corporations is no reason to overlook the danger inherent in accepting a theory that would allow government restrictions on their political speech. See generally *McConnell, supra*, at 283–286, 124 S.Ct. 619 (THOMAS, J., concurring in part, concurring in judgment in part, and dissenting in part).

These readings of *Austin* do no more than carry that decision's reasoning to its logical endpoint. In doing so, they highlight the threat *Austin* poses to First Amendment rights generally, even outside its specific factual context of corporate express advocacy. Because *Austin* is so difficult to confine to its facts—and because its logic threatens to undermine our First Amendment jurisprudence and the nature of public discourse more broadly—the costs of giving it *stare decisis* effect are unusually high.

Finally and most importantly, the Government's own effort to defend *Austin*—or, more accurately, to defend something that is not quite *Austin*—underscores its weakness as *383 a precedent of the Court. The Government concedes that *Austin* “is not the most lucid opinion,” yet asks us to reaffirm its holding. Tr. of Oral Arg. 62 (Sept. 9, 2009). But while invoking *stare decisis* to support this position, the Government never once even mentions the compelling interest that *Austin* relied upon in the first place: the need to diminish “the corrosive and distorting effects of immense aggregations of wealth that are accumulated with the help of the corporate form and that have little or no correlation to the public's support for the corporation's political ideas.” 494 U.S., at 660, 110 S.Ct. 1391.

Instead of endorsing *Austin* on its own terms, the Government urges us to reaffirm *Austin's* specific holding on the basis of two new and potentially expansive interests—the need to prevent actual or apparent *quid pro quo* corruption, and the need to protect corporate

shareholders. See Supp. Brief for Appellee 8–10, 12–13. Those interests may or may not support the *result* in *Austin*, but they were plainly not part of the *reasoning* on which *Austin* relied.

To its credit, the Government forthrightly concedes that *Austin* did not embrace either of the new rationales it now urges upon us. See, e.g., Supp. Brief for Appellee 11 (“The Court did not decide in *Austin* ... whether the compelling interest in preventing actual or apparent corruption provides a constitutionally sufficient justification ****924** for prohibiting the use of corporate treasury funds for independent electioneering”); Tr. of Oral Arg. 45 (Sept. 9, 2009) (“*Austin* did not articulate what we believe to be the strongest compelling interest”); *id.*, at 61 (“[The Court:] I take it we have never accepted your shareholder protection interest. This is a new argument. [The Government:] I think that that’s fair”); *id.*, at 64 (“[The Court:] In other words, you are asking us to uphold *Austin* on the basis of two arguments, two principles, two compelling interests we have never accepted in [the context of limits on political expenditures]. [The Government:] [I]n this particular context, fair enough”).

***384** To be clear: The Court in *Austin* nowhere relied upon the only arguments the Government now raises to support that decision. In fact, the only opinion in *Austin* endorsing the Government’s argument based on the threat of *quid pro quo* corruption was Justice STEVENS’s concurrence. 494 U.S., at 678. 110 S.Ct. 1391. The Court itself did not do so, despite the fact that the concurrence highlighted the argument. Moreover, the Court’s only discussion of shareholder protection in *Austin* appeared in a section of the opinion that sought merely to distinguish *Austin*’s facts from those of *Federal Election Comm’n v. Massachusetts Citizens for Life, Inc.*, 479 U.S. 238, 107 S.Ct. 616, 93 L.Ed.2d 539 (1986). *Austin, supra*, at 663. 110 S.Ct. 1391. Nowhere did *Austin* suggest that the goal of protecting shareholders is itself a compelling interest authorizing restrictions on First Amendment rights.

To the extent that the Government’s case for reaffirming *Austin* depends on radically reconceptualizing its reasoning, that argument is at odds with itself. *Stare decisis* is a doctrine of preservation, not transformation. It counsels deference to past mistakes, but provides no justification for making new ones. There is therefore no basis for the Court to give precedential sway to reasoning that it has never accepted, simply because that reasoning

happens to support a conclusion reached on different grounds that have since been abandoned or discredited.

Doing so would undermine the rule-of-law values that justify *stare decisis* in the first place. It would effectively license the Court to invent and adopt new principles of constitutional law solely for the purpose of rationalizing its past errors, without a proper analysis of whether those principles have merit on their own. This approach would allow the Court’s past missteps to spawn future mistakes, undercutting the very rule-of-law values that *stare decisis* is designed to protect.

None of this is to say that the Government is barred from making new arguments to support the outcome in *Austin*. ***385** On the contrary, it is free to do so. And of course the Court is free to accept them. But the Government’s new arguments must stand or fall on their own; they are not entitled to receive the special deference we accord to precedent. They are, as grounds to support *Austin*, literally *un*precedented. Moreover, to the extent the Government relies on new arguments—and declines to defend *Austin* on its own terms—we may reasonably infer that it lacks confidence in that decision’s original justification.

Because continued adherence to *Austin* threatens to subvert the “principled and intelligible” development of our First Amendment jurisprudence, *Vasquez*, 474 U.S., at 265. 106 S.Ct. 617. I support the Court’s determination to overrule that decision.

* * *

We have had two rounds of briefing in this case, two oral arguments, and 54 *amicus* ****925** briefs to help us carry out our obligation to decide the necessary constitutional questions according to law. We have also had the benefit of a comprehensive dissent that has helped ensure that the Court has considered all the relevant issues. This careful consideration convinces me that Congress violates the First Amendment when it decrees that some speakers may not engage in political speech at election time, when it matters most.

Justice SCALIA, with whom Justice ALITO joins, and with whom Justice THOMAS joins in part, concurring.

I join the opinion of the Court.¹

I write separately to address Justice STEVENS' discussion of "*Original Understandings*," *post*, at 948 (opinion concurring in part and dissenting in part) (hereinafter referred to as the dissent). This section of the dissent purports to show that today's decision is not supported by the original understanding of the First Amendment. The dissent attempts *386 this demonstration, however, in splendid isolation from the text of the First Amendment. It never shows why "the freedom of speech" that was the right of Englishmen did not include the freedom to speak in association with other individuals, including association in the corporate form. To be sure, in 1791 (as now) corporations could pursue only the objectives set forth in their charters; but the dissent provides no evidence that their speech in the pursuit of those objectives could be censored.

Instead of taking this straightforward approach to determining the Amendment's meaning, the dissent embarks on a detailed exploration of the Framers' views about the "role of corporations in society." *Post*, at 949. The Framers didn't like corporations, the dissent concludes, and therefore it follows (as night the day) that corporations had no rights of free speech. Of course the Framers' personal affection or disaffection for corporations is relevant only insofar as it can be thought to be reflected in the understood meaning of the text they enacted—not, as the dissent suggests, as a freestanding substitute for that text. But the dissent's distortion of proper analysis is even worse than that. Though faced with a constitutional text that makes no distinction between types of speakers, the dissent feels no necessity to provide even an isolated statement from the founding era to the effect that corporations are *not* covered, but places the burden on petitioners to bring forward statements showing that they *are* ("there is not a scintilla of evidence to support the notion that anyone believed [the First Amendment] would preclude regulatory distinctions based on the corporate form," *post*, at 948).

Despite the corporation-hating quotations the dissent has dredged up, it is far from clear that by the end of the 18th century corporations were despised. If so, how came there to be so many of them? The dissent's statement that there were few business corporations during the eighteenth century—"only a few hundred during all of the 18th century"—is misleading. *387 *Post*, at 949,

n. 53. There were approximately 335 charters issued to business corporations in the United States by the end of the 18th century.² See 2 J. & Davis, **926 *Essays in the Earlier History of American Corporations* 24 (1917) (reprint 2006) (hereinafter Davis). This was a "considerable extension of corporate enterprise in the field of business," Davis 8, and represented "unprecedented growth," *id.*, at 309. Moreover, what seems like a small number by today's standards surely does not indicate the relative importance of corporations when the Nation was considerably smaller. As I have previously noted, "[b]y the end of the eighteenth century the corporation was a familiar figure in American economic life." *McCormell v. Federal Election Comm'n*, 540 U.S. 93, 256, 124 S.Ct. 619, 157 L.Ed.2d 491 (2003) (SCALIA, J., concurring in part, concurring in judgment in part, and dissenting in part) (quoting C. Cooke, *Corporation Trust and Company* 92 (1951) (hereinafter Cooke)).

Even if we thought it proper to apply the dissent's approach of excluding from First Amendment coverage what the Founders disliked, and even if we agreed that the Founders disliked founding-era corporations; modern corporations might not qualify for exclusion. Most of the Founders' resentment towards corporations was directed at the state-granted monopoly privileges that individually chartered corporations enjoyed.³ Modern corporations do not have such *388 privileges, and would probably have been favored by most of our enterprising Founders—excluding, perhaps, Thomas Jefferson and others favoring perpetuation of an agrarian society. Moreover, if the Founders' specific intent with respect to corporations is what matters, why does the dissent ignore the Founders' views about other legal entities that have more in common with modern business corporations than the founding-era corporations? At the time of the founding, religious, educational, and literary corporations were incorporated under general incorporation statutes, much as business corporations are today.⁴ See Davis 16–17; R. Seavoy, *Origins of the American Business Corporation, 1784–1855*, p. 5 (1982); Cooke 94. There were also small unincorporated business associations, which some have argued were the "true progenitors" of today's business corporations. Friedman 200 (quoting S. Livermore, *Early American Land Companies: Their Influence on Corporate Development* 216 (1939)); see also Davis 33. Were all of these silently excluded from the protections of the First Amendment?

The lack of a textual exception for speech by corporations cannot be explained on the ground that such organizations did not exist or did not speak. To the contrary, colleges, towns and cities, religious institutions, and guilds had long been organized as corporations at common law and under the King's charter, see 1 W. Blackstone, Commentaries on the Laws of England 455–473 (1765); 1 S. Kyd, A ****927** Treatise on the Law of Corporations 1–32, 63 (1793) (reprinted 2006), and as ***389** I have discussed, the practice of incorporation only expanded in the United States. Both corporations and voluntary associations actively petitioned the Government and expressed their views in newspapers and pamphlets. For example: An antislavery Quaker corporation petitioned the First Congress, distributed pamphlets, and communicated through the press in 1790. W. diGiacomantonio, “For the Gratification of a Volunteering Society”: Antislavery and Pressure Group Politics in the First Federal Congress, 15 J. Early Republic 169 (1995). The New York Sons of Liberty sent a circular to colonies farther south in 1766. P. Maier, From Resistance to Revolution 79–80 (1972). And the Society for the Relief and Instruction of Poor Germans circulated a biweekly paper from 1755 to 1757. Adams, The Colonial German-language Press and the American Revolution, in The Press & the American Revolution 151, 161–162 (B. Bailyn & J. Hench eds.1980). The dissent offers no evidence—none whatever—that the First Amendment's unqualified text was originally understood to exclude such associational speech from its protection.⁵

390** Historical evidence relating to the textually similar clause “the freedom of ... the press” also provides no support for the proposition that the First Amendment excludes conduct of artificial legal entities from the scope of its protection. The freedom of “the press” was widely understood to protect the publishing activities of individual editors and printers. See *McIntyre v. Ohio Elections Comm'n*, 514 U.S. 334, 360, 115 S.Ct. 1511, 131 L.Ed.2d 426 (1995) (THOMAS, J., concurring in judgment); see also *McConnell*, 540 U.S., at 252–253, 124 S.Ct. 619 (opinion of SCALIA, J.). But these individuals often acted through newspapers, which (much like corporations) had their own names, outlived the individuals who had founded them, could be bought and sold, were sometimes owned by more than one person, and were operated for profit. See generally F. *928** Mott, *American Journalism: A History of Newspapers*

in the United States Through 250 Years 3–164 (1941); J. Smith, *Freedom's Fetters* (1956). Their activities were not stripped of First Amendment protection simply because they were carried out under the banner of an artificial legal entity. And the notion which follows from the dissent's view, that modern newspapers, since they are incorporated, have free-speech rights only at the sufferance of Congress, boggles the mind.⁶

***391** In passing, the dissent also claims that the Court's conception of corruption is unhistorical. The Framers “would have been appalled,” it says, by the evidence of corruption in the congressional findings supporting the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 2002. *Post*, at 963. For this proposition, the dissent cites a law review article arguing that “corruption” was originally understood to include “moral decay” and even actions taken by citizens in pursuit of private rather than public ends. Teachout, *The Anti-Corruption Principle*, 94 Cornell L.Rev. 341, 373, 378 (2009). It is hard to see how this has anything to do with what sort of corruption can be combated by restrictions on political speech. Moreover, if speech can be prohibited because, in the view of the Government, it leads to “moral decay” or does not serve “public ends,” then there is no limit to the Government's censorship power.

The dissent says that when the Framers “constitutionalized the right to free speech in the First Amendment, it was the free speech of individual Americans that they had in mind.” *Post*, at 950. That is no doubt true. All the provisions of the Bill of Rights set forth the rights of individual ***392** men and women—not, for example, of trees or polar bears. But the individual person's right to speak includes the right to speak *in association with other individual persons*. surely the dissent does not believe that speech by the Republican Party or the Democratic Party can be censored because it is not the speech of “an individual American.” It is the speech of many individual Americans, who have associated in a common cause, giving the leadership of the party the right to speak on their behalf. The association of individuals in a business corporation is no different—or at least it cannot be denied the right to speak on the simplistic ground that it is not “an individual American.”⁷

****929** But to return to, and summarize, my principal point, which is the conformity of today's opinion with the original meaning of the First Amendment. The Amendment is written in terms of “speech,”

not speakers. Its text offers no foothold *393 for excluding any category of speaker, from single individuals to partnerships of individuals, to unincorporated associations of individuals, to incorporated associations of individuals—and the dissent offers no evidence about the original meaning of the text to support any such exclusion. We are therefore simply left with the question whether the speech at issue in this case is “speech” covered by the First Amendment. No one says otherwise. A documentary film critical of a potential Presidential candidate is core political speech, and its nature as such does not change simply because it was funded by a corporation. Nor does the character of that funding produce any reduction whatever in the “inherent worth of the speech” and “its capacity for informing the public,” *First Nat. Bank of Boston v. Bellotti*, 435 U.S. 765, 777, 98 S.Ct. 1407, 55 L.Ed.2d 707 (1978). Indeed, to exclude or impede corporate speech is to muzzle the principal agents of the modern free economy. We should celebrate rather than condemn the addition of this speech to the public debate.

Justice STEVENS, with whom Justice GINSBURG, Justice BREYER, and Justice SOTOMAYOR join, concurring in part and dissenting in part.

The real issue in this case concerns how, not if, the appellant may finance its electioneering. Citizens United is a wealthy nonprofit corporation that runs a political action committee (PAC) with millions of dollars in assets. Under the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 2002 (BCRA), it could have used those assets to televise and promote *Hillary: The Movie* wherever and whenever it wanted to. It also could have spent unrestricted sums to broadcast *Hillary* at any time other than the 30 days before the last primary election. Neither Citizens United's nor any other corporation's speech has been “banned,” *ante*, at 886. All that the parties dispute is whether Citizens United had a right to use the funds in its general treasury to pay for broadcasts during the 30-day period. The notion that the First Amendment *394 dictates an affirmative answer to that question is, in my judgment, profoundly misguided. Even more misguided is the notion that the Court must rewrite the **930 law relating to campaign expenditures by *for-profit* corporations and unions to decide this case.

The basic premise underlying the Court's ruling is its iteration, and constant reiteration, of the proposition

that the First Amendment bars regulatory distinctions based on a speaker's identity, including its “identity” as a corporation. While that glittering generality has rhetorical appeal, it is not a correct statement of the law. Nor does it tell us when a corporation may engage in electioneering that some of its shareholders oppose. It does not even resolve the specific question whether Citizens United may be required to finance some of its messages with the money in its PAC. The conceit that corporations must be treated identically to natural persons in the political sphere is not only inaccurate but also inadequate to justify the Court's disposition of this case.

In the context of election to public office, the distinction between corporate and human speakers is significant. Although they make enormous contributions to our society, corporations are not actually members of it. They cannot vote or run for office. Because they may be managed and controlled by nonresidents, their interests may conflict in fundamental respects with the interests of eligible voters. The financial resources, legal structure, and instrumental orientation of corporations raise legitimate concerns about their role in the electoral process. Our lawmakers have a compelling constitutional basis, if not also a democratic duty, to take measures designed to guard against the potentially deleterious effects of corporate spending in local and national races.

The majority's approach to corporate electioneering marks a dramatic break from our past. Congress has placed special limitations on campaign spending by corporations ever since the passage of the Tillman Act in 1907, ch. 420, 34 Stat. 864. We have unanimously concluded that this “reflects a *395 permissible assessment of the dangers posed by those entities to the electoral process,” *FEC v. National Right to Work Comm.*, 459 U.S. 197, 209, 103 S.Ct. 552, 74 L.Ed.2d 364 (1982) (*NRWC*), and have accepted the “legislative judgment that the special characteristics of the corporate structure require particularly careful regulation,” *id.*, at 209–210, 103 S.Ct. 552. The Court today rejects a century of history when it treats the distinction between corporate and individual campaign spending as an invidious novelty born of *Austin v. Michigan Chamber of Commerce*, 494 U.S. 652, 110 S.Ct. 1391, 108 L.Ed.2d 652 (1990). Relying largely on individual dissenting opinions, the majority blazes through our precedents, overruling or disavowing a body of case law including *FEC v. Wisconsin Right to Life, Inc.*, 551 U.S. 449, 127 S.Ct. 2652, 168 L.Ed.2d 329

130 S.Ct. 876, 187 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 2961, 175 L.Ed.2d 753, 78 USLW 4078...

(2007) (*WRTL*), *McConnell v. FEC*, 540 U.S. 93, 124 S.Ct. 619, 157 L.Ed.2d 491 (2003), *FEC v. Beaumont*, 539 U.S. 146, 123 S.Ct. 2200, 156 L.Ed.2d 179 (2003), *FEC v. Massachusetts Citizens for Life, Inc.*, 479 U.S. 238, 107 S.Ct. 616, 93 L.Ed.2d 539 (1986) (*MCFL*), *NRWC*, 459 U.S. 197, 103 S.Ct. 552, 74 L.Ed.2d 364, and *California Medical Assn. v. FEC*, 453 U.S. 182, 101 S.Ct. 2712, 69 L.Ed.2d 567 (1981).

In his landmark concurrence in *Ashwander v. TVA*, 297 U.S. 288, 346, 56 S.Ct. 466, 80 L.Ed. 688 (1936), Justice Brandeis stressed the importance of adhering to rules the Court has “developed ... for its own governance” when deciding constitutional questions. Because departures from those rules always enhance the risk of error, I shall review the background of this case in some detail before explaining why the Court’s analysis rests on a faulty understanding of *Austin* and *McConnell* and **931 of our campaign finance jurisprudence more generally.¹ I regret the length of what follows, but the importance and novelty of the Court’s opinion require a full response. Although *396 I concur in the Court’s decision to sustain BCRA’s disclosure provisions and join Part IV of its opinion, I emphatically dissent from its principal holding.

I

The Court’s ruling threatens to undermine the integrity of elected institutions across the Nation. The path it has taken to reach its outcome will, I fear, do damage to this institution. Before turning to the question whether to overrule *Austin* and part of *McConnell*, it is important to explain why the Court should not be deciding that question.

Scope of the Case

The first reason is that the question was not properly brought before us. In declaring § 203 of BCRA facially unconstitutional on the ground that corporations’ electoral expenditures may not be regulated any more stringently than those of individuals, the majority decides this case on a basis relinquished below, not included in the questions presented to us by the litigants, and argued here only in response to the Court’s invitation. This procedure is unusual and inadvisable for a court.² Our colleagues’ suggestion that “we are asked to reconsider *Austin* and, in

effect, *McConnell*,” *ante*, at 886, would be more accurate if rephrased to state that “we have asked ourselves” to reconsider those cases.

In the District Court, Citizens United initially raised a facial challenge to the constitutionality of § 203. App. 23a–24a. *397 In its motion for summary judgment, however, Citizens United expressly abandoned its facial challenge, 1:07–cv–2240–RCL–RWR, Docket Entry No. 52, pp. 1–2 (May 16, 2008), and the parties stipulated to the dismissal of that claim, *id.*, Nos. 53 (May 22, 2008), 54 (May 23, 2008), App. 6a. The District Court therefore resolved the case on alternative grounds,³ and in its jurisdictional **932 statement to this Court, Citizens United properly advised us that it was raising only “an as-applied challenge to the constitutionality of ... BCRA § 203.” Juris. Statement 5. The jurisdictional statement never so much as cited *Austin*, the key case the majority today overrules. And not one of the questions presented suggested that Citizens United was surreptitiously raising the facial challenge to § 203 that it previously agreed to dismiss. In fact, not one of those questions raised an issue based on Citizens United’s corporate status. Juris. Statement (i). Moreover, even in its merits briefing, when Citizens United injected its request to overrule *Austin*, it never sought a declaration that § 203 was facially unconstitutional as to all corporations and unions; instead it argued only that the statute could not be applied to it because it was “funded overwhelmingly by individuals.” Brief for Appellant 29; see also *id.*, at 10, 12, 16, 28 (affirming “as applied” character of challenge to § 203); Tr. of Oral Arg. 4–9 (Mar. 24, 2009) (counsel *398 for Citizens United conceding that § 203 could be applied to General Motors); *id.*, at 55 (counsel for Citizens United stating that “we accept the Court’s decision in *Wisconsin Right to Life*”).

“It is only in exceptional cases coming here from the federal courts that questions not pressed or passed upon below are reviewed,” *Youakim v. Miller*, 425 U.S. 231, 234, 96 S.Ct. 1399, 47 L.Ed.2d 701 (1976) (*per curiam*) (quoting *Duignan v. United States*, 274 U.S. 195, 200, 47 S.Ct. 566, 71 L.Ed. 996 (1927)), and it is “only in the most exceptional cases” that we will consider issues outside the questions presented, *Stone v. Powell*, 428 U.S. 465, 481, n. 15, 96 S.Ct. 3037, 49 L.Ed.2d 1067 (1976). The appellant in this case did not so much as assert an exceptional circumstance, and one searches the majority opinion in

vain for the mention of any. That is unsurprising, for none exists.

Setting the case for reargument was a constructive step, but it did not cure this fundamental problem. Essentially, five Justices were unhappy with the limited nature of the case before us, so they changed the case to give themselves an opportunity to change the law.

As–Applied and Facial Challenges

This Court has repeatedly emphasized in recent years that “[f]acial challenges are disfavored.” *Washington State Grange v. Washington State Republican Party*, 552 U.S. 442, 450, 128 S.Ct. 1184, 170 L.Ed.2d 151 (2008); see also *Ayotte v. Planned Parenthood of Northern New Eng.*, 546 U.S. 320, 329, 126 S.Ct. 961, 163 L.Ed.2d 812 (2006) (“[T]he ‘normal rule’ is that ‘partial, rather than facial, invalidation is the required course,’ such that a ‘statute may ... be declared invalid to the extent that it reaches too far, but otherwise left intact’ ” (quoting *Brockett v. Spokane Arcades, Inc.*, 472 U.S. 491, 504, 105 S.Ct. 2794, 86 L.Ed.2d 394 (1985); alteration in original)). By declaring § 203 facially unconstitutional, our colleagues have turned an as-applied challenge into a facial challenge, in defiance of this principle.

This is not merely a technical defect in the Court's decision. The unnecessary resort to a facial inquiry “run[s] contrary *399 to the fundamental principle of judicial restraint **933 that courts should neither anticipate a question of constitutional law in advance of the necessity of deciding it nor formulate a rule of constitutional law broader than is required by the precise facts to which it is to be applied.” *Washington State Grange*, 552 U.S., at 450, 128 S.Ct. 1184 (internal quotation marks omitted). Scanting that principle “threaten[s] to short circuit the democratic process by preventing laws embodying the will of the people from being implemented in a manner consistent with the Constitution.” *Id.*, at 451, 128 S.Ct. 1184. These concerns are heightened when judges overrule settled doctrine upon which the legislature has relied. The Court operates with a sledge hammer rather than a scalpel when it strikes down one of Congress' most significant efforts to regulate the role that corporations and unions play in electoral politics. It compounds the offense by implicitly striking down a great many state laws as well.

The problem goes still deeper, for the Court does all of this on the basis of pure speculation. Had *Citizens United* maintained a facial challenge, and thus argued that there are virtually no circumstances in which BCRA § 203 can be applied constitutionally, the parties could have developed, through the normal process of litigation, a record about the *actual* effects of § 203, its actual burdens and its actual benefits, on *all* manner of corporations and unions.⁴ “Claims of facial invalidity often rest on speculation,” and consequently “raise the risk of premature interpretation of statutes on the *400 basis of factually barebones records.” *Id.*, at 450, 128 S.Ct. 1184 (internal quotation marks omitted). In this case, the record is not simply incomplete or unsatisfactory; it is nonexistent. Congress crafted BCRA in response to a virtual mountain of research on the corruption that previous legislation had failed to avert. The Court now negates Congress' efforts without a shred of evidence on how § 203 or its state-law counterparts have been affecting any entity other than *Citizens United*.⁵

Faced with this gaping empirical hole, the majority throws up its hands. Were we to confine our inquiry to *Citizens United*'s as-applied challenge, it protests, we would commence an “extended” process of “draw[ing], and then redraw[ing], constitutional **934 lines based on the particular media or technology used to disseminate political speech from a particular speaker.” *Ante*, at 891. While tacitly acknowledging that some applications of § 203 might be found constitutional, the majority thus posits a future in which novel First Amendment standards must be devised on an ad hoc basis, and then leaps from this unfounded prediction to the unfounded conclusion that such complexity counsels the abandonment of all normal restraint. Yet it is a pervasive *401 feature of regulatory systems that unanticipated events, such as new technologies, may raise some unanticipated difficulties at the margins. The fluid nature of electioneering communications does not make this case special. The fact that a Court can hypothesize situations in which a statute might, at some point down the line, pose some unforeseen as-applied problems, does not come close to meeting the standard for a facial challenge.⁶

The majority proposes several other justifications for the sweep of its ruling. It suggests that a facial ruling is necessary because, if the Court were to continue on its normal course of resolving as-applied challenges as they

present themselves, that process would itself run afoul of the First Amendment. See, e.g., *ante*, at 890 (as-applied review process “would raise questions as to the courts’ own lawful authority”); *ibid.* (“Courts, too, are bound by the First Amendment”). This suggestion is perplexing. Our colleagues elsewhere trumpet “our duty ‘to say what the law is,’ ” even when our predecessors on the bench and our counterparts in Congress have interpreted the law differently. *Ante*, at 913 (quoting *Marbury v. Madison*, 1 Cranch 137, 177, 2 L.Ed. 60 (1803)). We do not typically say what the law *is not* as a hedge against future judicial error. The possibility that later courts will misapply a constitutional provision does not give *402 us a basis for premitting litigation relating to that provision.⁷

The majority suggests that a facial ruling is necessary because anything less would chill too much protected speech. See *ante*, at 890 – 891, 892, 894 – 897. In addition to begging the question what types of corporate spending are constitutionally protected and to what extent, this claim rests on the assertion that some significant number of corporations have **935 been cowed into quiescence by FEC “ ‘censor[ship].’ ” *Ante*, at 895 – 896. That assertion is unsubstantiated, and it is hard to square with practical experience. It is particularly hard to square with the legal landscape following *WRTL*, which held that a corporate communication could be regulated under § 203 only if it was “susceptible of *no* reasonable interpretation other than as an appeal to vote for or against a specific candidate.” 551 U.S., at 470, 127 S.Ct. 2652 (opinion of ROBERTS, C.J.) (emphasis added). The whole point of this test was to make § 203 as simple and speech-protective as possible. The Court does not explain how, in the span of a single election cycle, it has determined THE CHIEF JUSTICE’s project to be a failure. In this respect, too, the majority’s critique of line-drawing collapses into a critique of the as-applied review method generally.⁸

*403 The majority suggests that, even though it expressly dismissed its facial challenge, Citizens United nevertheless preserved it—not as a freestanding “claim,” but as a potential argument in support of “a claim that the FEC has violated its First Amendment right to free speech.” *Ante*, at 892 – 893; see also *ante*, at 919 (ROBERTS, C.J., concurring) (describing Citizens United’s claim as: “[T]he Act violates the First Amendment”). By this novel logic, virtually any submission could be reconceptualized as “a claim that the Government has violated my rights,” and it would then be available to the Court to entertain any

conceivable issue that might be relevant to that claim’s disposition. Not only the as-applied/facial distinction, but the basic relationship between litigants and courts, would be upended if the latter had free rein to construe the former’s claims at such high levels of generality. There would be no need for plaintiffs to argue their case; they could just cite the constitutional provisions they think relevant, and leave the rest to us.⁹

Finally, the majority suggests that though the scope of Citizens United’s claim may be narrow, a facial ruling is necessary as a matter of remedy. Relying on a law review article, it asserts that Citizens United’s dismissal of the facial challenge does not prevent us “ ‘from making broader pronouncements of invalidity in properly “as-applied” cases.’ ” *Ante*, at 893 (quoting Fallon, *404 *As-Applied and Facial Challenges and Third-Party Standing*, 113 Harv. L.Rev. 1321, 1339 (2000) (hereinafter Fallon)); accord, *ante*, at 919 (opinion of ROBERTS, C.J.) (“Regardless whether we label Citizens United’s claim a ‘facial’ or ‘as-applied’ challenge, the consequences of the Court’s decision are the same”). The majority is on firmer conceptual ground here. Yet even if one accepts this part of Professor Fallon’s thesis, one must proceed **936 to ask *which* as-applied challenges, if successful, will “properly” invite or entail invalidation of the underlying statute.¹⁰ The paradigmatic case is a judicial determination that the legislature acted with an impermissible purpose in enacting a provision, as this carries the necessary implication that all future as-applied challenges to the provision must prevail. See Fallon 1339–1340.

Citizens United’s as-applied challenge was not of this sort. Until this Court ordered reargument, its contention was that BCRA § 203 could not lawfully be applied to a feature-length video-on-demand film (such as *Hillary*) or to a nonprofit corporation exempt from taxation under 26 U.S.C. § 501(c)(4)¹¹ and funded overwhelmingly by individuals (such as itself). See Brief for Appellant 16–41. Success on either of these claims would not necessarily carry any implications for the validity of § 203 as applied to other types of broadcasts, other *405 types of corporations, or unions. It certainly would not invalidate the statute as applied to a large for-profit corporation. See Tr. of Oral Arg. 8, 4 (Mar. 24, 2009) (counsel for Citizens United emphasizing that appellant is “a small, nonprofit organization, which is very much

like [an *MCFL* corporation],” and affirming that its argument “definitely would not be the same” if *Hillary* were distributed by General Motors).¹² There is no legitimate basis for resurrecting a facial challenge that dropped out of this case 20 months ago.

Narrower Grounds

It is all the more distressing that our colleagues have manufactured a facial challenge, because the parties have advanced numerous ways to resolve the case that would facilitate electioneering by nonprofit advocacy corporations such as Citizens ****937** United, without toppling statutes and precedents. Which is to say, the majority has transgressed yet another “cardinal” principle of the judicial process: “[I]f it is not necessary to decide more, it is necessary not to decide more,” ***406** *PDK Labs., Inc. v. Drug Enforcement Admin.*, 362 F.3d 786, 799 (C.A.D.C.2004) (Roberts, J., concurring in part and concurring in judgment).

Consider just three of the narrower grounds of decision that the majority has bypassed. First, the Court could have ruled, on statutory grounds, that a feature-length film distributed through video-on-demand does not qualify as an “electioneering communication” under § 203 of BCRA, 2 U.S.C. § 441b. BCRA defines that term to encompass certain communications transmitted by “broadcast, cable, or satellite.” § 434(f)(3)(A). When Congress was developing BCRA, the video-on-demand medium was still in its infancy, and legislators were focused on a very different sort of programming: short advertisements run on television or radio. See *McConnell*, 540 U.S., at 207, 124 S.Ct. 619. The sponsors of BCRA acknowledge that the FEC’s implementing regulations do not clearly apply to video-on-demand transmissions. See Brief for Senator John McCain et al. as *Amici Curiae* 17–19. In light of this ambiguity, the distinctive characteristics of video-on-demand, and “[t]he elementary rule ... that every reasonable construction must be resorted to, in order to save a statute from unconstitutionality,” *Hooper v. California*, 155 U.S. 648, 657, 15 S.Ct. 207, 39 L.Ed. 297 (1895), the Court could have reasonably ruled that § 203 does not apply to *Hillary*.¹³

Second, the Court could have expanded the *MCFL* exemption to cover § 501(c)(4) nonprofits that accept only a *de minimis* amount of money from for-profit

corporations. Citizens United professes to be such a group: Its brief says it “is funded predominantly by donations from individuals who support [its] ideological message.” Brief for Appellant 5. Numerous Courts of Appeal have held that *de minimis* business support does not, in itself, remove an otherwise ***407** qualifying organization from the ambit of *MCFL*.¹⁴ This court could have simply followed their lead.¹⁵

Finally, let us not forget Citizens United’s as-applied constitutional challenge. ****938** Precisely because Citizens United looks so much like the *MCFL* organizations we have exempted from regulation, while a feature-length video-on-demand film looks so unlike the types of electoral advocacy Congress has found deserving of regulation, this challenge is a substantial one. As the appellant’s own arguments show, the Court could have easily limited the breadth of its constitutional holding had it declined to adopt the novel notion that speakers and speech acts must always be treated identically—and always spared expenditures restrictions—in the political realm. Yet the Court nonetheless turns its back on the as-applied review process that has been a staple of campaign finance litigation since ***408** *Buckley v. Valeo*, 424 U.S. 1, 96 S.Ct. 612, 46 L.Ed.2d 659 (1976) (*per curiam*), and that was affirmed and expanded just two Terms ago in *WRTL*, 551 U.S. 449, 127 S.Ct. 2652, 168 L.Ed.2d 329.

This brief tour of alternative grounds on which the case could have been decided is not meant to show that any of these grounds is ideal, though each is perfectly “valid,” *ante*, at 892 (majority opinion).¹⁶ It is meant to show that there were principled, narrower paths that a Court that was serious about judicial restraint could have taken. There was also the straightforward path: applying *Austin* and *McConnell*, just as the District Court did in holding that the funding of Citizens United’s film can be regulated under them. The only thing preventing the majority from affirming the District Court, or adopting a narrower ground that would retain *Austin*, is its disdain for *Austin*.

II

The final principle of judicial process that the majority violates is the most transparent: *stare decisis*. I am not an absolutist when it comes to *stare decisis*, in the campaign finance area or in any other. No one is. But if this principle

is to do any meaningful work in supporting the rule of law, it must at least demand a significant justification, beyond the preferences of five Justices, for overturning settled doctrine. “[A] decision to overrule should rest on some special reason *409 over and above the belief that a prior case was wrongly decided.” *Planned Parenthood of Southeastern Pa. v. Casey*, 505 U.S. 833, 864, 112 S.Ct. 2791, 120 L.Ed.2d 674 (1992). No such justification exists in this case, and to the contrary there are powerful prudential reasons to keep faith with our precedents.¹⁷

The Court's central argument for why *stare decisis* ought to be trumped is that it does not like *Austin*. The opinion “was not well reasoned,” our colleagues assert, and it conflicts with First Amendment **939 principles. *Ante*, at 912. This, of course, is the Court's merits argument, the many defects in which we will soon consider. I am perfectly willing to concede that if one of our precedents were dead wrong in its reasoning or irreconcilable with the rest of our doctrine, there would be a compelling basis for revisiting it. But neither is true of *Austin*, as I explain at length in Parts III and IV, *infra*, at 942–979, and restating a merits argument with additional vigor does not give it extra weight in the *stare decisis* calculus.

Perhaps in recognition of this point, the Court supplements its merits case with a smattering of assertions. The Court proclaims that “*Austin* is undermined by experience since its announcement.” *Ante*, at 912. This is a curious claim to make in a case that lacks a developed record. The majority has no empirical evidence with which to substantiate the claim; we just have its *ipse dixit* that the real world has not been kind to *Austin*. Nor does the majority bother to specify in what sense *Austin* has been “undermined.” Instead it treats the reader to a string of non sequiturs: “Our Nation's speech dynamic is changing,” *ante*, at 912; “[s]peakers have become adept at presenting citizens with sound bites, talking points, and scripted messages,” *ibid.*; “[c]orporations ... do not have monolithic views,” *ibid.* How any *410 of these ruminations weakens the force of *stare decisis*, escapes my comprehension.¹⁸

The majority also contends that the Government's hesitation to rely on *Austin*'s antidistortion rationale “diminishe[s]” “the principle of adhering to that precedent.” *Ante*, at 912; see also *ante*, at 923 (opinion of ROBERTS, C.J.) (Government's litigating position is “most importan[t]” factor undermining *Austin*). Why it

diminishes the value of *stare decisis* is left unexplained. We have never thought fit to overrule a precedent because a litigant has taken any particular tack. Nor should we. Our decisions can often be defended on multiple grounds, and a litigant may have strategic or case-specific reasons for emphasizing only a subset of them. Members of the public, moreover, often rely on our bottom-line holdings far more than our precise legal arguments; surely this is true for the legislatures that have been regulating corporate electioneering since *Austin*. The task of evaluating the continued viability of precedents falls to this Court, not to the parties.¹⁹

**940 *411 Although the majority opinion spends several pages making these surprising arguments, it says almost nothing about the standard considerations we have used to determine *stare decisis* value, such as the antiquity of the precedent, the workability of its legal rule, and the reliance interests at stake. It is also conspicuously silent about *McConnell*, even though the *McConnell* Court's decision to uphold BCRA § 203 relied not only on the antidistortion logic of *Austin* but also on the statute's historical pedigree, see, e.g., 540 U.S., at 115–132, 223–224, 124 S.Ct. 619, and the need to preserve the integrity of federal campaigns, see *id.*, at 126–129, 205–208, and n. 88, 124 S.Ct. 619.

We have recognized that “[s]tare decisis has special force when legislators or citizens ‘have acted in reliance on a previous decision, for in this instance overruling the decision would dislodge settled rights and expectations or require an extensive legislative response.’” *Hubbard v. United States*, 514 U.S. 695, 714, 115 S.Ct. 1754, 131 L.Ed.2d 779 (1995) (quoting *Hilton v. South Carolina Public Railways Comm'n*, 502 U.S. 197, 202, 112 S.Ct. 560, 116 L.Ed.2d 560 (1991)). *Stare decisis* protects not only personal rights involving property or contract but also the ability of the elected branches to shape their laws in an effective and coherent fashion. Today's decision takes away a power that we have long permitted these branches to exercise. State legislatures have relied on their authority to regulate corporate electioneering, confirmed in *Austin*, for more than a century.²⁰ The Federal Congress has relied on this authority for a comparable stretch of time, and it specifically relied on *Austin* throughout the years it spent developing and debating *412 BCRA. The total record it compiled was 100,000 pages long.²¹ Pulling out the rug beneath Congress after affirming

the constitutionality of § 203 six years ago shows great disrespect for a coequal branch.

By removing one of its central components, today's ruling makes a hash out of BCRA's "delicate and interconnected regulatory scheme." *McConnell*, 540 U.S., at 172, 124 S.Ct. 619. Consider just one example of the distortions that will follow: Political parties are barred under BCRA from soliciting or spending "soft money," funds that are not subject to the statute's disclosure requirements or its source and amount limitations. 2 U.S.C. § 441i; *McConnell*, 540 U.S., at 122–126, 124 S.Ct. 619. Going forward, corporations and unions will be free to spend as much general treasury money as they wish on ads that support or attack specific candidates, whereas national parties will not be able to spend a dime of soft money on ads of any kind. The Court's ruling thus dramatically enhances the role of corporations and unions—and the narrow interests they represent—vis-à-vis the role of political parties—and the broad coalitions they represent—in determining who will hold public office.²²

Beyond the reliance interests at stake, the other *stare decisis* factors also cut against the Court. Considerations of antiquity **941 are significant for similar reasons. *McConnell* is only six years old, but *Austin* has been on the books for two decades, and many of the statutes called into question by today's opinion have been on the books for a half-century or more. The Court points to no intervening change in circumstances that warrants revisiting *Austin*. Certainly nothing *413 relevant has changed since we decided *WRTL* two Terms ago. And the Court gives no reason to think that *Austin* and *McConnell* are unworkable.

In fact, no one has argued to us that *Austin*'s rule has proved impracticable, and not a single for-profit corporation, union, or State has asked us to overrule it. Quite to the contrary, leading groups representing the business community,²³ organized labor,²⁴ and the nonprofit sector,²⁵ together with more than half of the States,²⁶ urge that we preserve *Austin*. As for *McConnell*, the portions of BCRA it upheld may be prolix, but all three branches of Government have worked to make § 203 as user-friendly as possible. For instance, Congress established a special mechanism for expedited review of constitutional challenges, see note following 2 U.S.C. § 437h; the FEC has established a standardized process,

with clearly defined safe harbors, for corporations to claim that a particular electioneering communication is permissible under *WRTL*, see 11 CFR § 114.15 (2009);²⁷ and, as noted above, THE CHIEF JUSTICE crafted his controlling opinion in *WRTL* with the express goal of maximizing clarity and administrability, 551 U.S., at 469–470, 473–474, 127 S.Ct. 2652. The case for *stare decisis* may be bolstered, we have said, when *414 subsequent rulings "have reduced the impact" of a precedent "while reaffirming the decision's core ruling." *Dickerson v. United States*, 530 U.S. 428, 443, 120 S.Ct. 2326, 147 L.Ed.2d 405 (2000).²⁸

In the end, the Court's rejection of *Austin* and *McConnell* comes down to nothing more than its disagreement with their results. **942 Virtually every one of its arguments was made and rejected in those cases, and the majority opinion is essentially an amalgamation of resuscitated dissents. The only relevant thing that has changed since *Austin* and *McConnell* is the composition of this Court. Today's ruling thus strikes at the vitals of *stare decisis*, "the means by which we ensure that the law will not merely change erratically, but will develop in a principled and intelligible fashion" that "permits society to presume that bedrock principles are founded in the law rather than in the proclivities of individuals." *Vasquez v. Hillery*, 474 U.S. 254, 265, 106 S.Ct. 617, 88 L.Ed.2d 598 (1986).

III

The novelty of the Court's procedural dereliction and its approach to *stare decisis* is matched by the novelty of its ruling on the merits. The ruling rests on several premises. First, the Court claims that *Austin* and *McConnell* have "banned" corporate speech. Second, it claims that the First Amendment precludes regulatory distinctions based on speaker identity, including the speaker's identity as a corporation. *415 Third, it claims that *Austin* and *McConnell* were radical outliers in our First Amendment tradition and our campaign finance jurisprudence. Each of these claims is wrong.

The So-Called "Ban"

Pervading the Court's analysis is the ominous image of a "categorical ba[n]" on corporate speech. *Ante*, at 910. Indeed, the majority invokes the specter of a "ban" on

130 S.Ct. 876, 187 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 2961, 175 L.Ed.2d 753, 78 USLW 4078...

nearly every page of its opinion. *Ante*, at 886 – 887, 889, 891 – 892, 894, 896 – 898, 900 – 907, 909 – 912, 915, 916. This characterization is highly misleading, and needs to be corrected.

In fact it already has been. Our cases have repeatedly pointed out that, “[c]ontrary to the [majority’s] critical assumptions,” the statutes upheld in *Austin* and *McConnell* do “not impose an *absolute* ban on all forms of corporate political spending.” *Austin*, 494 U.S., at 660, 110 S.Ct. 1391; see also *McConnell*, 540 U.S., at 203–204, 124 S.Ct. 619; *Beaumont*, 539 U.S., at 162–163, 123 S.Ct. 2200. For starters, both statutes provide exemptions for PACs, separate segregated funds established by a corporation for political purposes. See 2 U.S.C. § 441b(b)(2)(C); Mich. Comp. Laws Ann. § 169.255 (West 2005). “The ability to form and administer separate segregated funds,” we observed in *McConnell*, “has provided corporations and unions with a constitutionally sufficient opportunity to engage in express advocacy. That has been this Court’s unanimous view.” 540 U.S., at 203, 124 S.Ct. 619.

Under BCRA, any corporation’s “stockholders and their families and its executive or administrative personnel and their families” can pool their resources to finance electioneering communications. 2 U.S.C. § 441b(b)(4)(A) (i). A significant and growing number of corporations avail themselves of this option;²⁹ during the most recent election cycle, *416 corporate and union PACs raised nearly a billion dollars.³⁰ Administering **943 a PAC entails some administrative burden, but so does complying with the disclaimer, disclosure, and reporting requirements that the Court today upholds, see *ante*, at 914, and no one has suggested that the burden is severe for a sophisticated for-profit corporation. To the extent the majority is worried about this issue, it is important to keep in mind that we have no record to show how substantial the burden really is, just the majority’s own unsupported factfinding, see *ante*, at 897 – 898. Like all other natural persons, every shareholder of every corporation remains entirely free under *Austin* and *McConnell* to do however much electioneering she pleases outside of the corporate form. The owners of a “mom & pop” store can simply place ads in their own names, rather than the store’s. If ideologically aligned individuals wish to make unlimited expenditures through the corporate form, they may utilize an *MCFL* organization that has policies in place to avoid becoming a conduit for business or union interests. See *MCFL*, 479 U.S., at 263–264, 107 S.Ct. 616.

The laws upheld in *Austin* and *McConnell* leave open many additional avenues for corporations’ political speech. Consider the statutory provision we are ostensibly evaluating in this case, BCRA § 203. It has no application to genuine issue advertising—a category of corporate speech Congress found to be far more substantial than election-related advertising, see *McConnell*, 540 U.S., at 207, 124 S.Ct. 619—or to Internet, *417 telephone, and print advocacy.³¹ Like numerous statutes, it exempts media companies’ news stories, commentaries, and editorials from its electioneering restrictions, in recognition of the unique role played by the institutional press in sustaining public debate.³² See 2 U.S.C. § 434(f)(3)(B)(i); *McConnell*, 540 U.S., at 208–209, 124 S.Ct. 619; see also *Austin*, 494 U.S., at 666–668, 110 S.Ct. 1391. It also allows corporations to spend unlimited sums on political communications with their executives and shareholders, § 441b(b)(2)(A); 11 CFR § 114.3(a)(1), to fund additional PAC activity through trade associations, 2 U.S.C. § 441b(b)(4)(D), to distribute voting guides and voting records, **944 11 CFR §§ 114.4(c)(4)–(5), to underwrite voter registration and voter turnout activities, § 114.3(c)(4); § 114.4(c)(2), to host fundraising events for candidates within certain limits, *418 § 114.4(c); § 114.2(f)(2), and to publicly endorse candidates through a press release and press conference, § 114.4(c)(6).

At the time *Citizens United* brought this lawsuit, the only types of speech that could be regulated under § 203 were: (1) broadcast, cable, or satellite communications;³³ (2) capable of reaching at least 50,000 persons in the relevant electorate;³⁴ (3) made within 30 days of a primary or 60 days of a general federal election;³⁵ (4) by a labor union or a non-*MCFL*, nonmedia corporation;³⁶ (5) paid for with general treasury funds;³⁷ and (6) “susceptible of no reasonable interpretation other than as an appeal to vote for or against a specific candidate.”³⁸ The category of communications meeting all of these criteria is not trivial, but the notion that corporate political speech has been “suppress[ed] ... altogether,” *ante*, at 886, that corporations have been “exclud[ed] ... from the general public dialogue,” *ante*, at 899, or that a work of fiction such as *Mr. Smith Goes to Washington* might be covered, *ante*, at 916 – 917, is nonsense.³⁹ Even the plaintiffs in *McConnell*, who had every incentive to depict BCRA as negatively as possible, declined to argue that § 203’s

130 S.Ct. 876, 187 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 2961, 175 L.Ed.2d 753, 78 USLW 4078...

prohibition on certain uses of general treasury funds amounts to a complete ban. See 540 U.S., at 204, 124 S.Ct. 619.

***419** In many ways, then, § 203 functions as a source restriction or a time, place, and manner restriction. It applies in a viewpoint-neutral fashion to a narrow subset of advocacy messages about clearly identified candidates for federal office, made during discrete time periods through discrete channels. In the case at hand, all Citizens United needed to do to broadcast *Hillary* right before the primary was to abjure business contributions or use the funds in its PAC, which by its own account is “one of the most active conservative PACs in America,” Citizens United Political Victory Fund, <http://www.cupvf.org/>.⁴⁰

So let us be clear: Neither *Austin* nor *McConnell* held or implied that corporations may be silenced; the FEC is not a “censor”; and in the years since these ****945** cases were decided, corporations have continued to play a major role in the national dialogue. Laws such as § 203 target a class of communications that is especially likely to corrupt the political process, that is at least one degree removed from the views of individual citizens, and that may not even reflect the views of those who pay for it. Such laws burden political speech, and that is always a serious matter, demanding careful scrutiny. But the majority's incessant talk of a “ban” aims at a straw man.

Identity-Based Distinctions

The second pillar of the Court's opinion is its assertion that “the Government cannot restrict political speech based on the speaker's ... identity.” *Ante*, at 902; accord, *ante*, at 886, 898, 900, 902 – 904, 912 – 913. ***420** The case on which it relies for this proposition is *First Nat. Bank of Boston v. Bellotti*, 435 U.S. 765, 98 S.Ct. 1407, 55 L.Ed.2d 707 (1978). As I shall explain, *infra*, at 958 – 960, the holding in that case was far narrower than the Court implies. Like its paeans to unfettered discourse, the Court's denunciation of identity-based distinctions may have rhetorical appeal but it obscures reality.

“Our jurisprudence over the past 216 years has rejected an absolutist interpretation” of the First Amendment. *WRTL*, 551 U.S., at 482, 127 S.Ct. 2652 (opinion of ROBERTS, C.J.). The First Amendment provides that “Congress shall make no law ... abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press.” Apart perhaps from measures

designed to protect the press, that text might seem to permit no distinctions of any kind. Yet in a variety of contexts, we have held that speech can be regulated differentially on account of the speaker's identity, when identity is understood in categorical or institutional terms. The Government routinely places special restrictions on the speech rights of students,⁴¹ prisoners,⁴² members of the Armed Forces,⁴³ foreigners,⁴⁴ and its own employees.⁴⁵ ***421** When such restrictions are justified by a legitimate governmental interest, ****946** they do not necessarily raise constitutional problems.⁴⁶ In contrast to the blanket rule that the majority espouses, our cases recognize that the Government's interests may be more or less compelling with respect to different classes of speakers,⁴⁷ cf. *Minneapolis Star & Tribune Co. v. Minnesota Comm'r of Revenue*, 460 U.S. 575, 585, 103 S.Ct. 1365, 75 L.Ed.2d 295 (1983) (“[D]ifferential treatment” is constitutionally suspect “unless justified by some special characteristic” of the regulated class of speakers (emphasis added)), and that the constitutional rights of certain categories of speakers, in certain contexts, “are not automatically coextensive with the rights” that are normally accorded to members of our society, ***422** *Morse v. Frederick*, 551 U.S. 393, 396–397, 404, 127 S.Ct. 2618, 168 L.Ed.2d 290 (2007) (quoting *Bethel School Dist. No. 403 v. Fraser*, 478 U.S. 675, 682, 106 S.Ct. 3159, 92 L.Ed.2d 549 (1986)).

The free speech guarantee thus does not render every other public interest an illegitimate basis for qualifying a speaker's autonomy; society could scarcely function if it did. It is fair to say that our First Amendment doctrine has “frowned on” certain identity-based distinctions, *Los Angeles Police Dept. v. United Reporting Publishing Corp.*, 528 U.S. 32, 47, n. 4, 120 S.Ct. 483, 145 L.Ed.2d 451 (1999) (STEVENS, J., dissenting), particularly those that may reflect invidious discrimination or preferential treatment of a politically powerful group. But it is simply incorrect to suggest that we have prohibited all legislative distinctions based on identity or content. Not even close.

The election context is distinctive in many ways, and the Court, of course, is right that the First Amendment closely guards political speech. But in this context, too, the authority of legislatures to enact viewpoint-neutral regulations based on content and identity is well settled. We have, for example, allowed state-run broadcasters to exclude independent candidates from televised debates.

Arkansas Ed. Television Comm'n v. Forbes, 523 U.S. 666, 118 S.Ct. 1633, 140 L.Ed.2d 875 (1998).⁴⁸ We have upheld statutes that prohibit the distribution or display of campaign materials near a polling place. **947 *Burson v. Freeman*, 504 U.S. 191, 112 S.Ct. 1846, 119 L.Ed.2d 5 (1992).⁴⁹ Although we have not reviewed *423 them directly, we have never cast doubt on laws that place special restrictions on campaign spending by foreign nationals. See, e.g., 2 U.S.C. § 441e(a)(1). And we have consistently approved laws that bar Government employees, but not others, from contributing to or participating in political activities. See n. 45, *supra*. These statutes burden the political expression of one class of speakers, namely, civil servants. Yet we have sustained them on the basis of longstanding practice and Congress' reasoned judgment that certain regulations which leave "untouched full participation ... in political decisions at the ballot box," *Civil Service Comm'n v. Letter Carriers*, 413 U.S. 548, 556, 93 S.Ct. 2880, 37 L.Ed.2d 796 (1973) (internal quotation marks omitted), help ensure that public officials are "sufficiently free from improper influences," *id.*, at 564, 93 S.Ct. 2880, and that "confidence in the system of representative Government is not ... eroded to a disastrous extent," *id.*, at 565, 93 S.Ct. 2880.

The same logic applies to this case with additional force because it is the identity of corporations, rather than individuals, that the Legislature has taken into account. As we have unanimously observed, legislatures are entitled to decide "that the special characteristics of the corporate structure require particularly careful regulation" in an electoral context. *NRWC*, 459 U.S., at 209–210, 103 S.Ct. 552.⁵⁰ Not only has the distinctive potential of corporations to corrupt the electoral process long been recognized, but within the area of campaign finance, corporate spending is also "furthest from the core of political expression, since corporations' First Amendment speech and association interests are derived largely *424 from those of their members and of the public in receiving information," *Beaumont*, 539 U.S., at 161, n. 8, 123 S.Ct. 2200 (citation omitted). Campaign finance distinctions based on corporate identity tend to be less worrisome, in other words, because the "speakers" are not natural persons, much less members of our political community, and the governmental interests are of the highest order. Furthermore, when corporations, as a class, are distinguished from noncorporations, as a class, there

is a lesser risk that regulatory distinctions will reflect invidious discrimination or political favoritism.

If taken seriously, our colleagues' assumption that the identity of a speaker has *no* relevance to the Government's ability to regulate political speech would lead to some remarkable conclusions. Such an assumption would have accorded the propaganda broadcasts to our troops by "Tokyo Rose" during World War II the same protection as speech by Allied commanders. More pertinently, it would appear to afford the same protection to multinational corporations **948 controlled by foreigners as to individual Americans: To do otherwise, after all, could " 'enhance the relative voice' " of some (*i.e.*, humans) over others (*i.e.*, nonhumans). *Ante*, at 904 (quoting *Buckley*, 424 U.S., at 49, 96 S.Ct. 612).⁵¹ Under the *425 majority's view, I suppose it may be a First Amendment problem that corporations are not permitted to vote, given that voting is, among other things, a form of speech.⁵²

In short, the Court dramatically overstates its critique of identity-based distinctions, without ever explaining why corporate identity demands the same treatment as individual identity. Only the most wooden approach to the First Amendment could justify the unprecedented line it seeks to draw.

Our First Amendment Tradition

A third fulcrum of the Court's opinion is the idea that *Austin* and *McConnell* are radical outliers, "aberration[s]," in our First Amendment tradition. *Ante*, at 907; see also *ante*, at 910, 916 – 917 (professing fidelity to "our law and our tradition"). The Court has it exactly backwards. It is today's holding that is the radical departure from what had been settled First Amendment law. To see why, it is useful to take a long view.

1. *Original Understandings*

Let us start from the beginning. The Court invokes "ancient First Amendment principles," *ante*, at 886 (internal quotation marks omitted), and original understandings, *ante*, at 906 – 907, to defend today's ruling, yet it makes only a perfunctory attempt to ground its analysis in the principles or *426 understandings of

those who drafted and ratified the Amendment. Perhaps this is because there is not a scintilla of evidence to support the notion that anyone believed it would preclude regulatory distinctions based on the corporate form. To the extent that the Framers' views are discernible and relevant to the disposition of this case, they would appear to cut strongly against the majority's position.

This is not only because the Framers and their contemporaries conceived of speech more narrowly than we now think of it, see ****949** Bork, *Neutral Principles and Some First Amendment Problems*, 47 *Ind. L.J.* 1, 22 (1971), but also because they held very different views about the nature of the First Amendment right and the role of corporations in society. Those few corporations that existed at the founding were authorized by grant of a special legislative charter.⁵³ Corporate sponsors would petition the legislature, and the legislature, if amenable, would issue a charter that specified the corporation's powers and purposes and "authoritatively fixed ***427** the scope and content of corporate organization," including "the internal structure of the corporation." J. Hurst, *The Legitimacy of the Business Corporation in the Law of the United States 1780–1970*, pp. 15–16 (1970) (reprint 2004). Corporations were created, supervised, and conceptualized as quasi-public entities, "designed to serve a social function for the state." Handlin & Handlin, *Origin of the American Business Corporation*, 5 *J. Econ. Hist.* 1, 22 (1945). It was "assumed that [they] were legally privileged organizations that had to be closely scrutinized by the legislature because their purposes had to be made consistent with public welfare." R. Seavoy, *Origins of the American Business Corporation, 1784–1855*, p. 5 (1982).

The individualized charter mode of incorporation reflected the "cloud of disfavor under which corporations labored" in the early years of this Nation. 1 *W. Fletcher, Cyclopaedia of the Law of Corporations* § 2, p. 8 (rev. ed.2006); see also *Louis K. Liggett Co. v. Lee*, 288 U.S. 517, 548–549, 53 S.Ct. 481, 77 L.Ed. 929 (1933) (Brandeis, J., dissenting) (discussing fears of the "evils" of business corporations); L. Friedman, *A History of American Law* 194 (2d ed.1985) ("The word 'soulless' constantly recurs in debates over corporations.... Corporations, it was feared, could concentrate the worst urges of whole groups of men"). Thomas Jefferson famously fretted that corporations would subvert the Republic.⁵⁴ General incorporation statutes, and widespread acceptance of business corporations as socially useful actors, did not

emerge until the 1800's. See Hansmann & Kraakman, *The End of History for Corporate Law*, 89 *Geo. L.J.* 439, 440 (2001) (hereinafter Hansmann & Kraakman) ("[A]ll general business corporation statutes appear to date from well after 1800").

428** The Framers thus took it as a given that corporations could be comprehensively *950** regulated in the service of the public welfare. Unlike our colleagues, they had little trouble distinguishing corporations from human beings, and when they constitutionalized the right to free speech in the First Amendment, it was the free speech of individual Americans that they had in mind.⁵⁵ While individuals might join together to exercise their speech rights, business corporations, at least, were plainly not seen as facilitating such associational or expressive ends. Even "the notion that business corporations could invoke the First Amendment would probably have been quite a novelty," given that "at the time, the legitimacy of every corporate activity was thought to rest entirely in a concession of the sovereign." Shelledy, *Autonomy, Debate, and Corporate Speech*, 18 *Hastings Const. L.Q.* 541, 578 (1991); cf. *Trustees of Dartmouth College v. Woodward*, 4 *Wheat.* 518, 636, 4 *L.Ed.* 629 (1819) (Marshall, ***429** C.J.) ("A corporation is an artificial being, invisible, intangible, and existing only in contemplation of law. Being the mere creature of law, it possesses only those properties which the charter of its creation confers upon it"); Eule, *Promoting Speaker Diversity: Austin and Metro Broadcasting*, 1990 *S.Ct. Rev.* 105, 129 ("The framers of the First Amendment could scarcely have anticipated its application to the corporation form. That, of course, ought not to be dispositive. What is compelling, however, is an understanding of who was supposed to be the beneficiary of the free speech guaranty—the individual"). In light of these background practices and understandings, it seems to me implausible that the Framers believed "the freedom of speech" would extend equally to all corporate speakers, much less that it would preclude legislatures from taking limited measures to guard against corporate capture of elections.

The Court observes that the Framers drew on diverse intellectual sources, communicated through newspapers, and aimed to provide greater freedom of speech than had existed in England. *Ante.* at 906. From these (accurate) observations, the Court concludes that "[t]he First Amendment was certainly not understood to condone the

suppression of political speech in society's most salient media." *Ibid.* This conclusion is far from certain, given that many historians believe the Framers were focused on prior restraints on publication and did not understand the First Amendment to "prevent the subsequent punishment of such [publications] as may be deemed contrary to the public welfare." **951 *Near v. Minnesota ex rel. Olson*, 283 U.S. 697, 714, 51 S.Ct. 625, 75 L.Ed. 1357 (1931). Yet, even if the majority's conclusion were correct, it would tell us only that the First Amendment was understood to protect political speech *in certain media*. It would tell us little about whether the Amendment was understood to protect general treasury electioneering expenditures *by corporations, and to what extent*.

*430 As a matter of original expectations, then, it seems absurd to think that the First Amendment prohibits legislatures from taking into account the corporate identity of a sponsor of electoral advocacy. As a matter of original meaning, it likewise seems baseless—unless one evaluates the First Amendment's "principles," *ante*, at 886, 912, or its "purpose," *ante*, at 919–920 (opinion of ROBERTS, C.J.), at such a high level of generality that the historical understandings of the Amendment cease to be a meaningful constraint on the judicial task. This case sheds a revelatory light on the assumption of some that an impartial judge's application of an originalist methodology is likely to yield more determinate answers, or to play a more decisive role in the decisional process, than his or her views about sound policy.

Justice SCALIA criticizes the foregoing discussion for failing to adduce statements from the founding era showing that corporations were understood to be excluded from the First Amendment's free speech guarantee. *Ante*, at 925–926, 929. Of course, Justice SCALIA adduces no statements to suggest the contrary proposition, or even to suggest that the contrary proposition better reflects the kind of right that the drafters and ratifiers of the Free Speech Clause thought they were enshrining. Although Justice SCALIA makes a perfectly sensible argument that an individual's right to speak entails a right to speak with others for a common cause, cf. *MCFL*, 479 U.S. 238, 107 S.Ct. 616, 93 L.Ed.2d 539, he does not explain why those two rights must be precisely identical, or why that principle applies to electioneering by corporations that serve no "common cause." *Ante*, at 928. Nothing in his account dislodges my basic point that members of the founding generation held

a cautious view of corporate power and a narrow view of corporate rights (not that they "despised" corporations, *ante*, at 925), and that they conceptualized speech in individualistic terms. If no prominent Framers bothered to articulate that corporate speech would have lesser status than individual speech, that may well be because the contrary proposition—if *431 not also the very notion of "corporate speech"—was inconceivable.⁵⁶

Justice SCALIA also emphasizes the unqualified nature of the First Amendment text. *Ante*, at 925, 928–929. Yet he would seemingly read out the Free Press Clause: How else could he claim that my purported views on newspapers must track my views on corporations generally? *Ante*, at 927.⁵⁷ Like virtually all modern lawyers, Justice **952 SCALIA presumably believes that the First Amendment restricts the Executive, even though its language refers to Congress alone. In any event, the text only leads us back to the questions who or what is guaranteed "the freedom of speech," and, just as critically, what that freedom consists of and under what circumstances it may be limited. Justice SCALIA appears to believe that because corporations are created and utilized by individuals, it follows (as night the day) that their electioneering must be equally protected by the First Amendment *432 and equally immunized from expenditure limits. See *ante*, at 928–929. That conclusion certainly does not follow as a logical matter, and Justice SCALIA fails to explain why the original public meaning leads it to follow as a matter of interpretation.

The truth is we cannot be certain how a law such as BCRA § 203 meshes with the original meaning of the First Amendment.⁵⁸ I have given several reasons why I believe the Constitution would have been understood then, and ought to be understood now, to permit reasonable restrictions on corporate electioneering, and I will give many more reasons in the pages to come. The Court enlists the Framers in its defense without seriously grappling with their understandings of corporations or the free speech right, or with the republican principles that underlay those understandings.

In fairness, our campaign finance jurisprudence has never attended very closely to the views of the Framers, see *Randall v. Sorrell*, 548 U.S. 230, 280, 126 S.Ct. 2479, 165 L.Ed.2d 482 (2006) (STEVENS, J., dissenting), whose political universe differed profoundly from that of today. We have long since held that corporations are covered by

130 S.Ct. 876, 187 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 2961, 175 L.Ed.2d 753, 78 USLW 4078...

the First Amendment, and many legal scholars have long since rejected the concession theory of the corporation. But “historical context is usually relevant,” *ibid.* (internal quotation marks omitted), and in light of the Court's effort to cast itself as guardian of ancient values, it pays to remember that nothing in our constitutional history dictates today's outcome. To the contrary, this history helps illuminate just how extraordinarily dissonant the decision is.

2. Legislative and Judicial Interpretation

A century of more recent history puts to rest any notion that today's ruling is faithful to our First Amendment tradition. *433 At the federal level, the express distinction between corporate and individual political spending on elections stretches back to 1907, when Congress passed the Tillman Act, ch. 420, 34 Stat. 864, banning all corporate contributions to candidates. The Senate Report on the legislation observed that “[t]he evils of the use of [corporate] money in connection with political elections are so generally recognized that the committee deems it unnecessary to make any **953 argument in favor of the general purpose of this measure. It is in the interest of good government and calculated to promote purity in the selection of public officials.” S.Rep. No. 3056, 59th Cong., 1st Sess., 2 (1906). President Roosevelt, in his 1905 annual message to Congress, declared:

“ ‘All contributions by corporations to any political committee or for any political purpose should be forbidden by law; directors should not be permitted to use stockholders' money for such purposes; and, moreover, a prohibition of this kind would be, as far as it went, an effective method of stopping the evils aimed at in corrupt practices acts.’ ” *United States v. Automobile Workers*, 352 U.S. 567, 572, 77 S.Ct. 529, 1 L.Ed.2d 563 (1957) (quoting 40 Cong. Rec. 96).

The Court has surveyed the history leading up to the Tillman Act several times, see *WRTL*, 551 U.S., at 508–510, 127 S.Ct. 2652 (Souter, J., dissenting); *McCormell*, 540 U.S., at 115, 124 S.Ct. 619; *Automobile Workers*, 352 U.S., at 570–575, 77 S.Ct. 529, and I will refrain from doing so again. It is enough to say that the Act was primarily driven by two pressing concerns: first, the enormous power corporations had come to wield in

federal elections, with the accompanying threat of both actual corruption and a public perception of corruption; and second, a respect for the interest of shareholders and members in preventing the use of their money to support candidates they opposed. See *ibid.*; *United States v. CIO*, 335 U.S. 106, 113, 68 S.Ct. 1349, 92 L.Ed. 1849 (1948); Winkler, “Other People's Money”: Corporations, Agency Costs, and Campaign Finance Law, 92 Geo. L.J. 871 (2004).

*434 Over the years, the limitations on corporate political spending have been modified in a number of ways, as Congress responded to changes in the American economy and political practices that threatened to displace the commonweal. Justice Souter recently traced these developments at length.⁵⁹ *WRTL*, 551 U.S., at 507–519, 127 S.Ct. 2652 (dissenting opinion); see also *McCormell*, 540 U.S., at 115–133, 124 S.Ct. 619; *McCormell*, 251 F.Supp.2d, at 188–205. The Taft–Hartley Act of 1947 is of special significance for this case. In that Act passed more than 60 years ago, Congress extended the prohibition on corporate support of candidates to cover not only direct contributions, but independent expenditures as well. Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, § 304, 61 Stat. 159. The bar on contributions “was being so narrowly construed” that corporations were easily able to defeat the purposes of the Act by supporting candidates through other means. *WRTL*, 551 U.S., at 511, 127 S.Ct. 2652 (Souter, J., dissenting) (citing S.Rep. No. 1, 80th Cong., 1st Sess., 38–39 (1947)).

Our colleagues emphasize that in two cases from the middle of the 20th century, several Justices wrote separately to criticize the expenditure restriction as applied to unions, even though the Court declined to pass on its constitutionality. *Ante*, at 900 – 901. Two features of these cases are of far greater relevance. First, those Justices were writing separately; which is to *954 say, their position failed to command a majority. Prior to today, this was a fact we found significant *435 in evaluating precedents. Second, each case in this line expressed support for the principle that corporate and union political speech financed with PAC funds, collected voluntarily from the organization's stockholders or members, receives greater protection than speech financed with general treasury funds.⁶⁰

This principle was carried forward when Congress enacted comprehensive campaign finance reform in the Federal

130 S.Ct. 876, 187 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 2961, 175 L.Ed.2d 753, 78 USLW 4078...

Election Campaign Act of 1971 (FECA), 86 Stat. 3, which retained the restriction on using general treasury funds for contributions and expenditures, 2 U.S.C. § 441b(a). FECA *436 codified the option for corporations and unions to create PACs to finance contributions and expenditures forbidden to the corporation or union itself. § 441b(b).

By the time Congress passed FECA in 1971, the bar on corporate contributions and expenditures had become such an accepted part of federal campaign finance regulation that when a large number of plaintiffs, including several nonprofit corporations, challenged virtually every aspect of the Act in *Buckley*, 424 U.S. 1, 96 S.Ct. 612, 46 L.Ed.2d 659, no one even bothered to argue that the bar as such was unconstitutional. *Buckley* famously (or infamously) distinguished direct contributions from independent expenditures, *id.*, at 58–59, 96 S.Ct. 612, but its silence on corporations only reinforced the understanding that corporate expenditures could be treated differently from individual expenditures. “Since our decision in *Buckley*, Congress’ power to prohibit corporations and unions from using funds in their treasuries to finance advertisements expressly advocating the election or defeat of candidates in federal elections has been firmly embedded in our law.” *McConnell*, 540 U.S., at 203, 124 S.Ct. 619.

Thus, it was unremarkable, in a 1982 case holding that Congress could bar nonprofit corporations from soliciting nonmembers for PAC funds, that then-Justice Rehnquist wrote for a unanimous Court **955 that Congress’ “careful legislative adjustment of the federal electoral laws, in a cautious advance, step by step, to account for the particular legal and economic attributes of corporations ... warrants considerable deference,” and “reflects a permissible assessment of the dangers posed by those entities to the electoral process.” *NRWC*, 459 U.S., at 209, 103 S.Ct. 552 (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). “The governmental interest in preventing both actual corruption and the appearance of corruption of elected representatives has long been recognized,” the unanimous Court observed, “and there is no reason why it may not ... be accomplished by treating ... corporations ... differently from individuals.” *Id.*, at 210–211, 103 S.Ct. 552.

*437 The corporate/individual distinction was not questioned by the Court’s disposition, in 1986, of a challenge to the expenditure restriction as applied to a

distinctive type of nonprofit corporation. In *MCFL*, 479 U.S. 238, 107 S.Ct. 616, 93 L.Ed.2d 539, we stated again “that ‘the special characteristics of the corporate structure require particularly careful regulation,’ ” *id.*, at 256, 107 S.Ct. 616 (quoting *NRWC*, 459 U.S., at 209–210, 103 S.Ct. 552), and again we acknowledged that the Government has a legitimate interest in “regulat[ing] the substantial aggregations of wealth amassed by the special advantages which go with the corporate form,” 479 U.S., at 257, 107 S.Ct. 616 (internal quotation marks omitted). Those aggregations can distort the “free trade in ideas” crucial to candidate elections, *ibid.*, at the expense of members or shareholders who may disagree with the object of the expenditures, *id.*, at 260, 107 S.Ct. 616 (internal quotation marks omitted). What the Court held by a 5–to–4 vote was that a limited class of corporations must be allowed to use their general treasury funds for independent expenditures, because Congress’ interests in protecting shareholders and “restrict[ing] ‘the influence of political war chests funneled through the corporate form,’ ” *id.*, at 257, 107 S.Ct. 616 (quoting *FEC v. National Conservative Political Action Comm.*, 470 U.S. 480, 501, 105 S.Ct. 1459, 84 L.Ed.2d 455 (1985) (*NCPAC*)), did not apply to corporations that were structurally insulated from those concerns.⁶¹

It is worth remembering for present purposes that the four *MCFL* dissenters, led by Chief Justice Rehnquist, thought the Court was carrying the First Amendment *too* *438 *far*. They would have recognized congressional authority to bar general treasury electioneering expenditures even by this class of nonprofits; they acknowledged that “the threat from corporate political activity will vary depending on the particular characteristics of a given corporation,” but believed these “distinctions among corporations” were “distinctions in degree,” not “in kind,” and thus “more properly drawn by the Legislature than by the Judiciary.” 479 U.S., at 268, 107 S.Ct. 616 (opinion of Rehnquist, C.J.) (internal quotation marks omitted). Not a single Justice suggested that regulation of corporate **956 political speech could be no more stringent than of speech by an individual.

Four years later, in *Austin*, 494 U.S. 652, 110 S.Ct. 1391, 108 L.Ed.2d 652, we considered whether corporations falling outside the *MCFL* exception could be barred from using general treasury funds to make independent expenditures in support of, or in opposition to, candidates. We held they could be. Once again recognizing the importance of “the integrity of the marketplace of political

ideas” in candidate elections. *MCFL*, 479 U.S., at 257, 107 S.Ct. 616, we noted that corporations have “special advantages—such as limited liability, perpetual life, and favorable treatment of the accumulation and distribution of assets,” 494 U.S., at 658–659, 110 S.Ct. 1391—that allow them to spend prodigious general treasury sums on campaign messages that have “little or no correlation” with the beliefs held by actual persons, *id.*, at 660, 110 S.Ct. 1391. In light of the corrupting effects such spending might have on the political process, *ibid.*, we permitted the State of Michigan to limit corporate expenditures on candidate elections to corporations’ PACs, which rely on voluntary contributions and thus “reflect actual public support for the political ideas espoused by corporations,” *ibid.* Notwithstanding our colleagues’ insinuations that *Austin* deprived the public of general “ideas,” “facts,” and “knowledge,” *ante*, at 906 – 907, the decision addressed only candidate-focused expenditures and gave the State no license to regulate corporate spending on other matters.

*439 In the 20 years since *Austin*, we have reaffirmed its holding and rationale a number of times, see, e.g., *Beaumont*, 539 U.S., at 153–156, 123 S.Ct. 2200, most importantly in *McConnell*, 540 U.S. 93, 124 S.Ct. 619, 157 L.Ed.2d 491, where we upheld the provision challenged here, § 203 of BCRA.⁶² Congress crafted § 203 in response to a problem created by *Buckley*. The *Buckley* Court had construed FECA’s definition of prohibited “expenditures” narrowly to avoid any problems of constitutional vagueness, holding it applicable only to “communications that expressly advocate the election or defeat of a clearly identified candidate,” 424 U.S., at 80, 96 S.Ct. 612. *i.e.*, statements containing so-called “magic words” like “‘vote for,’ ‘elect,’ ‘support,’ ‘cast your ballot for,’ ‘Smith for Congress,’ ‘vote against,’ ‘defeat,’ [or] ‘reject,’ ” *id.*, at 43–44, and n. 52, 96 S.Ct. 612. After *Buckley*, corporations and unions figured out how to circumvent the limits on express advocacy by using sham “issue ads” that “eschewed the use of magic words” but nonetheless “advocate[d] the election or defeat of clearly *957 identified federal candidates.” *McConnell*, 540 U.S., at 126, 124 S.Ct. 619. “Corporations and unions spent hundreds *440 of millions of dollars of their general funds to pay for these ads.” *Id.*, at 127, 124 S.Ct. 619. Congress passed § 203 to address this circumvention, prohibiting corporations and unions from using general treasury funds for electioneering communications that “refe[r] to a clearly identified candidate,” whether or not

those communications use the magic words. 2 U.S.C. § 434(f)(3)(A)(i)(I).

When we asked in *McConnell* “whether a compelling governmental interest justify[ed]” § 203, we found the question “easily answered”: “We have repeatedly sustained legislation aimed at ‘the corrosive and distorting effects of immense aggregations of wealth that are accumulated with the help of the corporate form and that have little or no correlation to the public’s support for the corporation’s political ideas.’ ” 540 U.S., at 205, 124 S.Ct. 619 (quoting *Austin*, 494 U.S., at 660, 110 S.Ct. 1391). These precedents “represent respect for the legislative judgment that the special characteristics of the corporate structure require particularly careful regulation.” 540 U.S., at 205, 124 S.Ct. 619 (internal quotation marks omitted). “Moreover, recent cases have recognized that certain restrictions on corporate electoral involvement permissibly hedge against ‘circumvention of [valid] contribution limits.’ ” *Ibid.* (quoting *Beaumont*, 539 U.S., at 155, 123 S.Ct. 2200, in turn quoting *FEC v. Colorado Republican Federal Campaign Comm.*, 533 U.S. 431, 456, and n. 18, 121 S.Ct. 2351, 150 L.Ed.2d 461 (2001) (*Colorado II*); alteration in original). BCRA, we found, is faithful to the compelling governmental interests in “ ‘preserving the integrity of the electoral process, preventing corruption, ... sustaining the active, alert responsibility of the individual citizen in a democracy for the wise conduct of the government,’ ” and maintaining “ ‘the individual citizen’s confidence in government.’ ” 540 U.S., at 206–207, n. 88, 124 S.Ct. 619 (quoting *Bellotti*, 435 U.S., at 788–789, 98 S.Ct. 1407; some internal quotation marks and brackets omitted). What made the answer even easier than it might have been otherwise was the option to form PACs, which give corporations, at the least, *441 “a constitutionally sufficient opportunity to engage in” independent expenditures. 540 U.S., at 203, 124 S.Ct. 619.

3. *Buckley and Bellotti*

Against this extensive background of congressional regulation of corporate campaign spending, and our repeated affirmation of this regulation as constitutionally sound, the majority dismisses *Austin* as “a significant departure from ancient First Amendment principles,” *ante*, at 886 (internal quotation marks omitted). How does the majority attempt to justify this claim? Selected passages from two cases, *Buckley*, 424 U.S. 1, 96 S.Ct. 612,

46 L.Ed.2d 659, and *Bellotti*, 435 U.S. 765, 98 S.Ct. 1407, 55 L.Ed.2d 707, do all of the work. In the Court's view, *Buckley* and *Bellotti* decisively rejected the possibility of distinguishing corporations from natural persons in the 1970's; it just so happens that in every single case in which the Court has reviewed campaign finance legislation in the decades since, the majority failed to grasp this truth. The Federal Congress and dozens of state legislatures, we now know, have been similarly deluded.

The majority emphasizes *Buckley*'s statement that "[t]he concept that government may restrict the speech of some elements of our society in order to enhance the relative voice of others is wholly foreign to the First Amendment." *Ante*, at 904 (quoting 424 U.S., at 48–49, 96 S.Ct. 612); *ante*, at 921 (opinion of ROBERTS, **958 C.J.). But this elegant phrase cannot bear the weight that our colleagues have placed on it. For one thing, the Constitution does, in fact, permit numerous "restrictions on the speech of some in order to prevent a few from drowning out the many": for example, restrictions on ballot access and on legislators' floor time. *Nixon v. Shrink Missouri Government PAC*, 528 U.S. 377, 402, 120 S.Ct. 897, 145 L.Ed.2d 886 (2000) (BREYER, J., concurring). For another, the *Buckley* Court used this line in evaluating "the ancillary governmental interest in equalizing the relative ability of individuals and groups to influence the outcome of elections." 424 U.S., at 48, 96 S.Ct. 612. It is not apparent why this is relevant to the case *442 before us. The majority suggests that *Austin* rests on the foreign concept of speech equalization, *ante*, at 904 – 905; *ante*, at 921 – 922 (opinion of ROBERTS, C.J.), but we made it clear in *Austin* (as in several cases before and since) that a restriction on the way corporations spend their money is no mere exercise in disfavoring the voice of some elements of our society in preference to others. Indeed, we expressly ruled that the compelling interest supporting Michigan's statute was not one of " 'equaliz[ing] the relative influence of speakers on elections,' " *Austin*, 494 U.S., at 660, 110 S.Ct. 1391 (quoting *id.*, at 705, 110 S.Ct. 1391 (KENNEDY, J., dissenting)), but rather the need to confront the distinctive corrupting potential of corporate electoral advocacy financed by general treasury dollars, *id.*, at 659–660, 110 S.Ct. 1391.

For that matter, it should go without saying that when we made this statement in *Buckley*, we could not have been casting doubt on the restriction on corporate expenditures in candidate elections, which had not been challenged as

"foreign to the First Amendment," *ante*, at 904 (quoting *Buckley*, 424 U.S., at 49, 96 S.Ct. 612), or for any other reason. *Buckley*'s independent expenditure analysis was focused on a very different statutory provision, 18 U.S.C. § 608(c)(1) (1970 ed., Supp. V). It is implausible to think, as the majority suggests, *ante*, at 901 – 902, that *Buckley* covertly invalidated FECA's separate corporate and union campaign expenditure restriction, § 610 (now codified at 2 U.S.C. § 441b), even though that restriction had been on the books for decades before *Buckley* and would remain on the books, undisturbed, for decades after.

The case on which the majority places even greater weight than *Buckley*, however, is *Bellotti*, 435 U.S. 765, 98 S.Ct. 1407, 55 L.Ed.2d 707, claiming it "could not have been clearer" that *Bellotti*'s holding forbade distinctions between corporate and individual expenditures like the one at issue here, *ante*, at 902. The Court's reliance is odd. The only thing about *Bellotti* that could not be clearer is that it declined to adopt the majority's position. *Bellotti* ruled, in an explicit limitation on the scope of its holding, that "our consideration of a corporation's right to *443 speak on issues of general public interest implies no comparable right in the quite different context of participation in a political campaign for election to public office." 435 U.S., at 788, n. 26, 98 S.Ct. 1407; see also *id.*, at 787–788, 98 S.Ct. 1407 (acknowledging that the interests in preserving public confidence in Government and protecting dissenting shareholders may be "weighty ... in the context of partisan candidate elections"). *Bellotti*, in other words, did not touch the question presented in *Austin* and *McConnell*, and the opinion squarely disavowed the proposition for which the majority cites it.

The majority attempts to explain away the distinction *Bellotti* drew—between general corporate speech and campaign speech intended to promote or prevent the election of specific candidates for office—**959 as inconsistent with the rest of the opinion and with *Buckley*. *Ante*, at 903, 909 – 910. Yet the basis for this distinction is perfectly coherent: The anticorruption interests that animate regulations of corporate participation in candidate elections, the "importance" of which "has never been doubted," 435 U.S., at 788, n. 26, 98 S.Ct. 1407, do not apply equally to regulations of corporate participation in referenda. A referendum cannot owe a political debt to a corporation, seek to curry favor with a corporation, or fear the corporation's retaliation. Cf. *Austin*, 494 U.S., at 678, 110 S.Ct. 1391 (STEVENS, J., concurring);

130 S.Ct. 876, 187 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 2961, 175 L.Ed.2d 753, 78 USLW 4078...

Citizens Against Rent Control/Coalition for Fair Housing v. Berkeley, 454 U.S. 290, 299, 102 S.Ct. 434, 70 L.Ed.2d 492 (1981). The majority likewise overlooks the fact that, over the past 30 years, our cases have repeatedly recognized the candidate/issue distinction. See, e.g., *Austin*, 494 U.S., at 659, 110 S.Ct. 1391; *NCPAC*, 470 U.S., at 495–496, 105 S.Ct. 1459; *FCC v. League of Women Voters of Cal.*, 468 U.S. 364, 371, n. 9, 104 S.Ct. 3106, 82 L.Ed.2d 278 (1984); *NRWC*, 459 U.S., at 210, n. 7, 103 S.Ct. 552. The Court's critique of *Bellotti's* footnote 26 puts it in the strange position of trying to elevate *Bellotti* to canonical status, while simultaneously disparaging a critical piece of its analysis as unsupported and irreconcilable with *Buckley*. *Bellotti*, apparently, is both the font of all wisdom and internally incoherent.

***444** The *Bellotti* Court confronted a dramatically different factual situation from the one that confronts us in this case: a state statute that barred business corporations' expenditures on some referenda but not others. Specifically, the statute barred a business corporation "from making contributions or expenditures 'for the purpose of ... influencing or affecting the vote on any question submitted to the voters, other than one materially affecting any of the property, business or assets of the corporation,' " 435 U.S., at 768, 98 S.Ct. 1407 (quoting *Mass. Gen. Laws Ann.*, ch. 55, § 8 (West Supp.1977); alteration in original), and it went so far as to provide that referenda related to income taxation would not " 'be deemed materially to affect the property, business or assets of the corporation,' " 435 U.S., at 768, 98 S.Ct. 1407. As might be guessed, the legislature had enacted this statute in order to limit corporate speech on a proposed state constitutional amendment to authorize a graduated income tax. The statute was a transparent attempt to prevent corporations from spending money to defeat this amendment, which was favored by a majority of legislators but had been repeatedly rejected by the voters. See *id.*, at 769–770, and n. 3, 98 S.Ct. 1407. We said that "where, as here, the legislature's suppression of speech suggests an attempt to give one side of a debatable public question an advantage in expressing its views to the people, the First Amendment is plainly offended." *Id.*, at 785–786, 98 S.Ct. 1407 (footnote omitted).

Bellotti thus involved a *viewpoint-discriminatory* statute, created to effect a particular policy outcome. Even Justice Rehnquist, in dissent, had to acknowledge that "a very persuasive argument could be made that the

[Massachusetts Legislature], desiring to impose a personal income tax but more than once defeated in that desire by the combination of the Commonwealth's referendum provision and corporate expenditures in opposition to such a tax, simply decided to muzzle corporations on this sort of issue so that it could succeed in its desire." *Id.*, at 827, n. 6, 98 S.Ct. 1407. To make matters ***445** worse, the law at issue did not make any allowance for corporations to spend money through PACs. *Id.*, at 768, n. 2, 98 S.Ct. 1407 (opinion of the Court). This really was a ****960** complete ban on a specific, preidentified subject. See *MCFL*, 479 U.S., at 259, n. 12, 107 S.Ct. 616 (stating that 2 U.S.C. § 441b's expenditure restriction "is of course distinguishable from the complete foreclosure of any opportunity for political speech that we invalidated in the state referendum context in ... *Bellotti*" (emphasis added)).

The majority grasps a quotational straw from *Bellotti*, that speech does not fall entirely outside the protection of the First Amendment merely because it comes from a corporation. *Ante.*, at 902 – 903. Of course not, but no one suggests the contrary and neither *Austin* nor *McConnell* held otherwise. They held that even though the expenditures at issue were subject to First Amendment scrutiny, the restrictions on those expenditures were justified by a compelling state interest. See *McConnell*, 540 U.S., at 205, 124 S.Ct. 619; *Austin*, 494 U.S., at 658, 660, 110 S.Ct. 1391. We acknowledged in *Bellotti* that numerous "interests of the highest importance" can justify campaign finance regulation. 435 U.S., at 788–789, 98 S.Ct. 1407. But we found no evidence that these interests were served by the Massachusetts law. *Id.*, at 789, 98 S.Ct. 1407. We left open the possibility that our decision might have been different if there had been "record or legislative findings that corporate advocacy threatened imminently to undermine democratic processes, thereby denigrating rather than serving First Amendment interests." *Ibid.*

Austin and *McConnell*, then, sit perfectly well with *Bellotti*. Indeed, all six Members of the *Austin* majority had been on the Court at the time of *Bellotti*, and none so much as hinted in *Austin* that they saw any tension between the decisions. The difference between the cases is not that *Austin* and *McConnell* rejected First Amendment protection for corporations whereas *Bellotti* accepted it. The difference is that the statute at issue in *Bellotti* smacked of viewpoint ***446** discrimination, targeted one class of corporations, and provided no PAC option; and

the State has a greater interest in regulating independent corporate expenditures on candidate elections than on referenda, because in a functioning democracy the public must have faith that its representatives owe their positions to the people, not to the corporations with the deepest pockets.

In sum, over the course of the past century Congress has demonstrated a recurrent need to regulate corporate participation in candidate elections to “ [p]reserv[e] the integrity of the electoral process, preven[t] corruption, ... sustai[n] the active, alert responsibility of the individual citizen, ’ ” protect the expressive interests of shareholders, and “ [p]reserv [e] ... the individual citizen’s confidence in government. ’ ” *McConnell*, 540 U.S., at 206–207, n. 88, 124 S.Ct. 619 (quoting *Bellotti*, 435 U.S., at 788–789, 98 S.Ct. 1407; first alteration in original). These understandings provided the combined impetus behind the Tillman Act in 1907, see *Automobile Workers*, 352 U.S., at 570–575, 77 S.Ct. 529, the Taft–Hartley Act in 1947, see *WRTL*, 551 U.S., at 511, 127 S.Ct. 2652 (Souter, J., dissenting), FECA in 1971, see *NRWC*, 459 U.S., at 209–210, 103 S.Ct. 552, and BCRA in 2002, see *McConnell*, 540 U.S., at 126–132, 124 S.Ct. 619. Continuously for over 100 years, this line of “[c]ampaign finance reform has been a series of reactions to documented threats to electoral integrity obvious to any voter, posed by large sums of money from corporate or union treasuries.” *WRTL*, 551 U.S., at 522, 127 S.Ct. 2652 (Souter, J., dissenting). Time and again, we have recognized these realities in approving ****961** measures that Congress and the States have taken. None of the cases the majority cites is to the contrary. The only thing new about *Austin* was the dissent, with its stunning failure to appreciate the legitimacy of interests recognized in the name of democratic integrity since the days of the Progressives.

***447** IV

Having explained why this is not an appropriate case in which to revisit *Austin* and *McConnell* and why these decisions sit perfectly well with “First Amendment principles,” *ante*, at 886, 912, I come at last to the interests that are at stake. The majority recognizes that *Austin*

and *McConnell* may be defended on anticorruption, antidistortion, and shareholder protection rationales. *Ante*, at 903 – 911. It badly errs both in explaining the nature of these rationales, which overlap and complement each other, and in applying them to the case at hand.

The Anticorruption Interest

Undergirding the majority’s approach to the merits is the claim that the only “sufficiently important governmental interest in preventing corruption or the appearance of corruption” is one that is “limited to *quid pro quo* corruption.” *Ante*, at 909 – 910. This is the same “crabbed view of corruption” that was espoused by Justice KENNEDY in *McConnell* and squarely rejected by the Court in that case. 540 U.S., at 152, 124 S.Ct. 619. While it is true that we have not always spoken about corruption in a clear or consistent voice, the approach taken by the majority cannot be right, in my judgment. It disregards our constitutional history and the fundamental demands of a democratic society.

On numerous occasions we have recognized Congress’ legitimate interest in preventing the money that is spent on elections from exerting an “ ‘undue influence on an officeholder’s judgment’ ” and from creating “ ‘the appearance of such influence, ’ ” beyond the sphere of *quid pro quo* relationships. *Id.*, at 150, 124 S.Ct. 619; see also, e.g., *id.*, at 143–144, 152–154, 124 S.Ct. 619; *Colorado II*, 533 U.S., at 441, 121 S.Ct. 2351; *Shrink Missouri*, 528 U.S., at 389, 120 S.Ct. 897. Corruption can take many forms. Bribery may be the paradigm case. But the difference between selling a vote and selling access is a matter of degree, not kind. And selling ***448** access is not qualitatively different from giving special preference to those who spent money on one’s behalf. Corruption operates along a spectrum, and the majority’s apparent belief that *quid pro quo* arrangements can be neatly demarcated from other improper influences does not accord with the theory or reality of politics. It certainly does not accord with the record Congress developed in passing BCRA, a record that stands as a remarkable testament to the energy and ingenuity with which corporations, unions, lobbyists, and politicians may go about scratching each other’s backs—and which amply supported Congress’ determination to target a limited set of especially destructive practices.

The District Court that adjudicated the initial challenge to BCRA pored over this record. In a careful analysis, Judge Kollar-Kotelly made numerous findings about the corrupting consequences of corporate and union independent expenditures in the years preceding BCRA's passage. See *McConnell*, 251 F.Supp.2d. at 555–560, 622–625; see also *id.*, at 804–805, 813, n. 143 (Leon, J.) (indicating agreement). As summarized in her own words:

“The factual findings of the Court illustrate that corporations and labor unions routinely notify Members of Congress as soon as they air electioneering communications relevant to the Members' elections. The record also indicates ****962** that Members express appreciation to organizations for the airing of these election-related advertisements. Indeed, Members of Congress are particularly grateful when negative issue advertisements are run by these organizations, leaving the candidates free to run positive advertisements and be seen as ‘above the fray.’ Political consultants testify that campaigns are quite aware of who is running advertisements on the candidate's behalf, when they are being run, and where they are being run. Likewise, a prominent lobbyist ***449** testifies that these organizations use issue advocacy as a means to influence various Members of Congress.

“The Findings also demonstrate that Members of Congress seek to have corporations and unions run these advertisements on their behalf. The Findings show that Members suggest that corporations or individuals make donations to interest groups with the understanding that the money contributed to these groups will assist the Member in a campaign. After the election, these organizations often seek credit for their support.... Finally, a large majority of Americans (80%) are of the view that corporations and other organizations that engage in electioneering communications, which benefit specific elected officials, receive special consideration from those officials when matters arise that affect these corporations and organizations.” *Id.* at 623–624 (citations and footnote omitted).

Many of the relationships of dependency found by Judge Kollar-Kotelly seemed to have a *quid pro quo* basis, but other arrangements were more subtle. Her analysis shows the great difficulty in delimiting the precise scope of the *quid pro quo* category, as well as the adverse consequences that *all* such arrangements may have. There

are threats of corruption that are far more destructive to a democratic society than the odd bribe. Yet the majority's understanding of corruption would leave lawmakers impotent to address all but the most discrete abuses.

Our “undue influence” cases have allowed the American people to cast a wider net through legislative experiments designed to ensure, to some minimal extent, “that officeholders will decide issues ... on the merits of their constituencies,” and not “according to the wishes of those who have made large financial contributions”—or expenditures—“valued by the officeholder.” ***450** *McConnell*, 540 U.S., at 153, 124 S.Ct. 619.⁶³ when private interests are seen TO EXERT OUTSIZED CONTROL OVER officeholders solely on account of the money spent on (or withheld from) their campaigns, the result can depart so thoroughly “from what is pure or correct” in the conduct of Government, Webster's Third New International Dictionary 512 (1966) (defining “corruption”), that it amounts to a “subversion ... of the electoral ****963** process.” *Automobile Workers*, 352 U.S., at 575, 77 S.Ct. 529. At stake in the legislative efforts to address this threat is therefore not only the legitimacy and quality of Government but also the public's faith therein, not only “the capacity of this democracy to represent its constituents [but also] the confidence of its citizens in their capacity to govern themselves,” *WRTL*, 551 U.S., at 507, 127 S.Ct. 2652 (Souter, J., dissenting). “Take away Congress' authority to regulate the appearance of undue influence and ‘the cynical assumption that large donors call the tune could jeopardize the willingness of voters to take part in democratic governance.’ ” *McConnell*, 540 U.S., at 144, 124 S.Ct. 619 (quoting *Shrink Missouri*, 528 U.S., at 390, 120 S.Ct. 897).⁶⁴

***451** The cluster of interrelated interests threatened by such undue influence and its appearance has been well captured under the rubric of “ democratic integrity.” *WRTL*, 551 U.S., at 522, 127 S.Ct. 2652 (Souter, J., dissenting). This value has underlined a century of state and federal efforts to regulate the role of corporations in the electoral process.⁶⁵

Unlike the majority's myopic focus on *quid pro quo* scenarios and the free-floating “First Amendment principles” on which it rests so much weight, *ante*, at 886, 912, this broader understanding of corruption has

deep roots in the Nation's history. "During debates on the earliest [campaign finance] reform acts, the terms 'corruption' and 'undue influence' were used nearly interchangeably." Pasquale, *Reclaiming Egalitarianism in the Political Theory of Campaign Finance Reform*, 2008 U. Ill. L.Rev. 599, 601. Long before *Buckley*, we appreciated that "[t]o say that Congress is without power to pass appropriate legislation to safeguard ... an election from the improper use of money to influence the result is to deny to the nation in a vital particular the power of self protection." *Burroughs v. United States*, 290 U.S. 534, 545, 54 S.Ct. 287, 78 L.Ed. 484 (1934). And whereas we have no evidence to support the notion that the Framers would have wanted corporations to have the same rights as natural persons in the electoral context, we have ample evidence to suggest that they would *452 have been appalled by the evidence of corruption that Congress unearthed in developing BCRA and that the Court today discounts to irrelevance. It is fair to say that "[t]he Framers were obsessed with corruption," **964 Teachout 348, which they understood to encompass the dependency of public officeholders on private interests, see *id.*, at 373–374; see also *Randall*, 548 U.S., at 280, 126 S.Ct. 2479 (STEVENS, J., dissenting). They discussed corruption "more often in the Constitutional Convention than factions, violence, or instability." Teachout 352. When they brought our constitutional order into being, the Framers had their minds trained on a threat to republican self-government that this Court has lost sight of.

Quid Pro Quo Corruption

There is no need to take my side in the debate over the scope of the anticorruption interest to see that the Court's merits holding is wrong. Even under the majority's "crabbed view of corruption," *McCormell*, 540 U.S., at 152, 124 S.Ct. 619, the Government should not lose this case.

"The importance of the governmental interest in preventing [corruption through the creation of political debts] has never been doubted." *Bellotti*, 435 U.S., at 788, n. 26, 98 S.Ct. 1407. Even in the cases that have construed the anticorruption interest most narrowly, we have never suggested that such *quid pro quo* debts must take the form of outright vote buying or bribes, which have long been distinct crimes. Rather, they encompass the myriad ways in which outside parties may induce an officeholder

to confer a legislative benefit in direct response to, or anticipation of, some outlay of money the parties have made or will make on behalf of the officeholder. See *McCormell*, 540 U.S., at 143, 124 S.Ct. 619 ("We have not limited [the anticorruption] interest to the elimination of cash-for-votes exchanges. In *Buckley*, we expressly rejected the argument that antibribery laws provided a less restrictive alternative to FECA's contribution limits, noting that such laws 'deal[t] with only the most blatant and specific attempts *453 of those with money to influence governmental action' " (quoting 424 U.S., at 28, 96 S.Ct. 612; alteration in original)). It has likewise never been doubted that "[o]f almost equal concern as the danger of actual *quid pro quo* arrangements is the impact of the appearance of corruption." *Id.*, at 27, 96 S.Ct. 612. Congress may "legitimately conclude that the avoidance of the appearance of improper influence is also critical ... if confidence in the system of representative Government is not to be eroded to a disastrous extent." *Ibid.* (internal quotation marks omitted; alteration in original). A democracy cannot function effectively when its constituent members believe laws are being bought and sold.

In theory, our colleagues accept this much. As applied to BCRA § 203, however, they conclude "[t]he anticorruption interest is not sufficient to displace the speech here in question." *Ante*, at 908.

Although the Court suggests that *Buckley* compels its conclusion, *ante*, at 908 – 910, *Buckley* cannot sustain this reading. It is true that, in evaluating FECA's ceiling on independent expenditures by all persons, the *Buckley* Court found the governmental interest in preventing corruption "inadequate." 424 U.S., at 45, 96 S.Ct. 612. But *Buckley* did not evaluate corporate expenditures specifically, nor did it rule out the possibility that a future Court might find otherwise. The opinion reasoned that an expenditure limitation covering only express advocacy (*i.e.*, magic words) would likely be ineffectual, *ibid.*, a problem that Congress tackled in BCRA, and it concluded that "the independent advocacy restricted by [FECA § 608(e)(1)] does not presently appear to pose dangers of real or apparent corruption comparable to those identified with large campaign contributions." *id.*, at 46, 96 S.Ct. 612 (emphasis added). *Buckley* expressly contemplated that an anticorruption **965 rationale might justify restrictions on independent expenditures at a later date, "because it may be that, in some circumstances, 'large

independent expenditures pose the same dangers of actual or apparent *quid pro quo* *454 arrangements as do large contributions.’ ” *WRTL*, 551 U.S., at 478, 127 S.Ct. 2652 (opinion of ROBERTS, C.J.) (quoting *Buckley*, 424 U.S., at 45, 96 S.Ct. 612). Certainly *Buckley* did not foreclose this possibility with respect to electioneering communications made with corporate general treasury funds, an issue the Court had no occasion to consider.

The *Austin* Court did not rest its holding on *quid pro quo* corruption, as it found the broader corruption implicated by the antidistortion and shareholder protection rationales a sufficient basis for Michigan's restriction on corporate electioneering. 494 U.S., at 658–660, 110 S.Ct. 1391. Concurring in that opinion, I took the position that “the danger of either the fact, or the appearance, of *quid pro quo* relationships [also] provides an adequate justification for state regulation” of these independent expenditures. *Id.*, at 678, 110 S.Ct. 1391. I did not see this position as inconsistent with *Buckley*'s analysis of individual expenditures. Corporations, as a class, tend to be more attuned to the complexities of the legislative process and more directly affected by tax and appropriations measures that receive little public scrutiny; they also have vastly more money with which to try to buy access and votes. See Supp. Brief for Appellee 17 (stating that the Fortune 100 companies earned revenues of \$13.1 trillion during the last election cycle). Business corporations must engage the political process in instrumental terms if they are to maximize shareholder value. The unparalleled resources, professional lobbyists, and single-minded focus they bring to this effort, I believed, make *quid pro quo* corruption and its appearance inherently more likely when they (or their conduits or trade groups) spend unrestricted sums on elections.

It is with regret rather than satisfaction that I can now say that time has borne out my concerns. The legislative and judicial proceedings relating to BCRA generated a substantial body of evidence suggesting that, as corporations grew more and more adept at crafting “issue ads” to help *455 or harm a particular candidate, these nominally independent expenditures began to corrupt the political process in a very direct sense. The sponsors of these ads were routinely granted special access after the campaign was over; “candidates and officials knew who their friends were,” *McCormell*, 540 U.S., at 129, 124 S.Ct. 619. Many corporate independent expenditures, it seemed, had become essentially interchangeable with

direct contributions in their capacity to generate *quid pro quo* arrangements. In an age in which money and television ads are the coin of the campaign realm, it is hardly surprising that corporations deployed these ads to curry favor with, and to gain influence over, public officials.

The majority appears to think it decisive that the BCRA record does not contain “direct examples of votes being exchanged for ... expenditures.” *Ante*, at 910 (internal quotation marks omitted). It would have been quite remarkable if Congress had created a record detailing such behavior by its own Members. Proving that a specific vote was exchanged for a specific expenditure has always been next to impossible: Elected officials have diverse motivations, and no one will acknowledge that he sold a vote. Yet, even if “[i]ngratiation and access ... are not corruption” themselves, *ibid.*, they are necessary prerequisites to it; they can create both the opportunity for, and the appearance of, *quid pro quo* arrangements. The influx of unlimited corporate money into the electoral **966 realm also creates new opportunities for the mirror image of *quid pro quo* deals: threats, both explicit and implicit. Starting today, corporations with large war chests to deploy on electioneering may find democratically elected bodies becoming much more attuned to their interests. The majority both misreads the facts and draws the wrong conclusions when it suggests that the BCRA record provides “only scant evidence that independent expenditures ... ingratiate,” and that, “in any event,” none of it matters. *Ibid.*

*456 In her analysis of the record, Judge Kollar-Kotelly documented the pervasiveness of this ingratiation and explained its significance under the majority's own touchstone for defining the scope of the anticorruption rationale, *Buckley*. See *McCormell*, 251 F.Supp.2d, at 555–560, 622–625. Witnesses explained how political parties and candidates used corporate independent expenditures to circumvent FECA's “hard-money” limitations. See, e.g., *id.*, at 478–479. One former Senator candidly admitted to the District Court that “ [c]andidates whose campaigns benefit from [phony “issue ads”] greatly appreciate the help of these groups. In fact, Members will also be favorably disposed to those who finance these groups when they later seek access to discuss pending legislation.’ ” *Id.*, at 556 (quoting declaration of Sen. Dale Bumpers). One prominent lobbyist went so far as to state, in uncontroverted

130 S.Ct. 876, 187 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 2961, 175 L.Ed.2d 753, 78 USLW 4078...

testimony, that “‘unregulated expenditures—whether soft money donations to the parties or issue ad campaigns—can sometimes generate *far more* influence than direct campaign contributions.’” *Ibid.* (quoting declaration of Wright Andrews; emphasis added). In sum, Judge Kollar-Kotelly found, “[t]he record powerfully demonstrates that electioneering communications paid for with the general treasury funds of labor unions and corporations endears those entities to elected officials in a way that could be perceived by the public as corrupting.” *Id.* at 622–623. She concluded that the Government’s interest in preventing the appearance of corruption, as that concept was defined in *Buckley*, was itself sufficient to uphold BCRA § 203. 251 F.Supp.2d, at 622–625. Judge Leon agreed. See *id.*, at 804–805 (dissenting only with respect to the Wellstone Amendment’s coverage of *MCFL* corporations).

When the *McConnell* Court affirmed the judgment of the District Court regarding § 203, we did not rest our holding on a narrow notion of *quid pro quo* corruption. Instead we relied on the governmental interest in combating the unique forms of corruption threatened by corporations, as recognized *457 in *Austin’s* antidistortion and shareholder protection rationales, 540 U.S., at 205, 124 S.Ct. 619 (citing *Austin*, 494 U.S., at 660, 110 S.Ct. 1391), as well as the interest in preventing circumvention of contribution limits, 540 U.S., at 128–129, 205, 206, n. 88, 124 S.Ct. 619. Had we felt constrained by the view of today’s Court that *quid pro quo* corruption and its appearance are the only interests that count in this field, *ante*, at 903–911, we of course would have looked closely at that issue. And as the analysis by Judge Kollar-Kotelly reflects, it is a very real possibility that we would have found one or both of those interests satisfied and § 203 appropriately tailored to them.

The majority’s rejection of the *Buckley* anticorruption rationale on the ground that independent corporate expenditures “do not give rise to [*quid pro quo*] corruption or the appearance of corruption,” *ante*, at 909, is thus unfair as well as unreasonable. Congress and outside experts have generated significant evidence corroborating this rationale, and the only reason we do not have any of the relevant materials before us is that the Government had no reason **967 to develop a record at trial for a facial challenge the plaintiff had abandoned. The Court cannot both *sua sponte* choose to relitigate *McConnell* on appeal and then complain that the Government has failed to substantiate its case. If our colleagues were

really serious about the interest in preventing *quid pro quo* corruption, they would remand to the District Court with instructions to commence evidentiary proceedings.⁶⁶

*458 The insight that even technically independent expenditures can be corrupting in much the same way as direct contributions is bolstered by our decision last year in *Caperton v. A.T. Massey Coal Co.*, 556 U.S. 868, 129 S.Ct. 2252, 173 L.Ed.2d 1208 (2009). In that case, Don Blankenship, the chief executive officer of a corporation with a lawsuit pending before the West Virginia high court, spent large sums on behalf of a particular candidate, Brent Benjamin, running for a seat on that court. “In addition to contributing the \$1,000 statutory maximum to Benjamin’s campaign committee, Blankenship donated almost \$2.5 million to ‘And For The Sake Of The Kids,’” a § 527 corporation that ran ads targeting Benjamin’s opponent. *Id.*, at —, 129 S.Ct., at 2257. “This was not all. Blankenship spent, in addition, just over \$500,000 on independent expenditures ... ‘to support ... Brent Benjamin.’” * *Id.*, at —, 129 S.Ct., at 2257 (second alteration in original). Applying its common sense, this Court accepted petitioners’ argument that Blankenship’s “pivotal role in getting Justice Benjamin elected created a constitutionally intolerable probability of actual bias” when Benjamin later declined to recuse himself from the appeal by Blankenship’s corporation. *Id.*, at —, 129 S.Ct., at 2262. “Though n[o] ... bribe or criminal influence” was involved, we recognized that “Justice Benjamin would nevertheless feel a debt of gratitude to Blankenship for his extraordinary efforts to get him elected.” *Ibid.* “The difficulties of inquiring into actual bias,” we further noted, “simply underscore the need for objective rules,” *id.*, at —, 129 S.Ct., at 2263—rules which will perforce turn on the appearance of bias rather than its actual existence.

In *Caperton*, then, we accepted the premise that, at least in some circumstances, independent expenditures on candidate elections will raise an intolerable specter of *quid pro quo* corruption. Indeed, this premise struck the Court as so intuitive that it repeatedly referred to Blankenship’s spending on behalf of Benjamin—spending that consisted of *459 99.97% independent expenditures (\$3 million) and 0.03% direct contributions (\$1,000)—as a “contribution.” See, e.g., *id.*, at —, 129 S.Ct., at 2257 (“The basis for the [recusal] motion was that the justice had received campaign contributions in an extraordinary amount from” Blankenship); *id.*, at —,

129 S.Ct., at 2258 (referencing “Blankenship’s \$3 million in contributions”); *id.*, at —, 129 S.Ct., at 2264 (“Blankenship contributed some \$3 million to unseat the incumbent and replace **968 him with Benjamin”); *id.*, at —, 129 S.Ct., at 2264 (“Blankenship’s campaign contributions ... had a significant and disproportionate influence on the electoral outcome”). The reason the Court so thoroughly conflated expenditures and contributions, one assumes, is that it realized that some expenditures may be functionally equivalent to contributions in the way they influence the outcome of a race, the way they are interpreted by the candidates and the public, and the way they taint the decisions that the officeholder thereafter takes.

Caperton is illuminating in several additional respects. It underscores the old insight that, on account of the extreme difficulty of proving corruption, “prophylactic measures, reaching some [campaign spending] not corrupt in purpose or effect, [may be] nonetheless required to guard against corruption.” *Buckley*, 424 U.S., at 30, 96 S.Ct. 612; see also *Shrink Missouri*, 528 U.S., at 392, n. 5, 120 S.Ct. 897. It underscores that “certain restrictions on corporate electoral involvement” may likewise be needed to “hedge against circumvention of valid contribution limits.” *McCormell*, 540 U.S., at 205, 124 S.Ct. 619 (internal quotation marks and brackets omitted); see also *Colorado II*, 533 U.S., at 456, 121 S.Ct. 2351 (“[A]ll Members of the Court agree that circumvention is a valid theory of corruption”). It underscores that for-profit corporations associated with electioneering communications will often prefer to use nonprofit conduits with “misleading names,” such as And For The Sake Of The Kids, “to conceal their identity” as the sponsor of those communications, thereby frustrating the utility of disclosure *460 laws. *McCormell*, 540 U.S., at 128, 124 S.Ct. 619; see also *id.* at 196–197, 124 S.Ct. 619.

And it underscores that the consequences of today’s holding will not be limited to the legislative or executive context. The majority of the States select their judges through popular elections. At a time when concerns about the conduct of judicial elections have reached a fever pitch, see, e.g., O’Connor, Justice for Sale, *Wall St. Journal*, Nov. 15, 2007, p. A25; Brief for Justice at Stake et al. as *Amici Curiae* 2, the Court today unleashes the floodgates of corporate and union general treasury spending in these races. Perhaps “*Caperton* motions” will catch some of

the worst abuses. This will be small comfort to those States that, after today, may no longer have the ability to place modest limits on corporate electioneering even if they believe such limits to be critical to maintaining the integrity of their judicial systems.

Deference and Incumbent Self-Protection

Rather than show any deference to a coordinate branch of Government, the majority thus rejects the anticorruption rationale without serious analysis.⁶⁷ Today’s opinion provides no clear rationale for being so dismissive of Congress, but the prior individual opinions on which it relies have offered one: the incentives of the legislators who passed BCRA. Section 203, our colleagues have suggested, may be little more than “an incumbency protection plan,” *McCormell*, 540 U.S., at 306, 124 S.Ct. 619 (KENNEDY, J., concurring in judgment in part and dissenting in part); see also *id.*, at 249–250, 260–263, 124 S.Ct. 619 (SCALIA, J., concurring in part, concurring in judgment in part, and dissenting in part), a disreputable attempt at legislative **969 self-dealing rather than an earnest effort to facilitate First Amendment values and safeguard the legitimacy *461 of our political system. This possibility, the Court apparently believes, licenses it to run roughshod over Congress’ handiwork.

In my view, we should instead start by acknowledging that “Congress surely has both wisdom and experience in these matters that is far superior to ours.” *Colorado Republican Federal Campaign Comm. v. FEC*, 518 U.S. 604, 650, 116 S.Ct. 2309, 135 L.Ed.2d 795 (1996) (STEVENS, J., dissenting). Many of our campaign finance precedents explicitly and forcefully affirm the propriety of such presumptive deference. See, e.g., *McCormell*, 540 U.S., at 158, 124 S.Ct. 619; *Beaumont*, 539 U.S., at 155–156, 123 S.Ct. 2200; *NRWC*, 459 U.S., at 209–210, 103 S.Ct. 552. Moreover, “[j]udicial deference is particularly warranted where, as here, we deal with a congressional judgment that has remained essentially unchanged throughout a century of careful legislative adjustment.” *Beaumont*, 539 U.S., at 162, n. 9, 123 S.Ct. 2200 (internal quotation marks omitted); cf. *Shrink Missouri*, 528 U.S., at 391, 120 S.Ct. 897 (“The quantum of empirical evidence needed to satisfy heightened judicial scrutiny of legislative judgments will vary up or down with the novelty and plausibility of the justification raised”). In America, incumbent legislators pass the laws that govern campaign finance, just like all other laws. To apply a level of scrutiny that effectively

bars them from regulating electioneering whenever there is the faintest whiff of self-interest, is to deprive them of the ability to regulate electioneering.

This is not to say that deference would be appropriate if there were a solid basis for believing that a legislative action was motivated by the desire to protect incumbents or that it will degrade the competitiveness of the electoral process.⁶⁸ *462 See *League of United Latin American Citizens v. Perry*, 548 U.S. 399, 447, 126 S.Ct. 2594, 165 L.Ed.2d 609 (2006) (STEVENS, J., concurring in part and dissenting in part); *Vieth v. Jubelirer*, 541 U.S. 267, 317, 124 S.Ct. 1769, 158 L.Ed.2d 546 (2004) (STEVENS, J., dissenting). Along with our duty to balance competing constitutional concerns, we have a vital role to play in ensuring that elections remain at least minimally open, fair, and competitive. But it is the height of recklessness to dismiss Congress' years of bipartisan deliberation and its reasoned judgment on this basis, without first confirming that the statute in question was intended to be, or will function as, a restraint on electoral competition. "Absent record evidence of invidious discrimination against challengers as a class, a court should generally be hesitant to invalidate legislation which on its face imposes evenhanded restrictions." *Buckley*, 424 U.S., at 31, 96 S.Ct. 612.

We have no record evidence from which to conclude that BCRA § 203, or any of the dozens of state laws that the Court today calls into question, reflects or fosters such invidious discrimination. Our colleagues have opined that "'any restriction upon a type of campaign speech that is equally available to challengers and incumbents tends to favor incumbents.'" *McConnell*, 540 U.S., at 249, 124 S.Ct. 619 (opinion of SCALIA, J.). This kind of airy speculation could easily be turned on its head. The electioneering prohibited by **970 § 203 might well tend to favor incumbents, because incumbents have pre-existing relationships with corporations and unions, and groups that wish to procure legislative benefits may tend to support the candidate who, as a sitting officeholder, is already in a position to dispense benefits and is statistically likely to retain office. If a corporation's goal is to induce officeholders to do its bidding, the corporation would do well to cultivate stable, long-term relationships of dependency.

So we do not have a solid theoretical basis for condemning § 203 as a front for incumbent self-protection, and it

seems equally if not more plausible that restrictions on corporate electioneering will be self-denying. Nor do we have a good *463 empirical case for skepticism, as the Court's failure to cite any empirical research attests. Nor does the legislative history give reason for concern. Congress devoted years of careful study to the issues underlying BCRA; "[f]ew legislative proposals in recent years have received as much sustained public commentary or news coverage"; "[p]olitical scientists and academic experts ... with no self-interest in incumbent protectio[n] were central figures in pressing the case for BCRA"; and the legislation commanded bipartisan support from the outset. Pildes, *The Supreme Court 2003 Term Foreword: The Constitutionalization of Democratic Politics*, 118 *Harv. L.Rev.* 28, 137 (2004). Finally, it is important to remember just how incumbent-friendly congressional races were prior to BCRA's passage. As the Solicitor General aptly remarked at the time, "the evidence supports overwhelmingly that incumbents were able to get re-elected under the old system just fine." *Tr. of Oral Arg. in McConnell v. FEC*, O.T. 2003, No. 02-1674, p. 61. "It would be hard to develop a scheme that could be better for incumbents." *Id.*, at 63.

In this case, then, "there is no convincing evidence that th[e] important interests favoring expenditure limits are fronts for incumbency protection." *Randall*, 548 U.S., at 279, 126 S.Ct. 2479 (STEVENS, J., dissenting). "In the meantime, a legislative judgment that 'enough is enough' should command the greatest possible deference from judges interpreting a constitutional provision that, at best, has an indirect relationship to activity that affects the quantity ... of repetitive speech in the marketplace of ideas." *Id.*, at 279-280, 126 S.Ct. 2479. The majority cavalierly ignores Congress' factual findings and its constitutional judgment: It acknowledges the validity of the interest in preventing corruption, but it effectively discounts the value of that interest to zero. This is quite different from conscientious policing for impermissibly anticompetitive motive or effect in a sensitive First Amendment context. *464 It is the denial of Congress' authority to regulate corporate spending on elections.

Austin and Corporate Expenditures

Just as the majority gives short shrift to the general societal interests at stake in campaign finance regulation, it also overlooks the distinctive considerations raised by the regulation of *corporate* expenditures. The majority fails to

130 S.Ct. 876, 187 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 2961, 175 L.Ed.2d 753, 78 USLW 4078...

appreciate that *Austin's* antidistortion rationale is itself an anticorruption rationale, see 494 U.S., at 660, 110 S.Ct. 1391 (describing “a different type of corruption”), tied to the special concerns raised by corporations. Understood properly, “antidistortion” is simply a variant on the classic governmental interest in protecting against improper influences on officeholders that debilitate the democratic process. It is manifestly not just an “‘equalizing’” ideal in disguise. *Ante*, at 904 (quoting *Buckley*, 424 U.S., at 48, 96 S.Ct. 612).⁶⁹

***465 **971** 1. *Antidistortion*

The fact that corporations are different from human beings might seem to need no elaboration, except that the majority opinion almost completely elides it. *Austin* set forth some of the basic differences. Unlike natural persons, corporations have “limited liability” for their owners and managers, “perpetual life,” separation of ownership and control, “and favorable treatment of the accumulation and distribution of assets ... that enhance their ability to attract capital and to deploy their resources in ways that maximize the return on their shareholders' investments.” 494 U.S., at 658–659, 110 S.Ct. 1391. Unlike voters in U.S. elections, corporations may be foreign controlled.⁷⁰ Unlike other interest groups, business corporations have been “effectively delegated responsibility for ensuring society's economic welfare”;⁷¹ they inescapably structure the life of every citizen. “[T]he resources in the treasury of a business corporation,” furthermore, “‘are not an indication of popular support for the corporation's political ideas.’” *Id.*, at 659, 110 S.Ct. 1391 (quoting *MCFL*, 479 U.S., at 258, 107 S.Ct. 616). “‘They reflect instead the economically motivated decisions of investors and customers. The availability of these resources may make a corporation a formidable political presence, even though the power of the corporation may be no reflection of the power of its ideas.’” 494 U.S., at 659, 110 S.Ct. 1391 (quoting *MCFL*, 479 U.S., at 258, 107 S.Ct. 616).⁷²

****972 *466** It might also be added that corporations have no consciences, no beliefs, no feelings, no thoughts, no desires. Corporations help structure and facilitate the activities of human beings, to be sure, and their “personhood” often serves as a useful legal fiction. But

they are not themselves members of “We the People” by whom and for whom our Constitution was established.

These basic points help explain why corporate electioneering is not only more likely to impair compelling governmental interests, but also why restrictions on that electioneering are less likely to encroach upon First Amendment freedoms. One fundamental concern of the First Amendment is to “protect the individual's interest in self-expression.” *Consolidated Edison Co. of N.Y. v. Public Serv. Comm'n of N. Y.*, 447 U.S. 530, 534, n. 2, 100 S.Ct. 2326, 65 L.Ed.2d 319 (1980); see also *Bellotti*, 435 U.S., at 777, n. 12, 98 S.Ct. 1407. Freedom of speech helps “make men free to develop their faculties,” *Whitney v. California*, 274 U.S. 357, 375, 47 S.Ct. 641, 71 L.Ed. 1095 (1927) (Brandeis, J., concurring), it respects their “dignity and choice,” *Cohen v. California*, 403 U.S. 15, 24, 91 S.Ct. 1780, 29 L.Ed.2d 284 (1971), and it facilitates the value of “individual self-realization,” Redish, *The Value of Free Speech*, 130 U. Pa. L.Rev. 591, 594 (1982). Corporate speech, however, is derivative speech, speech by proxy. A regulation such as BCRA § 203 may affect the way in which individuals disseminate certain messages through the corporate form, but it does not prevent anyone from speaking in his or her own voice. “Within the realm of [campaign spending] generally,” corporate ***467** spending is “furthest from the core of political expression.” *Beaumont*, 539 U.S., at 161, n. 8, 123 S.Ct. 2200.

It is an interesting question “who” is even speaking when a business corporation places an advertisement that endorses or attacks a particular candidate. Presumably it is not the customers or employees, who typically have no say in such matters. It cannot realistically be said to be the shareholders, who tend to be far removed from the day-to-day decisions of the firm and whose political preferences may be opaque to management. Perhaps the officers or directors of the corporation have the best claim to be the ones speaking, except their fiduciary duties generally prohibit them from using corporate funds for personal ends. Some individuals associated with the corporation must make the decision to place the ad, but the idea that these individuals are thereby fostering their self-expression or cultivating their critical faculties is fanciful. It is entirely possible that the corporation's electoral message will *conflict* with their personal convictions. Take away the ability to use general treasury funds for some of those ads,

and no one's autonomy, dignity, or political equality has been impinged upon in the least.

Corporate expenditures are distinguishable from individual expenditures in this respect. I have taken the view that a legislature may place reasonable restrictions on individuals' electioneering expenditures in the service of the governmental interests explained above, and in recognition of the fact that such restrictions are not direct restraints on speech but rather on its financing. See, e.g., **973 *Randall*, 548 U.S. at 273, 126 S.Ct. 2479 (dissenting opinion). But those restrictions concededly present a tougher case, because the primary conduct of actual, flesh-and-blood persons is involved. Some of those individuals might feel that they need to spend large sums of money on behalf of a particular candidate to vindicate the intensity of their electoral preferences. This is obviously not the situation with business corporations, as their routine practice of giving "substantial sums to both major national *468 parties" makes pellucidly clear. *McCormell*, 540 U.S. at 148, 124 S.Ct. 619. "[C]orporate participation" in elections, any business executive will tell you, "is more transactional than ideological." Supp. Brief for Committee for Economic Development as *Amicus Curiae* 10.

In this transactional spirit, some corporations have affirmatively urged Congress to place limits on their electioneering communications. These corporations fear that officeholders will shake them down for supportive ads, that they will have to spend increasing sums on elections in an ever-escalating arms race with their competitors, and that public trust in business will be eroded. See *id.*, at 10–19. A system that effectively forces corporations to use their shareholders' money both to maintain access to, and to avoid retribution from, elected officials may ultimately prove more harmful than beneficial to many corporations. It can impose a kind of implicit tax.⁷³

In short, regulations such as § 203 and the statute upheld in *Austin* impose only a limited burden on First Amendment freedoms not only because they target a narrow subset of expenditures and leave untouched the broader "public dialogue," *ante*, at 899, but also because they leave untouched *469 the speech of natural persons. Recognizing the weakness of a speaker-based critique of *Austin*, the Court places primary emphasis not on the corporation's right to electioneer, but rather on the

listener's interest in hearing what every possible speaker may have to say. The Court's central argument is that laws such as § 203 have "deprived [the electorate] of information, knowledge and opinion vital to its function," *ante*, at 907 (quoting *CIO*, 335 U.S. at 144, 68 S.Ct. 1349 (Rutledge, J., concurring in judgment)), and this, in turn, "interferes with the 'open marketplace' of ideas protected by the First Amendment," *ante*, at 906 (quoting *New York State Bd. of Elections v. Lopez Torres*, 552 U.S. 196, 208, 128 S.Ct. 791, 169 L.Ed.2d 665 (2008)).

There are many flaws in this argument. If the overriding concern depends on the interests of the audience, surely the public's perception of the value of corporate speech should be given important weight. That perception today is the same as it **974 was a century ago when Theodore Roosevelt delivered the speeches to Congress that, in time, led to the limited prohibition on corporate campaign expenditures that is overruled today. See *WRTL*, 551 U.S. at 509–510, 127 S.Ct. 2652 (Souter, J., dissenting) (summarizing President Roosevelt's remarks). The distinctive threat to democratic integrity posed by corporate domination of politics was recognized at "the inception of the republic" and "has been a persistent theme in American political life" ever since. Regan 302. It is only certain Members of this Court, not the listeners themselves, who have agitated for more corporate electioneering.

Austin recognized that there are substantial reasons why a legislature might conclude that unregulated general treasury expenditures will give corporations "unfair influence" in the electoral process, 494 U.S. at 660, 110 S.Ct. 1391, and distort public debate in ways that undermine rather than advance the interests of listeners. The legal structure of corporations allows them to amass and deploy financial resources on a scale few natural persons can match. The structure of a business corporation, furthermore, draws a line between the *470 corporation's economic interests and the political preferences of the individuals associated with the corporation; the corporation must engage the electoral process with the aim "to enhance the profitability of the company, no matter how persuasive the arguments for a broader or conflicting set of priorities." Brief for American Independent Business Alliance as *Amicus Curiae* 11; see also ALI, Principles of Corporate Governance: Analysis and Recommendations § 2.01(a), p. 55 (1992) ("[A] corporation ... should have

as its objective the conduct of business activities with a view to enhancing corporate profit and shareholder gain"). In a state election such as the one at issue in *Austin*, the interests of nonresident corporations may be fundamentally adverse to the interests of local voters. Consequently, when corporations grab up the prime broadcasting slots on the eve of an election, they can flood the market with advocacy that bears "little or no correlation" to the ideas of natural persons or to any broader notion of the public good, 494 U.S., at 660, 110 S.Ct. 1391. The opinions of real people may be marginalized. "The expenditure restrictions of [2 U.S.C.] § 441b are thus meant to ensure that competition among actors in the political arena is truly competition among ideas." *MCFL*, 479 U.S., at 259, 107 S.Ct. 616.

In addition to this immediate drowning out of noncorporate voices, there may be deleterious effects that follow soon thereafter. Corporate "domination" of electioneering, *Austin*, 494 U.S., at 659, 110 S.Ct. 1391, can generate the impression that corporations dominate our democracy. When citizens turn on their televisions and radios before an election and hear only corporate electioneering, they may lose faith in their capacity, as citizens, to influence public policy. A Government captured by corporate interests, they may come to believe, will be neither responsive to their needs nor willing to give their views a fair hearing. The predictable result is cynicism and disenchantment: an increased perception that large spenders " 'call the tune' " and a reduced " 'willingness of voters to take part in democratic governance.' " *471 *McConnell*, 540 U.S., at 144, 124 S.Ct. 619 (quoting *Shrink Missouri*, 528 U.S., at 390, 120 S.Ct. 897). To the extent that corporations are allowed to exert undue influence in electoral races, the speech of the eventual winners of those races may also be chilled. Politicians who fear that a certain corporation can make or break their reelection chances may be cowed into silence about that corporation. On a variety of levels, unregulated corporate electioneering **975 might diminish the ability of citizens to "hold officials accountable to the people," *ante*, at 898, and disserve the goal of a public debate that is " uninhibited, robust, and wide-open," *New York Times Co. v. Sullivan*, 376 U.S. 254, 270, 84 S.Ct. 710, 11 L.Ed.2d 686 (1964). At the least, I stress again, a legislature is entitled to credit these concerns and to take tailored measures in response.

The majority's unwillingness to distinguish between corporations and humans similarly blinds it to the possibility that corporations' "war chests" and their special "advantages" in the legal realm, *Austin*, 494 U.S., at 659, 110 S.Ct. 1391, may translate into special advantages in the market for legislation. When large numbers of citizens have a common stake in a measure that is under consideration, it may be very difficult for them to coordinate resources on behalf of their position. The corporate form, by contrast, "provides a simple way to channel rents to only those who have paid their dues, as it were. If you do not own stock, you do not benefit from the larger dividends or appreciation in the stock price caused by the passage of private interest legislation." Sitkoff, *Corporate Political Speech, Political Extortion, and the Competition for Corporate Charters*, 69 U. Chi. L.Rev. 1103, 1113 (2002). Corporations, that is, are uniquely equipped to seek laws that favor their owners, not simply because they have a lot of money but because of their legal and organizational structure. Remove all restrictions on their electioneering, and the door may be opened to a type of rent seeking that is "far more destructive" than what noncorporations are capable of. *472 *Ibid*. It is for reasons such as these that our campaign finance jurisprudence has long appreciated that "the 'differing structures and purposes' of different entities 'may require different forms of regulation in order to protect the integrity of the electoral process.' " *NRWC*, 459 U.S., at 210, 103 S.Ct. 552 (quoting *California Medical Assn.*, 453 U.S., at 201, 101 S.Ct. 2712).

The Court's facile depiction of corporate electioneering assumes away all of these complexities. Our colleagues ridicule the idea of regulating expenditures based on "nothing more" than a fear that corporations have a special "ability to persuade," *ante*, at 923 (opinion of ROBERTS, C.J.), as if corporations were our society's ablest debaters and viewpoint-neutral laws such as § 203 were created to suppress their best arguments. In their haste to knock down yet another straw man, our colleagues simply ignore the fundamental concerns of the *Austin* Court and the legislatures that have passed laws like § 203: to safeguard the integrity, competitiveness, and democratic responsiveness of the electoral process. All of the majority's theoretical arguments turn on a proposition with undeniable surface appeal but little grounding in evidence or experience, "that there is no such thing as too much speech," *Austin*, 494 U.S., at 695, 110 S.Ct. 1391 (SCALIA, J., dissenting).⁷⁴ If individuals in our

society had infinite free time to listen to and contemplate every last bit of speech uttered by anyone, anywhere; and if broadcast advertisements had no special ability to influence elections apart from the merits of their arguments (to the extent they make any); and if legislators always operated with nothing less than perfect virtue; then I suppose the majority's premise would be sound. In the real world, we have seen, corporate domination of the airwaves prior to an election may decrease the average listener's exposure to ****976** relevant viewpoints, and it may diminish citizens' willingness and capacity to participate in the democratic process.

***473** None of this is to suggest that corporations can or should be denied an opportunity to participate in election campaigns or in any other public forum (much less that a work of art such as *Mr. Smith Goes to Washington* may be banned), or to deny that some corporate speech may contribute significantly to public debate. What it shows, however, is that *Austin*'s "concern about corporate domination of the political process," 494 U.S. at 659, 110 S.Ct. 1391, reflects more than a concern to protect governmental interests outside of the First Amendment. It also reflects a concern to *facilitate* First Amendment values by preserving some breathing room around the electoral "marketplace" of ideas, *ante*, at 896, 904, 906, 914, 915, the marketplace in which the actual people of this Nation determine how they will govern themselves. The majority seems oblivious to the simple truth that laws such as § 203 do not merely pit the anticorruption interest against the First Amendment, but also pit competing First Amendment values against each other. There are, to be sure, serious concerns with any effort to balance the First Amendment rights of speakers against the First Amendment rights of listeners. But when the speakers in question are not real people and when the appeal to "First Amendment principles" depends almost entirely on the listeners' perspective, *ante*, at 886, 912, it becomes necessary to consider how listeners will actually be affected.

In critiquing *Austin*'s antidistortion rationale and campaign finance regulation more generally, our colleagues place tremendous weight on the example of media corporations. See *ante*, at 905 – 907, 911; *ante*, at 917, 923 (opinion of ROBERTS, C.J.); *ante*, at 927 – 928 (opinion of SCALIA, J.). Yet it is not at all clear that *Austin* would permit § 203 to be applied to them. The press plays a unique role not only in the text, history, and

structure of the First Amendment but also in facilitating public discourse; as the *Austin* Court explained, "media corporations differ significantly from other corporations in that their resources are devoted to the collection ***474** of information and its dissemination to the public," 494 U.S. at 667, 110 S.Ct. 1391. Our colleagues have raised some interesting and difficult questions about Congress' authority to regulate electioneering by the press, and about how to define what constitutes the press. *But that is not the case before us.* Section 203 does not apply to media corporations, and even if it did, *Citizens United* is not a media corporation. There would be absolutely no reason to consider the issue of media corporations if the majority did not, first, transform *Citizens United*'s as-applied challenge into a facial challenge and, second, invent the theory that legislatures must eschew all "identity"-based distinctions and treat a local nonprofit news outlet exactly the same as General Motors.⁷⁵ This calls to mind George Berkeley's description of philosophers: "[W]e have first raised a dust and then complain we cannot see." *Principles of Human Knowledge/ Three Dialogues* 38, ¶ 3 (R. Woolhouse ed.1988).

It would be perfectly understandable if our colleagues feared that a campaign finance ****977** regulation such as § 203 may be counterproductive or self-interested, and therefore attended carefully to the choices the Legislature has made. But the majority does not bother to consider such practical matters, or even to consult a record; it simply stipulates that "enlightened self-government" can arise only in the absence of regulation. *Ante*, at 898. In light of the distinctive features of corporations identified in *Austin*, there is no valid basis for this assumption. The marketplace of ideas is not actually a place where items—or laws—are meant to be bought and sold, and when we move from the realm of economics ***475** to the realm of corporate electioneering, there may be no "reason to think the market ordering is intrinsically good at all," Strauss 1386.

The Court's blinkered and aphoristic approach to the First Amendment may well promote corporate power at the cost of the individual and collective self-expression the Amendment was meant to serve. It will undoubtedly cripple the ability of ordinary citizens, Congress, and the States to adopt even limited measures to protect against corporate domination of the electoral process. Americans may be forgiven if they do not feel the Court has advanced the cause of self-government today.

2. Shareholder Protection

There is yet another way in which laws such as § 203 can serve First Amendment values. Interwoven with *Austin's* concern to protect the integrity of the electoral process is a concern to protect the rights of shareholders from a kind of coerced speech: electioneering expenditures that do not “reflec [t] [their] support.” 494 U.S., at 660–661, 110 S.Ct. 1391. When corporations use general treasury funds to praise or attack a particular candidate for office, it is the shareholders, as the residual claimants, who are effectively footing the bill. Those shareholders who disagree with the corporation's electoral message may find their financial investments being used to undermine their political convictions.

The PAC mechanism, by contrast, helps ensure that those who pay for an electioneering communication actually support its content and that managers do not use general treasuries to advance personal agendas. *Ibid.* It “ ‘allows corporate political participation without the temptation to use corporate funds for political influence, quite possibly at odds with the sentiments of some shareholders or members.’ ” *McConnell*, 540 U.S., at 204, 124 S.Ct. 619 (quoting *Beaumont*, 539 U.S., at 163, 123 S.Ct. 2200). A rule that privileges the use of PACs thus does more than facilitate the political speech of like-minded shareholders; *476 it also curbs the rent seeking behavior of executives and respects the views of dissenters. *Austin's* acceptance of restrictions on general treasury spending “ ‘simply allows people who have invested in the business corporation for purely economic reasons’—the vast majority of investors, one assumes—“to avoid being taken advantage of, without sacrificing their economic objectives.” Winkler, *Beyond Bellotti*, 32 *Loyola (LA) L.Rev.* 133, 201 (1998).

The concern to protect dissenting shareholders and union members has a long history in campaign finance reform. It provided a central motivation for the Tillman Act in 1907 and subsequent legislation, see *Pipefitters v. United States*, 407 U.S. 385, 414–415, 92 S.Ct. 2247, 33 L.Ed.2d 11 (1972); Winkler, 92 *Geo. L. J.*, at 887–900, and it has been endorsed in a long line of our cases, see, e.g., *McConnell*, 540 U.S., at 204–205, 124 S.Ct. 619; *Beaumont*, 539 U.S., at 152–154, 123 S.Ct. 2200; *MCFL*, 479 U.S., at 258, 107 S.Ct. 616; *NRWC*, 459 U.S., at 207–208, 103 S.Ct. 552;

*978 *Pipefitters*, 407 U.S., at 414–416, 92 S.Ct. 2247; see also n. 60, *supra*. Indeed, we have unanimously recognized the governmental interest in “protect[ing] the individuals who have paid money into a corporation or union for purposes other than the support of candidates from having that money used to support political candidates to whom they may be opposed.” *NRWC*, 459 U.S., at 207–208, 103 S.Ct. 552.

The Court dismisses this interest on the ground that abuses of shareholder money can be corrected “through the procedures of corporate democracy,” *ante*, at 911 (internal quotation marks omitted), and, it seems, through Internet-based disclosures, *ante*, at 916.⁷⁶ I fail to understand *477 how this addresses the concerns of dissenting union members, who will also be affected by today's ruling, and I fail to understand why the Court is so confident in these mechanisms. By “corporate democracy,” presumably the Court means the rights of shareholders to vote and to bring derivative suits for breach of fiduciary duty. In practice, however, many corporate lawyers will tell you that “these rights are so limited as to be almost nonexistent,” given the internal authority wielded by boards and managers and the expansive protections afforded by the business judgment rule. Blair & Stout 320; see also *id.*, at 298–315; Winkler, 32 *Loyola (LA) L.Rev.*, at 165–166, 199–200. Modern technology may help make it easier to track corporate activity, including electoral advocacy, but it is utopian to believe that it solves the problem. Most American households that own stock do so through intermediaries such as mutual funds and pension plans, see Evans, *A Requiem for the Retail Investor?* 95 *Va. L.Rev.* 1105 (2009), which makes it more difficult both to monitor and to alter particular holdings. Studies show that a majority of individual investors make no trades at all during a given year. *Id.* at 1117. Moreover, if the corporation in question operates a PAC, an investor who sees the company's ads may not know whether they are being funded through the PAC or through the general treasury.

If and when shareholders learn that a corporation has been spending general treasury money on objectionable electioneering, they can divest. Even assuming that they reliably learn as much, however, this solution is only partial. The injury to the shareholders' expressive rights has already occurred: they might have preferred to keep that corporation's stock in their portfolio for any number of economic reasons; and they may incur a capital

gains tax or other penalty from selling their shares, changing their pension plan, or the like. The shareholder protection rationale has been criticized as underinclusive, in that corporations also spend money on lobbying and charitable contributions in ways that any particular *478 shareholder might disapprove. But those expenditures do not implicate the selection of public officials, an area in which “the interests of unwilling ... corporate shareholders [in not being] forced to subsidize that speech” “are at their zenith.” *Austin*, 494 U.S., at 677, 110 S.Ct. 1391 (Brennan, J., concurring). And in any event, the question is whether shareholder protection provides a basis for regulating expenditures in the weeks before an election, not whether additional types of corporate communications **979 might similarly be conditioned on voluntariness.

Recognizing the limits of the shareholder protection rationale, the *Austin* Court did not hold it out as an adequate and independent ground for sustaining the statute in question. Rather, the Court applied it to reinforce the antidistortion rationale, in two main ways. First, the problem of dissenting shareholders shows that even if electioneering expenditures can advance the political views of some members of a corporation, they will often compromise the views of others. See, e.g., *id.*, at 663, 110 S.Ct. 1391 (discussing risk that corporation’s “members may be ... reluctant to withdraw as members even if they disagree with [its] political expression”). Second, it provides an additional reason, beyond the distinctive legal attributes of the corporate form, for doubting that these “expenditures reflect actual public support for the political ideas espoused,” *id.*, at 660, 110 S.Ct. 1391. The shareholder protection rationale, in other words, bolsters the conclusion that restrictions on corporate electioneering can serve both speakers’ and listeners’ interests, as well as the anticorruption interest. And it supplies yet another reason why corporate expenditures merit less protection than individual expenditures.

V

Today’s decision is backwards in many senses. It elevates the majority’s agenda over the litigants’ submissions, facial attacks over as-applied claims, broad constitutional theories *479 over narrow statutory grounds, individual dissenting opinions over precedential holdings, assertion over tradition, absolutism over empiricism, rhetoric over

reality. Our colleagues have arrived at the conclusion that *Austin* must be overruled and that § 203 is facially unconstitutional only after mischaracterizing both the reach and rationale of those authorities, and after bypassing or ignoring rules of judicial restraint used to cabin the Court’s lawmaking power. Their conclusion that the societal interest in avoiding corruption and the appearance of corruption does not provide an adequate justification for regulating corporate expenditures on candidate elections relies on an incorrect description of that interest, along with a failure to acknowledge the relevance of established facts and the considered judgments of state and federal legislatures over many decades.

In a democratic society, the longstanding consensus on the need to limit corporate campaign spending should outweigh the wooden application of judge-made rules. The majority’s rejection of this principle “elevate[s] corporations to a level of deference which has not been seen at least since the days when substantive due process was regularly used to invalidate regulatory legislation thought to unfairly impinge upon established economic interests.” *Bellotti*, 435 U.S., at 817, n. 13, 98 S.Ct. 1407 (White, J., dissenting). At bottom, the Court’s opinion is thus a rejection of the common sense of the American people, who have recognized a need to prevent corporations from undermining self-government since the founding, and who have fought against the distinctive corrupting potential of corporate electioneering since the days of Theodore Roosevelt. It is a strange time to repudiate that common sense. While American democracy is imperfect, few outside the majority of this Court would have thought its flaws included a dearth of corporate money in politics.

I would affirm the judgment of the District Court.

*480 Justice THOMAS, concurring in part and dissenting in part.

I join all but Part IV of the Court’s opinion.

**980 Political speech is entitled to robust protection under the First Amendment. Section 203 of the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 2002 (BCRA) has never been reconcilable with that protection. By striking down § 203, the Court takes an important first step toward restoring full constitutional protection to speech that is “indispensable to the effective and intelligent use of

the processes of popular government.” *McConnell v. Federal Election Comm'n*, 540 U.S. 93, 265, 124 S.Ct. 619, 157 L.Ed.2d 491 (2003) (THOMAS, J., concurring in part, concurring in judgment in part, and dissenting in part) (internal quotation marks omitted). I dissent from Part IV of the Court's opinion, however, because the Court's constitutional analysis does not go far enough. The disclosure, disclaimer, and reporting requirements in BCRA §§ 201 and 311 are also unconstitutional. See *id.* at 275–277, and n. 10, 124 S.Ct. 619.

Congress may not abridge the “right to anonymous speech” based on the “ ‘simple interest in providing voters with additional relevant information,’ ” *id.* at 276, 124 S.Ct. 619 (quoting *McIntyre v. Ohio Elections Comm'n*, 514 U.S. 334, 348, 115 S.Ct. 1511, 131 L.Ed.2d 426 (1995)). In continuing to hold otherwise, the Court misapprehends the import of “recent events” that some *amici* describe “in which donors to certain causes were blacklisted, threatened, or otherwise targeted for retaliation.” *Ante*, at 916. The Court properly recognizes these events as “cause for concern,” *ibid.*, but fails to acknowledge their constitutional significance. In my view, *amici's* submissions show why the Court's insistence on upholding §§ 201 and 311 will ultimately prove as misguided (and ill fated) as was its prior approval of § 203.

Amici's examples relate principally to Proposition 8, a state ballot proposition that California voters narrowly passed in the 2008 general election. Proposition 8 amended *481 California's constitution to provide that “[o]nly marriage between a man and a woman is valid or recognized in California.” *Cal. Const., Art. I, § 7.5*. Any donor who gave more than \$100 to any committee supporting or opposing Proposition 8 was required to disclose his full name, street address, occupation, employer's name (or business name, if self-employed), and the total amount of his contributions.¹ See *Cal. Govt.Code Ann. § 84211(f)* (West 2005). The California Secretary of State was then required to post this information on the Internet. See §§ 84600–84601; §§ 84602–84602.1 (West Supp.2010); §§ 84602.5–84604 (West 2005); § 85605 (West Supp.2010); §§ 84606–84609 (West 2005).

Some opponents of Proposition 8 compiled this information and created Web sites with maps showing the locations of homes or businesses of Proposition 8 supporters. Many supporters (or their customers)

suffered property damage, or threats of physical violence or death, as a result. They cited these incidents in a complaint they filed after the 2008 election, seeking to invalidate California's mandatory disclosure laws. Supporters recounted being told: “Consider yourself lucky. If I had a gun I would have gunned you down along with each and every other supporter,” or, “we have plans for you and your friends.” Complaint in **981 *ProtectMarriage.com—Yes on 8 v. Bowen*, Case No. 2:09-cv-00058-MCE-DAD (ED Cal.), ¶ 31. Proposition 8 opponents also allegedly harassed the measure's supporters by defacing or damaging their property. *Id.*, ¶ 32. Two religious organizations supporting Proposition 8 reportedly received through the mail envelopes containing a white powdery substance. *Id.*, ¶ 33.

*482 Those accounts are consistent with media reports describing Proposition 8–related retaliation. The director of the nonprofit California Musical Theater gave \$1,000 to support the initiative; he was forced to resign after artists complained to his employer. Lott & Smith, Donor Disclosure Has Its Downsides, *Wall Street Journal*, Dec. 26, 2008, p. A13. The director of the Los Angeles Film Festival was forced to resign after giving \$1,500 because opponents threatened to boycott and picket the next festival. *Ibid.* And a woman who had managed her popular, family-owned restaurant for 26 years was forced to resign after she gave \$100, because “throng[s] of [angry] protesters” repeatedly arrived at the restaurant and “shout[ed] ‘shame on you’ at customers.” Lopez, Prop. 8 Stance Upends Her Life, *Los Angeles Times*, Dec. 14, 2008, p. B1. The police even had to “arriv[e] in riot gear one night to quell the angry mob” at the restaurant. *Ibid.* Some supporters of Proposition 8 engaged in similar tactics; one real estate businessman in San Diego who had donated to a group opposing Proposition 8 “received a letter from the Prop. 8 Executive Committee threatening to publish his company's name if he didn't also donate to the ‘Yes on 8’ campaign.” Donor Disclosure, *supra*, at A13.

The success of such intimidation tactics has apparently spawned a cottage industry that uses forcibly disclosed donor information to *pre-empt* citizens' exercise of their First Amendment rights. Before the 2008 Presidential election, a “newly formed nonprofit group ... plann[ed] to confront donors to conservative groups, hoping to create a chilling effect that will dry up contributions.” Luo, Group Plans Campaign Against G.O.P. Donors, *N.Y.*

Times, Aug. 8, 2008, p. A15. Its leader, “who described his effort as ‘going for the jugular,’ ” detailed the group’s plan to send a “warning letter ... alerting donors who might be considering giving to right-wing groups to a variety of potential dangers, including *483 legal trouble, public exposure and watchdog groups digging through their lives.” *Ibid.*

These instances of retaliation sufficiently demonstrate why this Court should invalidate mandatory disclosure and reporting requirements. But *amici* present evidence of yet another reason to do so—the threat of retaliation from *elected officials*. As *amici*’s submissions make clear, this threat extends far beyond a single ballot proposition in California. For example, a candidate challenging an incumbent state attorney general reported that some members of the State’s business community feared donating to his campaign because they did not want to cross the incumbent; in his words, “ ‘I go to so many people and hear the same thing: ‘I sure hope you beat [the incumbent], but I can’t afford to have my name on your records. He might come after me next.’ ” Strassel, Challenging Spitzerism at the Polls, Wall Street Journal, Aug. 1, 2008, p. A11. The incumbent won reelection in 2008.

My point is not to express any view on the merits of the political controversies I describe. Rather, it is to demonstrate—using real-world, recent examples—the fallacy in the Court’s conclusion that “[d]isclaimer and disclosure requirements ... impose no ceiling on campaign-related activities, and do not prevent anyone from speaking.” *Ante*, at 914 (internal quotation marks and citations omitted). Of **982 course they do. Disclaimer and disclosure requirements enable private citizens and elected officials to implement political strategies *specifically calculated* to curtail campaign-related activity and prevent the lawful, peaceful exercise of First Amendment rights.

The Court nevertheless insists that as-applied challenges to disclosure requirements will suffice to vindicate those speech rights, as long as potential plaintiffs can “show a reasonable probability that disclosure ... will subject them to threats, harassment, or reprisals from either Government officials *484 or private parties.” *Ante*, at 914 (internal quotation marks omitted). But the Court’s opinion itself proves the irony in this compromise. In correctly explaining why it must address the facial

constitutionality of § 203, see *ante*, at 888 – 897, the Court recognizes that “[t]he First Amendment does not permit laws that force speakers to ... seek declaratory rulings before discussing the most salient political issues of our day,” *ante*, at 889; that as-applied challenges to § 203 “would require substantial litigation over an extended time” and result in an “interpretive process [that] itself would create an inevitable, pervasive, and serious risk of chilling protected speech pending the drawing of fine distinctions that, in the end, would themselves be questionable,” *ante*, at 891; that “a court would be remiss in performing its duties were it to accept an unsound principle merely to avoid the necessity of making a broader ruling,” *ante*, at 892; and that avoiding a facial challenge to § 203 “would prolong the substantial, nationwide chilling effect” that § 203 causes, *ante*, at 894. This logic, of course, applies equally to as-applied challenges to §§ 201 and 311.

Irony aside, the Court’s promise that as-applied challenges will adequately protect speech is a hollow assurance. Now more than ever, §§ 201 and 311 will chill protected speech because—as California voters can attest—“the advent of the Internet” enables “prompt disclosure of expenditures,” which “provide[s]” political opponents “with the information needed” to intimidate and retaliate against their foes. *Ante*, at 916. Thus, “disclosure permits citizens ... to react to the speech of [their political opponents] in a proper”—or undeniably *improper*—“way” long before a plaintiff could prevail on an as-applied challenge.² *Ibid.*

*485 I cannot endorse a view of the First Amendment that subjects citizens of this Nation to death threats, ruined careers, damaged or defaced property, or preemptive and threatening warning letters as the price for engaging in “core political speech, the ‘primary object of First Amendment protection.’ ” *McConnell*, 540 U.S., at 264, 124 S.Ct. 619 (THOMAS, J., concurring in part, concurring in judgment in part, and dissenting in part) (quoting *Nixon v. Shrink Missouri Government PAC*, 528 U.S. 377, 410–411, 120 S.Ct. 897, 145 L.Ed.2d 886 (2000) (THOMAS, J., dissenting)). Accordingly, I respectfully dissent from the Court’s judgment upholding BCRA §§ 201 and 311.

All Citations

10,166, 10 Cal. Daily Op. Serv. 776, 2010 Daily Journal
D.A.R. 949, 22 Fla. L. Weekly Fed. S 73

558 U.S. 310, 130 S.Ct. 876, 175 L.Ed.2d 753, 187
L.R.R.M. (BNA) 2961, 78 USLW 4078, 159 Lab.Cas. P

Footnotes

* The syllabus constitutes no part of the opinion of the Court but has been prepared by the Reporter of Decisions for the convenience of the reader. See *United States v. Detroit Timber & Lumber Co.*, 200 U.S. 321, 337, 26 S.Ct. 282, 50 L.Ed. 499.

1 The dissent suggests that I am "much too quick" to reach this conclusion because I "ignore" Citizens United's narrower arguments. *Post*, at 936, n. 12. But in fact I do not ignore those arguments; on the contrary, I (and my colleagues in the majority) appropriately consider and reject them on their merits, before addressing Citizens United's broader claims. *Supra*, at 918 – 919; *ante*, at 888 – 892.

2 See also, e.g., R. Hasen, The Supreme Court and Election Law: Judging Equality from *Baker v. Carr* to *Bush v. Gore* 114 (2003) ("*Austin* represents the first and only case [before *McConnell*] in which a majority of the Court accepted, in deed if not in word, the equality rationale as a permissible state interest"); Strauss, *Corruption, Equality, and Campaign Finance Reform*, 94 *Colum. L.Rev.* 1369, 1369, and n. 1 (1994) (noting that *Austin*'s rationale was based on equalizing political speech); Ashdown, *Controlling Campaign Spending and the "New Corruption": Waiting for the Court*, 44 *Vand. L.Rev.* 767, 781 (1991); Eule, *Promoting Speaker Diversity: Austin and Metro Broadcasting*, 1990 S.Ct. Rev. 105, 108–111.

1 Justice THOMAS does not join Part IV of the Court's opinion.

2 The dissent protests that 1791 rather than 1800 should be the relevant date, and that "[m]ore than half of the century's total business charters were issued between 1796 and 1800." *Post*, at 949, n. 53. I used 1800 only because the dissent did. But in any case, it is surely fanciful to think that a consensus of hostility towards corporations was transformed into general favor at some magical moment between 1791 and 1796.

3 "[P]eople in 1800 identified corporations with franchised monopolies." L. Friedman, *A History of American Law* 194 (2d ed.1985) (hereinafter Friedman). "The chief cause for the changed popular attitude towards business corporations that marked the opening of the nineteenth century was the elimination of their inherent monopolistic character. This was accomplished primarily by an extension of the principle of free incorporation under general laws." 1 *W. Fletcher, Cyclopedia of the Law of Corporations* § 2, p. 8 (rev. ed.2006).

4 At times (though not always) the dissent seems to exclude such non-"business corporations" from its denial of free speech rights. See *post*, at 949 – 950. Finding in a seemingly categorical text a distinction between the rights of business corporations and the rights of non-business corporations is even more imaginative than finding a distinction between the rights of *all* corporations and the rights of other associations.

5 The best the dissent can come up with is that "[p]ostratification practice" supports its reading of the First Amendment. *Post*, at 951, n. 56. For this proposition, the dissent cites Justice White's statement (in dissent) that "[t]he common law was generally interpreted as prohibiting corporate political participation," *First Nat. Bank of Boston v. Bellotti*, 435 U.S. 765, 819, 98 S.Ct. 1407, 55 L.Ed.2d 707 (1978). The sole authority Justice White cited for this proposition, *id.*, at 819, n. 14, 98 S.Ct. 1407, was a law-review note that made no such claim. To the contrary, it stated that the cases dealing with the propriety of corporate political expenditures were "few." Note, *Corporate Political Affairs Programs*, 70 *Yale L. J.* 821, 852 (1961). More specifically, the note cites only two holdings to that effect, one by a Federal District Court, and one by the Supreme Court of Montana. *Id.*, at 852, n. 197. Of course even if the common law was "generally interpreted" to prohibit corporate political expenditures as ultra vires, that would have nothing to do with whether political expenditures that were authorized by a corporation's charter could constitutionally be suppressed.

As additional "[p]ostratification practice," the dissent notes that the Court "did not recognize any First Amendment protections for corporations until the middle part of the 20th century." *Post*, at 951, n. 56. But it did that in *Grosjean v. American Press Co.*, 297 U.S. 233, 56 S.Ct. 444, 80 L.Ed. 660 (1936), a case involving freedom of the press—which the dissent acknowledges *did* cover corporations from the outset. The relative recency of that first case is unsurprising. All of our First Amendment jurisprudence was slow to develop. We did not consider application of the First Amendment to speech restrictions other than prior restraints until 1919, see *Schenck v. United States*, 249 U.S. 47, 39 S.Ct. 247, 63 L.Ed. 470 (1919); we did not invalidate a state law on First Amendment grounds until 1931, see *Stromberg v. California*, 283 U.S. 359, 51 S.Ct. 532, 75 L.Ed. 1117 (1931), and a federal law until 1965, see *Lamont v. Postmaster General*, 381 U.S. 301, 85 S.Ct. 1493, 14 L.Ed.2d 398 (1965).

6 The dissent seeks to avoid this conclusion (and to turn a liability into an asset) by interpreting the Freedom of the Press Clause to refer to the institutional press (thus demonstrating, according to the dissent, that the Founders "did draw distinctions—explicit distinctions—between types of 'speakers,' or speech outlets or forms"). *Post*, at 951 – 952 and n. 57. It is passing strange to interpret the phrase "the freedom of speech, or of the press" to mean, not everyone's right to speak or publish, but rather everyone's right to speak or the institutional press's right to publish. No one thought that is what it meant. Patriot Noah Webster's 1828 dictionary contains, under the word "press," the following entry:

"*Liberty of the press*, in civil policy, is the free right of publishing books, pamphlets, or papers without previous restraint; or the unrestrained right which every citizen enjoys of publishing his thoughts and opinions, subject only to punishment for publishing what is pernicious to morals or to the peace of the state." 2 American Dictionary of the English Language (1828) (reprinted 1970).

As the Court's opinion describes, *ante*, at 905 – 906, our jurisprudence agrees with Noah Webster and contradicts the dissent.

"The liberty of the press is not confined to newspapers and periodicals. It necessarily embraces pamphlets and leaflets.... The press in its historical connotation comprehends every sort of publication which affords a vehicle of information and opinion." *Lovell v. City of Griffin*, 303 U.S. 444, 452, 58 S.Ct. 666, 82 L.Ed. 949 (1938).

7 The dissent says that "'speech'" refers to oral communications of human beings, and since corporations are not human beings they cannot speak. *Post*, at 950, n. 55. This is sophistry. The authorized spokesman of a corporation is a human being, who speaks on behalf of the human beings who have formed that association—just as the spokesman of an unincorporated association speaks on behalf of its members. The power to publish thoughts, no less than the power to speak thoughts, belongs only to human beings, but the dissent sees no problem with a corporation's enjoying the freedom of the press.

The same footnote asserts that "it has been 'claimed that the notion of institutional speech ... did not exist in post-revolutionary America.'" This is quoted from a law-review article by a Bigelow Fellow at the University of Chicago (Fagundes, *State Actors as First Amendment Speakers*, 100 Nw. U.L.Rev. 1637, 1654 (2006)), which offers as the sole support for its statement a treatise dealing with government speech, M. Yudof, *When Government Speaks* 42–50 (1983). The cited pages of that treatise provide no support whatever for the statement—unless, as seems overwhelmingly likely, the "institutional speech" referred to was speech by the subject of the law-review article, governmental institutions.

The other authority cited in the footnote, a law-review article by a professor at Washington and Lee Law School, Bezanson, *Institutional Speech*, 80 Iowa L.Rev. 735, 775 (1995), in fact contradicts the dissent, in that it would accord free-speech protection to associations.

1 Specifically, Part I, *infra*, at 931 – 938, addresses the procedural history of the case and the narrower grounds of decision the majority has bypassed. Part II, *infra*, at 938 – 942, addresses *stare decisis*. Part III, *infra*, at 942 – 961, addresses the Court's assumptions that BCRA "bans" corporate speech, that identity-based distinctions may not be drawn in the political realm, and that *Austin* and *McConnell* were outliers in our First Amendment tradition. Part IV, *infra*, at 961 – 979, addresses the Court's treatment of the anticorruption, antidistortion, and shareholder protection rationales for regulating corporate electioneering.

2 See *Yee v. Escondido*, 503 U.S. 519, 535, 112 S.Ct. 1522, 118 L.Ed.2d 153 (1992) ("[U]nder this Court's Rule 14.1(a), only questions set forth in the petition, or fairly included therein, will be considered by the Court" (internal quotation marks and alteration omitted)); *Wood v. Allen*, 558 U.S. 290, 130 S.Ct. 841, 175 L.Ed.2d 738, 2010 WL 173369 *5 ("[T]he fact that petitioner discussed [an] issue in the text of his petition for certiorari does not bring it before us. Rule 14.1(a) requires that a subsidiary question be fairly included in the *question presented* for our review" (internal quotation marks and brackets omitted)); *Cooper Industries, Inc. v. Aviall Services, Inc.*, 543 U.S. 157, 168–169, 125 S.Ct. 577, 160 L.Ed.2d 548 (2004) ("We ordinarily do not decide in the first instance issues not decided below" (internal quotation marks omitted)).

3 The majority states that, in denying Citizens United's motion for a preliminary injunction, the District Court "addressed" the facial validity of BCRA § 203. *Ante*, at 892 – 893. That is true, in the narrow sense that the court observed the issue was foreclosed by *McConnell v. FEC*, 540 U.S. 93, 124 S.Ct. 619, 157 L.Ed.2d 491 (2003). See 530 F.Supp.2d 274, 278 (D.D.C.2008) (*per curiam*). Yet as explained above, Citizens United subsequently dismissed its facial challenge, so that by the time the District Court granted the Federal Election Commission's (FEC) motion for summary judgment, App. 261a–262a, any question about statutory validity had dropped out of the case. That latter ruling by the District Court was the "final decision" from which Citizens United appealed to this Court under BCRA § 403(a)(3). As regards the lower court decision that has come before us, the claim that § 203 is facially unconstitutional was neither pressed nor passed upon in any form.

130 S.Ct. 876, 187 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 2961, 175 L.Ed.2d 753, 78 USLW 4078...

- 4 Shortly before Citizens United mooted the issue by abandoning its facial challenge, the Government advised the District Court that it "require[d] time to develop a factual record regarding [the] facial challenge." 1:07-cv-2240-RCL-RWR, Docket Entry No. 47, p. 4 (Mar. 26, 2008). By reinstating a claim that Citizens United abandoned, the Court gives it a perverse litigating advantage over its adversary, which was deprived of the opportunity to gather and present information necessary to its rebuttal.
- 5 In fact, we do not even have a good evidentiary record of how § 203 has been affecting Citizens United, which never submitted to the District Court the details of *Hillary's* funding or its own finances. We likewise have no evidence of how § 203 and comparable state laws were expected to affect corporations and unions in the future.
- It is true, as the majority points out, that the *McConnell* Court evaluated the facial validity of § 203 in light of an extensive record. See *ante*, at 893 – 894. But that record is not before us in this case. And in any event, the majority's argument for striking down § 203 depends on its contention that the statute has proved too "chilling" in practice—and in particular on the contention that the controlling opinion in *WRTL*, 551 U.S. 449, 127 S.Ct. 2652, 168 L.Ed.2d 329 (2007), failed to bring sufficient clarity and "breathing space" to this area of law. See *ante*, at 892, 894 – 897. We have no record with which to assess that claim. The Court complains at length about the burdens of complying with § 203, but we have no meaningful evidence to show how regulated corporations and unions have experienced its restrictions.
- 6 Our cases recognize a "type of facial challenge in the First Amendment context under which a law may be overturned as impermissibly overbroad because a substantial number of its applications are unconstitutional." *Washington State Grange v. Washington State Republican Party*, 552 U.S. 442, 449, n. 6, 128 S.Ct. 1184, 170 L.Ed.2d 151 (2008) (internal quotation marks omitted). Citizens United has not made an overbreadth argument, and "[w]e generally do not apply the strong medicine of overbreadth analysis where the parties fail to describe the instances of arguable overbreadth of the contested law," *ibid.* (internal quotation marks omitted). If our colleagues nonetheless concluded that § 203's fatal flaw is that it affects too much protected speech, they should have invalidated it for overbreadth and given guidance as to which applications are permissible, so that Congress could go about repairing the error.
- 7 Also perplexing is the majority's attempt to pass blame to the Government for its litigating position. By "hold[ing] out the possibility of ruling for Citizens United on a narrow ground yet refrain[ing] from adopting that position," the majority says, the Government has caused "added uncertainty [that] demonstrates the necessity to address the question of statutory validity." *Ante*, at 895. Our colleagues have apparently never heard of an alternative argument. Like every litigant, the Government would prefer to win its case outright; failing that, it would prefer to lose on a narrow ground. The fact that there are numerous different ways this case could be decided, and that the Government acknowledges as much, does not demonstrate anything about the propriety of a facial ruling.
- 8 The majority's "chilling" argument is particularly inapposite with respect to 2 U.S.C. § 441b's longstanding restriction on the use of corporate general treasury funds for express advocacy. If there was ever any significant uncertainty about what counts as the functional equivalent of express advocacy, there has been little doubt about what counts as express advocacy since the "magic words" test of *Buckley v. Valeo*, 424 U.S. 1, 44, n. 52, 96 S.Ct. 612, 46 L.Ed.2d 659 (1976) (*per curiam*). Yet even though Citizens United's briefs never once mention § 441b's restriction on express advocacy; even though this restriction does not generate chilling concerns; and even though no one has suggested that *Hillary* counts as express advocacy; the majority nonetheless reaches out to opine that this statutory provision is "invalid" as well. *Ante*, at 913.
- 9 The majority adds that the distinction between facial and as-applied challenges does not have "some automatic effect" that mechanically controls the judicial task. *Ante*, at 893. I agree, but it does not follow that in any given case we should ignore the distinction, much less invert it.
- 10 Professor Fallon proposes an intricate answer to this question that the majority ignores. Fallon 1327–1359. It bears mention that our colleagues have previously cited Professor Fallon's article for the exact opposite point from the one they wish to make today. In *Gonzales v. Carhart*, 550 U.S. 124, 127 S.Ct. 1610, 167 L.Ed.2d 480 (2007), the Court explained that "[i]t is neither our obligation nor within our traditional institutional role to resolve questions of constitutionality with respect to each potential situation that might develop," and "[f]or this reason, '[a]s-applied challenges are the basic building blocks of constitutional adjudication.'" *Id.*, at 168, 127 S.Ct. 1610 (opinion for the Court by KENNEDY, J.) (quoting Fallon 1328 (second alteration in original)).
- 11 Internal Revenue Code section 501(c)(4) applies, *inter alia*, to nonprofit organizations "operated exclusively for the promotion of social welfare, ... the net earnings of which are devoted exclusively to charitable, educational, or recreational purposes."
- 12 THE CHIEF JUSTICE is therefore much too quick when he suggests that, "[e]ven if considered in as-applied terms, a holding in this case that the Act may not be applied to Citizens United—because corporations as well as individuals enjoy

the pertinent First Amendment rights—would mean that any other corporation raising the same challenge would also win." *Ante*, at 919 (concurring opinion). That conclusion would only follow if the Court were to ignore Citizens United's plausible as-applied arguments and instead take the implausible position that *all* corporations and *all* types of expenditures enjoy the same First Amendment protections, which *always* trump the interests in regulation. At times, the majority appears to endorse this extreme view. At other times, however, it appears to suggest that nonprofit corporations have a better claim to First Amendment protection than for-profit corporations, see *ante*, at 897, 907, "advocacy" organizations have a better claim than other nonprofits, *ante*, at 897, domestic corporations have a better claim than foreign corporations, *ante*, at 911 – 912, small corporations have a better claim than large corporations, *ante*, at 906 – 908, and printed matter has a better claim than broadcast communications, *ante*, at 904. The majority never uses a multinational business corporation in its hypotheticals.

- 13 The Court entirely ignores this statutory argument. It concludes that § 203 applies to *Hillary* on the basis of the film's content, *ante*, at 889 – 890, without considering the possibility that § 203 does not apply to video-on-demand transmissions generally.
- 14 See *Colorado Right to Life Comm., Inc. v. Coffman*, 498 F.3d 1137, 1148 (C.A.10 2007) (adopting this rule and noting that "every other circuit to have addressed this issue" has done likewise); Brief for Independent Sector as *Amicus Curiae* 10–11 (collecting cases). The Court rejects this solution in part because the Government "merely suggest[s] it" and "does not say that it agrees with the interpretation." *Ante*, at 892. Our colleagues would thus punish a defendant for showing insufficient excitement about a ground it has advanced, at the same time that they decide the case on a ground the plaintiff expressly abandoned. The Court also protests that a *de minimis* standard would "requir[e] intricate case-by-case determinations." *Ante*, at 892. But *de minimis* tests need not be intricate at all. A test that granted MCFL status to § 501(c)(4) organizations if they received less than a fixed dollar amount of business donations in the previous year, or if such donations represent less than a fixed percentage of their total assets, would be perfectly easy to understand and administer.
- 15 Another bypassed ground, not briefed by the parties, would have been to revive the Snow–Jeffords Amendment in BCRA § 203(c), allowing certain nonprofit corporations to pay for electioneering communications with general treasury funds, to the extent they can trace the payments to individual contributions. See Brief for National Rifle Association as *Amicus Curiae* 5–15 (arguing forcefully that Congress intended this result).
- 16 THE CHIEF JUSTICE finds our discussion of these narrower solutions "quite perplexing" because we suggest that the Court should "latch on to one of them in order to avoid reaching the broader constitutional question," without doing the same ourselves. *Ante*, at 918 – 919. There is nothing perplexing about the matter, because we are not similarly situated to our colleagues in the majority. We do not share their view of the First Amendment. Our reading of the Constitution would not lead us to strike down any statutes or overturn any precedents in this case, and we therefore have no occasion to practice constitutional avoidance or to vindicate Citizens United's as-applied challenge. Each of the arguments made above is surely at least as strong as the statutory argument the Court accepted in last year's Voting Rights Act case, *Northwest Austin Municipal Util. Dist. No. One v. Holder*, 557 U.S. 193, 129 S.Ct. 2504, 174 L.Ed.2d 140 (2009).
- 17 I will have more to say shortly about the merits—about why *Austin* and *McConnell* are not doctrinal outliers, as the Court contends, and why their logic is not only defensible but also compelling. For present purposes, I limit the discussion to *stare-decisus*-specific considerations.
- 18 THE CHIEF JUSTICE suggests that *Austin* has been undermined by subsequent dissenting opinions. *Ante*, at 934. Under this view, it appears that the more times the Court stands by a precedent in the face of requests to overrule it, the weaker that precedent becomes. THE CHIEF JUSTICE further suggests that *Austin* "is uniquely destabilizing because it threatens to subvert our Court's decisions even outside" its particular facts, as when we applied its reasoning in *McConnell*. *Ante*, at 922. Once again, the theory seems to be that the more we utilize a precedent, the more we call it into question. For those who believe *Austin* was correctly decided—as the Federal Government and the States have long believed, as the majority of Justices to have served on the Court since *Austin* have believed, and as we continue to believe—there is nothing "destabilizing" about the prospect of its continued application. It is gutting campaign finance laws across the country, as the Court does today, that will be destabilizing.
- 19 Additionally, the majority cites some recent scholarship challenging the historical account of campaign finance law given in *United States v. Automobile Workers*, 352 U.S. 567, 77 S.Ct. 529, 1 L.Ed.2d 563 (1957). *Ante*, at 912. *Austin* did not so much as allude to this historical account, much less rely on it. Even if the scholarship cited by the majority is correct that certain campaign finance reforms were less deliberate or less benignly motivated than *Automobile Workers* suggested, the point remains that this body of law has played a significant and broadly accepted role in American political life for decades upon decades.

- 20 See Brief for State of Montana et al. as *Amici Curiae* 5–13; see also Supp. Brief for Senator John McCain et al. as *Amici Curiae* 1a–8a (listing 24 States that presently limit or prohibit independent electioneering expenditures from corporate general treasuries).
- 21 Magleby, *The Importance of the Record in McConnell v. FEC*, 3 Election L. J. 285 (2004).
- 22 To be sure, the majority may respond that Congress can correct the imbalance by removing BCRA's soft-money limits. Cf. Tr. of Oral Arg. 24 (Sept. 9, 2009) (query of KENNEDY, J.). But this is no response to any legislature that takes campaign finance regulation seriously. It merely illustrates the breadth of the majority's deregulatory vision.
- 23 See Brief for Committee for Economic Development as *Amicus Curiae*; Brief for American Independent Business Alliance as *Amicus Curiae*. But see Supp. Brief for Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America as *Amicus Curiae*.
- 24 See Brief for American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations as *Amicus Curiae* 3, 9.
- 25 See Brief for Independent Sector as *Amicus Curiae* 16–20.
- 26 See Brief for State of Montana et al. as *Amici Curiae*.
- 27 The FEC established this process following the Court's June 2007 decision in that case, 551 U.S. 449, 127 S.Ct. 2652, 168 L.Ed.2d 329. In the brief interval between the establishment of this process and the 2008 election, corporations and unions used it to make \$108.5 million in electioneering communications. Supp. Brief for Appellee 22–23; FEC, *Electioneering Communication Summary*, online at <http://fec.gov/finance/disclosure/ECSummary.shtml> (all Internet materials as visited Jan. 18, 2010, and available in Clerk of Court's case file).
- 28 Concededly, *Austin* and *McConnell* were constitutional decisions, and we have often said that "claims of *stare decisis* are at the weakest in that field, where our mistakes cannot be corrected by Congress." *Vieth v. Jubelirer*, 541 U.S. 267, 305, 124 S.Ct. 1769, 158 L.Ed.2d 546 (2004) (plurality opinion). As a general matter, this principle is a sound one. But the principle only takes on real force when an earlier ruling has obstructed the normal democratic process; it is the fear of making "mistakes [that] cannot be corrected by Congress," *ibid.*, that motivates us to review constitutional precedents with a more critical eye. *Austin* and *McConnell* did not obstruct state or congressional legislative power in any way. Although it is unclear how high a bar today's decision will pose to future attempts to regulate corporate electioneering, it will clearly restrain much legislative action.
- 29 See FEC, *Number of Federal PAC's Increases*, <http://fec.gov/press/press2008/20080812paccount.shtml>.
- 30 See Supp. Brief for Appellee 16 (citing FEC statistics placing this figure at \$840 million). The majority finds the PAC option inadequate in part because "[a] PAC is a separate association from the corporation." *Ante*, at 897. The formal "separateness" of PACs from their host corporations—which administer and control the PACs but which cannot funnel general treasury funds into them or force members to support them—is, of course, the whole point of the PAC mechanism.
- 31 Roaming far afield from the case at hand, the majority worries that the Government will use § 203 to ban books, pamphlets, and blogs. *Ante*, at 896, 904, 912 – 913. Yet by its plain terms, § 203 does not apply to printed material. See 2 U.S.C. § 434(f)(3)(A)(i); see also 11 CFR § 100.29(c)(1) ("[E]lectioneering communication does not include communications appearing in print media"). And in light of the ordinary understanding of the terms "broadcast, cable, [and] satellite," § 434(f)(3)(A)(i), coupled with Congress' clear aim of targeting "a virtual torrent of televised election-related ads," *McConnell*, 540 U.S., at 207, 124 S.Ct. 619, we highly doubt that § 203 could be interpreted to apply to a Web site or book that happens to be transmitted at some stage over airwaves or cable lines, or that the FEC would ever try to do so. See 11 CFR § 100.26 (exempting most Internet communications from regulation as advertising); § 100.155 (exempting uncompensated Internet activity from regulation as an expenditure); Supp. Brief for Center for Independent Media et al. as *Amici Curiae* 14 (explaining that "the FEC has consistently construed [BCRA's] media exemption to apply to a variety of non-traditional media"). If it should, the Government acknowledges "there would be quite [a] good as-applied challenge." Tr. of Oral Arg. 65 (Sept. 9, 2009).
- 32 As the Government points out, with a media corporation there is also a lesser risk that investors will not understand, learn about, or support the advocacy messages that the corporation disseminates. Supp. Reply Brief for Appellee 10. Everyone knows and expects that media outlets may seek to influence elections in this way.
- 33 2 U.S.C. § 434(f)(3)(A)(i).
- 34 § 434(f)(3)(C).
- 35 § 434(f)(3)(A)(i)(II).
- 36 § 441b(b); *McConnell*, 540 U.S., at 211, 124 S.Ct. 619.
- 37 § 441b(b)(2)(C).
- 38 *WRTL*, 551 U.S. 449, 470, 127 S.Ct. 2652, 168 L.Ed.2d 329 (2007) (opinion of Roberts, C.J.).

130 S.Ct. 876, 187 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 2961, 175 L.Ed.2d 753, 78 USLW 4078...

- 39 It is likewise nonsense to suggest that the FEC's "business is to censor." *Ante*, at 896 (quoting *Freedman v. Maryland*, 380 U.S. 51, 57, 85 S.Ct. 734, 13 L.Ed.2d 649 (1965)). The FEC's business is to administer and enforce the campaign finance laws. The regulatory body at issue in *Freedman* was a state Board of Censors that had virtually unfettered discretion to bar distribution of motion picture films it deemed not to be "moral and proper." See *id.*, at 52–53, and n. 2, 85 S.Ct. 734. No movie could be shown in the State of Maryland that was not first approved and licensed by the Board of Censors. *Id.*, at 52, n. 1, 85 S.Ct. 734. It is an understatement to say that *Freedman* is not on point, and the majority's characterization of the FEC is deeply disconcerting.
- 40 Citizens United has administered this PAC for over a decade. See Defendant FEC's Memorandum in Opposition to Plaintiff's Second Motion for Preliminary Injunction in No. 07–2240 (ARR, RCL, RWR) (DC), p. 20. Citizens United also operates multiple "527" organizations that engage in partisan political activity. See Defendant FEC's Statement of Material Facts as to Which There Is No Genuine Dispute in No. 07–2240(DC), ¶¶ 22–24.
- 41 See, e.g., *Bethel School Dist. No. 403 v. Fraser*, 478 U.S. 675, 682, 106 S.Ct. 3159, 92 L.Ed.2d 549 (1986) ("[T]he constitutional rights of students in public school are not automatically coextensive with the rights of adults in other settings").
- 42 See, e.g., *Jones v. North Carolina Prisoners' Labor Union, Inc.*, 433 U.S. 119, 129, 97 S.Ct. 2532, 53 L.Ed.2d 629 (1977) ("In a prison context, an inmate does not retain those First Amendment rights that are inconsistent with his status as a prisoner or with the legitimate penological objectives of the corrections system" (internal quotation marks omitted)).
- 43 See, e.g., *Parker v. Levy*, 417 U.S. 733, 758, 94 S.Ct. 2547, 41 L.Ed.2d 439 (1974) ("While the members of the military are not excluded from the protection granted by the First Amendment, the different character of the military community and of the military mission requires a different application of those protections").
- 44 See, e.g., 2 U.S.C. § 441e(a)(1) (foreign nationals may not directly or indirectly make contributions or independent expenditures in connection with a U.S. election).
- 45 See, e.g., *Civil Service Comm'n v. Letter Carriers*, 413 U.S. 548, 93 S.Ct. 2880, 37 L.Ed.2d 796 (1973) (upholding statute prohibiting Executive Branch employees from taking "any active part in political management or in political campaigns" (internal quotation marks omitted)); *Public Workers v. Mitchell*, 330 U.S. 75, 67 S.Ct. 556, 91 L.Ed. 754 (1947) (same); *United States v. Wurzbach*, 280 U.S. 396, 50 S.Ct. 167, 74 L.Ed. 508 (1930) (upholding statute prohibiting federal employees from making contributions to Members of Congress for "any political purpose whatever" (internal quotation marks omitted)); *Ex parte Curtis*, 106 U.S. 371, 1 S.Ct. 381, 27 L.Ed. 232 (1882) (upholding statute prohibiting certain federal employees from giving money to other employees for political purposes).
- 46 The majority states that the cases just cited are "inapposite" because they "stand only for the proposition that there are certain governmental functions that cannot operate without some restrictions on particular kinds of speech." *Ante*, at 899. The majority's creative suggestion that these cases stand only for that one proposition is quite implausible. In any event, the proposition lies at the heart of this case, as Congress and half the state legislatures have concluded, over many decades, that their core functions of administering elections and passing legislation cannot operate effectively without some narrow restrictions on corporate electioneering paid for by general treasury funds.
- 47 Outside of the law, of course, it is a commonplace that the identity and incentives of the speaker might be relevant to an assessment of his speech. See Aristotle, *Poetics* 43–44 (M. Heath transl. 1996) ("In evaluating any utterance or action, one must take into account not just the moral qualities of what is actually done or said, but also the identity of the agent or speaker, the addressee, the occasion, the means, and the motive"). The insight that the identity of speakers is a proper subject of regulatory concern, it bears noting, motivates the disclaimer and disclosure provisions that the Court today upholds.
- 48 I dissented in *Forbes* because the broadcaster's decision to exclude the respondent from its debate was done "on the basis of entirely subjective, ad hoc judgments," 523 U.S., at 690, 118 S.Ct. 1633, that suggested anticompetitive viewpoint discrimination, *id.*, at 693–694, 118 S.Ct. 1633, and lacked a compelling justification. Needless to say, my concerns do not apply to the instant case.
- 49 The law at issue in *Burson* was far from unusual. "[A]ll 50 States," the Court observed, "limit access to the areas in or around polling places." 504 U.S., at 206, 112 S.Ct. 1846; see also Note, 91 Ky. L. J. 715, 729, n. 89, 747–769 (2003) (collecting statutes). I dissented in *Burson* because the evidence adduced to justify Tennessee's law was "exceptionally thin," 504 U.S., at 219, 112 S.Ct. 1846, and "the reason for [the] restriction [had] disappear[ed]" over time, *id.*, at 223, 112 S.Ct. 1846. "In short," I concluded, "Tennessee ha[d] failed to point to any legitimate interest that would justify its selective regulation of campaign-related expression." *Id.*, at 225, 112 S.Ct. 1846. These criticisms are inapplicable to the case before us.

- 50 They are likewise entitled to regulate media corporations differently from other corporations "to ensure that the law 'does not hinder or prevent the institutional press from reporting on, and publishing editorials about, newsworthy events.'" *McCormell*, 540 U.S., at 208, 124 S.Ct. 619 (quoting *Austin v. Michigan Chamber of Commerce*, 494 U.S. 652, 668, 110 S.Ct. 1391, 108 L.Ed.2d 652 (1990)).
- 51 The Court all but confesses that a categorical approach to speaker identity is untenable when it acknowledges that Congress might be allowed to take measures aimed at "preventing foreign individuals or associations from influencing our Nation's political process." *Ante*, at 911. Such measures have been a part of U.S. campaign finance law for many years. The notion that Congress might lack the authority to distinguish foreigners from citizens in the regulation of electioneering would certainly have surprised the Framers, whose "obsession with foreign influence derived from a fear that foreign powers and individuals had no basic investment in the well-being of the country." Teachout, *The Anti-Corruption Principle*, 94 *Cornell L.Rev.* 341, 393, n. 245 (2009) (hereinafter Teachout); see also U.S. Const., Art. I, § 9, cl. 8 ("[N]o Person holding any Office of Profit or Trust ... shall, without the Consent of the Congress, accept of any present, Emolument, Office, or Title, of any kind whatever, from any King, Prince, or foreign State"). Professor Teachout observes that a corporation might be analogized to a foreign power in this respect, "inasmuch as its legal loyalties necessarily exclude patriotism." Teachout 393, n. 245.
- 52 See A. Bickel, *The Supreme Court and the Idea of Progress* 59–60 (1978); A. Meiklejohn, *Political Freedom: The Constitutional Powers of the People* 39–40 (1965); Tokaji, *First Amendment Equal Protection: On Discretion, Inequality, and Participation*, 101 *Mich. L.Rev.* 2409, 2508–2509 (2003). Of course, voting is not speech in a pure or formal sense, but then again neither is a campaign expenditure; both are nevertheless communicative acts aimed at influencing electoral outcomes. Cf. Strauss, *Corruption, Equality, and Campaign Finance Reform*, 94 *Colum. L.Rev.* 1369, 1383–1384 (1994) (hereinafter Strauss).
- 53 Scholars have found that only a handful of business corporations were issued charters during the colonial period, and only a few hundred during all of the 18th century. See E. Dodd, *American Business Corporations Until 1860*, p. 197 (1954); L. Friedman, *A History of American Law* 188–189 (2d ed. 1985); Baldwin, *American Business Corporations Before 1789*, 8 *Am. Hist. Rev.* 449, 450–459 (1903). Justice SCALIA quibbles with these figures; whereas we say that "a few hundred" charters were issued to business corporations during the 18th century, he says that the number is "approximately 335." *Ante*, at 925 (concurring opinion). Justice SCALIA also raises the more serious point that it is improper to assess these figures by today's standards, *ante*, at 926, though I believe he fails to substantiate his claim that "the corporation was a familiar figure in American economic life" by the century's end, *ibid.* (internal quotation marks omitted). His formulation of that claim is also misleading, because the relevant reference point is not 1800 but the date of the First Amendment's ratification, in 1791. And at that time, the number of business charters must have been significantly smaller than 335, because the pace of chartering only began to pick up steam in the last decade of the 18th century. More than half of the century's total business charters were issued between 1796 and 1800. Friedman, *History of American Law*, at 189.
- 54 See Letter from Thomas Jefferson to Tom Logan (Nov. 12, 1816), in 12 *The Works of Thomas Jefferson* 42, 44 (P. Ford ed. 1905) ("I hope we shall ... crush in [its] birth the aristocracy of our monied corporations which dare already to challenge our government to a trial of strength and bid defiance to the laws of our country").
- 55 In normal usage then, as now, the term "speech" referred to oral communications by individuals. See, e.g., 2 S. Johnson, *Dictionary of the English Language 1853–1854* (4th ed. 1773) (reprinted 1978) (listing as primary definition of "speech": "The power of articulate utterance; the power of expressing thoughts by vocal words"); 2 N. Webster, *American Dictionary of the English Language* (1828) (reprinted 1970) (listing as primary definition of "speech": "The faculty of uttering articulate sounds or words, as in human beings; the faculty of expressing thoughts by words or articulate sounds. *Speech* was given to man by his Creator for the noblest purposes"). Indeed, it has been "claimed that the notion of institutional speech ... did not exist in post-revolutionary America." Fagundes, *State Actors as First Amendment Speakers*, 100 *Nw. U. L. Rev.* 1637, 1654 (2006); see also Bezanson, *Institutional Speech*, 80 *Iowa L. Rev.* 735, 775 (1995) ("In the intellectual heritage of the eighteenth century, the idea that free speech was individual and personal was deeply rooted and clearly manifest in the writings of Locke, Milton, and others on whom the framers of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights drew"). Given that corporations were conceived of as artificial entities and do not have the technical capacity to "speak," the burden of establishing that the Framers and ratifiers understood "the freedom of speech" to encompass corporate speech is, I believe, far heavier than the majority acknowledges.
- 56 Post-ratification practice bolsters the conclusion that the First Amendment, "as originally understood," *ante*, at 906, did not give corporations political speech rights on a par with the rights of individuals. Well into the modern era of general incorporation statutes, "[t]he common law was generally interpreted as prohibiting corporate political participation," *First Nat. Bank of Boston v. Bellotti*, 435 U.S. 765, 819, 98 S.Ct. 1407, 55 L.Ed.2d 707 (1978) (White, J., dissenting), and

130 S.Ct. 876, 187 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 2961, 175 L.Ed.2d 753, 78 USLW 4078...

this Court did not recognize *any* First Amendment protections for corporations until the middle part of the 20th century, see *ante*, at 899 – 900 (listing cases).

57 In fact, the Free Press Clause might be turned against Justice SCALIA, for two reasons. First, we learn from it that the drafters of the First Amendment did draw distinctions—explicit distinctions—between types of “speakers,” or speech outlets or forms. Second, the Court’s strongest historical evidence all relates to the Framers’ views on the press, see *ante*, at 906 – 907; *ante*, at 926 – 928 (SCALIA, J., concurring), yet while the Court tries to sweep this evidence into the Free Speech Clause, the Free Press Clause provides a more natural textual home. The text and history highlighted by our colleagues suggests why one type of corporation, those that are part of the press, might be able to claim special First Amendment status, and therefore why some kinds of “identity”-based distinctions might be permissible after all. Once one accepts that much, the intellectual edifice of the majority opinion crumbles.

58 Cf. L. Levy, *Legacy of Suppression: Freedom of Speech and Press in Early American History* 4 (1960) (“The meaning of no other clause of the Bill of Rights at the time of its framing and ratification has been so obscure to us” as the Free Speech and Press Clause).

59 As the majority notes, there is some academic debate about the precise origins of these developments. *Ante*, at 912; see also n. 19, *supra*. There is *always* some academic debate about such developments; the motives of legislatures are never entirely clear or unitary. Yet the basic shape and trajectory of 20th-century campaign finance reform are clear, and one need not take a naive or triumphalist view of this history to find it highly relevant. The Court’s skepticism does nothing to mitigate the absurdity of its claim that *Austin* and *McConnell* were outliers. Nor does it alter the fact that five Justices today destroy a longstanding American practice.

60 See *Pipefitters v. United States*, 407 U.S. 385, 409, 414–415, 92 S.Ct. 2247, 33 L.Ed.2d 11 (1972) (reading the statutory bar on corporate and union campaign spending not to apply to “the voluntary donations of employees,” when maintained in a separate account, because “[t]he dominant [legislative] concern in requiring that contributions be voluntary was, after all, to protect the dissenting stockholder or union member”); *Automobile Workers*, 352 U.S., at 592, 77 S.Ct. 529 (advising the District Court to consider on remand whether the broadcast in question was “paid for out of the general dues of the union membership or [whether] the funds [could] be fairly said to have obtained on a voluntary basis”); *United States v. CIO*, 335 U.S. 106, 123, 68 S.Ct. 1349, 92 L.Ed. 1849 (1948) (observing that “funds voluntarily contributed [by union members or corporate stockholders] for election purposes” might not be covered by the expenditure bar). Both the *Pipefitters* and the *Automobile Workers* Court approvingly referenced Congress’ goal of reducing “the effect of aggregated wealth on federal elections,” understood as wealth drawn from a corporate or union general treasury without the stockholders’ or members’ “free and knowing choice.” *Pipefitters*, 407 U.S., at 416, 92 S.Ct. 2247; see *Automobile Workers*, 352 U.S., at 582, 77 S.Ct. 529.

The two dissenters in *Pipefitters* would not have read the statutory provision in question, a successor to § 304 of the Taft–Hartley Act, to allow such robust use of corporate and union funds to finance otherwise prohibited electioneering. “This opening of the door to extensive corporate and union influence on the elective and legislative processes,” Justice Powell wrote, “must be viewed with genuine concern. This seems to me to be a regressive step as contrasted with the numerous legislative and judicial actions in recent years designed to assure that elections are indeed free and representative.” 407 U.S., at 450, 92 S.Ct. 2247 (opinion of Powell, J., joined by Burger, C.J.).

61 Specifically, these corporations had to meet three conditions. First, they had to be formed “for the express purpose of promoting political ideas,” so that their resources reflected political support rather than commercial success. *MCFL*, 479 U.S., at 264, 107 S.Ct. 616. Next, they had to have no shareholders, so that “persons connected with the organization will have no economic disincentive for disassociating with it if they disagree with its political activity.” *Ibid*. Finally, they could not be “established by a business corporation or a labor union,” nor “accept contributions from such entities,” lest they “serv[e] as conduits for the type of direct spending that creates a threat to the political marketplace.” *Ibid*.

62 According to THE CHIEF JUSTICE, we are “erroneou[s]” in claiming that *McConnell* and *Beaumont* “reaffirmed” *Austin*. *Ante*, at 919 – 920. In both cases, the Court explicitly relied on *Austin* and quoted from it at length. See 540 U.S., at 204–205, 124 S.Ct. 619, 539 U.S., at 153–155, 158, 160, 163, 123 S.Ct. 2200; see also *ante*, at 893 – 894 (“The holding and validity of *Austin* were essential to the reasoning of the *McConnell* majority opinion”); Brief for Appellants National Rifle Association et al., O.T. 2003, No. 02–1675, p. 21 (“*Beaumont* reaffirmed ... the *Austin* rationale for restricting expenditures”). The *McConnell* Court did so in the teeth of vigorous protests by Justices in today’s majority that *Austin* should be overruled. See *ante*, at 893 – 894 (citing relevant passages); see also *Beaumont*, 539 U.S., at 163–164, 123 S.Ct. 2200 (KENNEDY, J., concurring in judgment). Both Courts also heard criticisms of *Austin* from parties or *amici*. See Brief for Appellants Chamber of Commerce of the United States et al., O.T. 2003, No. 02–1756, p. 35, n. 22; Reply Brief for Appellants/Cross–Appellees Senator Mitch McConnell et al., O.T. 2003, No. 02–1674, pp. 13–14; Brief for Pacific

- Legal Foundation as *Amicus Curiae* in *FEC v. Beaumont*, O.T. 2002, No. 02–403, *passim*. If this does not qualify as reaffirmation of a precedent, then I do not know what would.
- 63 Cf. *Nixon v. Shrink Missouri Government PAC*, 528 U.S. 377, 389, 120 S.Ct. 897, 145 L.Ed.2d 886 (2000) (recognizing “the broader threat from politicians too compliant with the wishes of large contributors”). Though discrete in scope, these experiments must impose some meaningful limits if they are to have a chance at functioning effectively and preserving the public’s trust. “Even if it occurs only occasionally, the potential for such undue influence is manifest. And unlike straight cash-for-votes transactions, such corruption is neither easily detected nor practical to criminalize.” *McConnell*, 540 U.S., at 153, 124 S.Ct. 619. There should be nothing controversial about the proposition that the influence being targeted is “undue.” In a democracy, officeholders should not make public decisions with the aim of placating a financial benefactor, except to the extent that the benefactor is seen as representative of a larger constituency or its arguments are seen as especially persuasive.
- 64 The majority declares by fiat that the appearance of undue influence by high-spending corporations “will not cause the electorate to lose faith in our democracy.” *Ante*, at 910. The electorate itself has consistently indicated otherwise, both in opinion polls, see *McConnell v. FEC*, 251 F.Supp.2d 176, 557–558, 623–624 (D.D.C.2003) (opinion of Kollar-Kotelly, J.), and in the laws its representatives have passed, and our colleagues have no basis for elevating their own optimism into a tenet of constitutional law.
- 65 Quite distinct from the interest in preventing improper influences on the electoral process, I have long believed that “a number of [other] purposes, both legitimate and substantial, may justify the imposition of reasonable limitations on the expenditures permitted during the course of any single campaign.” *Davis v. FEC*, 554 U.S. 724, —, 128 S.Ct. 2759, 2779, 171 L.Ed.2d 737 (2008) (opinion concurring in part and dissenting in part). In my judgment, such limitations may be justified to the extent they are tailored to “improving the quality of the exposition of ideas” that voters receive, *ibid.*, “free[ing] candidates and their staffs from the interminable burden of fundraising,” *ibid.* (internal quotation marks omitted), and “protect[ing] equal access to the political arena,” *Randall v. Sorrell*, 548 U.S. 230, 278, 126 S.Ct. 2479, 165 L.Ed.2d 482 (2006) (STEVENS, J., dissenting) (internal quotation marks omitted). I continue to adhere to these beliefs, but they have not been briefed by the parties or *amici* in this case, and their soundness is immaterial to its proper disposition.
- 66 In fact, the notion that the “electioneering communications” covered by § 203 can breed *quid pro quo* corruption or the appearance of such corruption has only become more plausible since we decided *McConnell*. Recall that THE CHIEF JUSTICE’s controlling opinion in *WRTL* subsequently limited BCRA’s definition of “electioneering communications” to those that are “susceptible of no reasonable interpretation other than as an appeal to vote for or against a specific candidate.” 551 U.S., at 470, 127 S.Ct. 2652. The upshot was that after *WRTL*, a corporate or union expenditure could be regulated under § 203 only if everyone would understand it as an endorsement of or attack on a particular candidate for office. It does not take much imagination to perceive why this type of advocacy might be especially apt to look like or amount to a deal or a threat.
- 67 “We must give weight” and “due deference” to Congress’ efforts to dispel corruption, the Court states at one point. *Ante*, at 911. It is unclear to me what these maxims mean, but as applied by the Court they clearly do not entail “deference” in any normal sense of that term.
- 68 Justice BREYER has suggested that we strike the balance as follows: “We should defer to [the legislature’s] political judgment that unlimited spending threatens the integrity of the electoral process. But we should not defer in respect to whether its solution ... insulates legislators from effective electoral challenge.” *Shrink Missouri*, 528 U.S., at 403–404, 120 S.Ct. 897 (concurring opinion).
- 69 THE CHIEF JUSTICE denies this, *ante*, at 921 – 923, citing scholarship that has interpreted *Austin* to endorse an equality rationale, along with an article by Justice Thurgood Marshall’s former law clerk that states that Marshall, the author of *Austin*, accepted “equality of opportunity” and “equalizing access to the political process” as bases for campaign finance regulation, Garrett, *New Voices in Politics: Justice Marshall’s Jurisprudence on Law and Politics*, 52 *Howard L. J.* 655, 667–668 (2009) (internal quotation marks omitted). It is fair to say that *Austin* can bear an egalitarian reading, and I have no reason to doubt this characterization of Justice Marshall’s beliefs. But the fact that *Austin* can be read a certain way hardly proves THE CHIEF JUSTICE’s charge that there is nothing more to it. Many of our precedents can bear multiple readings, and many of our doctrines have some “equalizing” implications but do not rest on an equalizing theory: for example, our takings jurisprudence and numerous rules of criminal procedure. More important, the *Austin* Court expressly declined to rely on a speech-equalization rationale, see 494 U.S., at 660, 110 S.Ct. 1391, and we have never understood *Austin* to stand for such a rationale. Whatever his personal views, Justice Marshall simply did not write the opinion that THE CHIEF JUSTICE suggests he did; indeed, he “would have viewed it as irresponsible to write an opinion that boldly

- staked out a rationale based on equality that no one other than perhaps [Justice White would have even considered joining.](#)" [Garrett, 52 Howard L. J., at 674.](#)
- 70 In state elections, even domestic corporations may be "foreign"-controlled in the sense that they are incorporated in another jurisdiction and primarily owned and operated by out-of-state residents.
- 71 Regan, *Corporate Speech and Civic Virtue*, in *Debating Democracy's Discontent* 289, 302 (A. Allen & M. Regan eds. 1998) (hereinafter Regan).
- 72 Nothing in this analysis turns on whether the corporation is conceptualized as a grantee of a state concession, see, e.g., *Trustees of Dartmouth College v. Woodward*, 4 Wheat. 518, 636, 4 L.Ed. 629 (1819) (Marshall, C. J.), a nexus of explicit and implicit contracts, see, e.g., F. Easterbrook & D. Fischel, *The Economic Structure of Corporate Law* 12 (1991), a mediated hierarchy of stakeholders, see, e.g., Blair & Stout, *A Team Production Theory of Corporate Law*, 85 Va. L. Rev. 247 (1999) (hereinafter Blair & Stout), or any other recognized model. *Austin* referred to the structure and the advantages of corporations as "state-conferred" in several places, 494 U.S., at 660, 665, 667, 110 S.Ct. 1391, but its antidistortion argument relied only on the basic descriptive features of corporations, as sketched above. It is not necessary to agree on a precise theory of the corporation to agree that corporations differ from natural persons in fundamental ways, and that a legislature might therefore need to regulate them differently if it is human welfare that is the object of its concern. Cf. *Hansmann & Kraakman* 441, n. 5.
- 73 Not all corporations support BCRA § 203, of course, and not all corporations are large business entities or their tax-exempt adjuncts. Some nonprofit corporations are created for an ideological purpose. Some closely held corporations are strongly identified with a particular owner or founder. The fact that § 203, like the statute at issue in *Austin*, regulates some of these corporations' expenditures does not disturb the analysis above. See 494 U.S., at 661–665, 110 S.Ct. 1391. Small-business owners may speak in their own names, rather than the business', if they wish to evade § 203 altogether. Nonprofit corporations that want to make unrestricted electioneering expenditures may do so if they refuse donations from businesses and unions and permit members to disassociate without economic penalty. See *MCFL*, 479 U.S. 238, 264, 107 S.Ct. 616, 93 L.Ed.2d 539 (1986). Making it plain that their decision is not motivated by a concern about BCRA's coverage of nonprofits that have ideological missions but lack *MCFL* status, our colleagues refuse to apply the Snowe–Jeffords Amendment or the lower courts' *de minimis* exception to *MCFL*. See *ante*, at 891 – 892.
- 74 Of course, no presiding person in a courtroom, legislature, classroom, polling place, or family dinner would take this hyperbole literally.
- 75 Under the majority's view, the legislature is thus damned if it does and damned if it doesn't. If the legislature gives media corporations an exemption from electioneering regulations that apply to other corporations, it violates the newly minted First Amendment rule against identity-based distinctions. If the legislature does not give media corporations an exemption, it violates the First Amendment rights of the press. The only way out of this invented bind: no regulations whatsoever.
- 76 I note that, among the many other regulatory possibilities it has left open, ranging from new versions of § 203 supported by additional evidence of *quid pro quo* corruption or its appearance to any number of tax incentive or public financing schemes, today's decision does not require that a legislature rely solely on these mechanisms to protect shareholders. Legislatures remain free in their incorporation and tax laws to condition the types of activity in which corporations may engage, including electioneering activity, on specific disclosure requirements or on prior express approval by shareholders or members.
- 1 BCRA imposes similar disclosure requirements. See, e.g., 2 U.S.C. § 434(f)(2)(F) ("Every person who makes a disbursement for the direct costs of producing and airing electioneering communications in an aggregate amount in excess of \$10,000 during any calendar year" must disclose "the names and addresses of all contributors who contributed an aggregate amount of \$1,000 or more to the person making the disbursement").
- 2 But cf. *Hill v. Colorado*, 530 U.S. 703, 707–710, 120 S.Ct. 2480, 147 L.Ed.2d 597 (2000) (approving a statute restricting speech "within 100 feet" of abortion clinics because it protected women seeking an abortion from " 'sidewalk counseling,' " which "consists of efforts 'to educate, counsel, persuade, or inform passersby about abortion and abortion alternatives by means of verbal or written speech,' " and which "sometimes" involved "strong and abusive language in face-to-face encounters").

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Constitution of the State of Arizona (Refs & Annos)
Article VIII. Removal from Office
Part 1. Recall of Public Officers (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. Const. Art. 8 Pt. 1 § 1

§ 1. Officers subject to recall; petitioners

[Currentness](#)

Section 1. Every public officer in the state of Arizona, holding an elective office, either by election or appointment, is subject to recall from such office by the qualified electors of the electoral district from which candidates are elected to such office. Such electoral district may include the whole state. Such number of said electors as shall equal twenty-five per centum of the number of votes cast at the last preceding general election for all of the candidates for the office held by such officer, may by petition, which shall be known as a recall petition, demand his recall.

Credits

Amendment approved election Nov. 5, 1912, eff. Dec. 5, 1912.

A. R. S. Const Art. 8 Pt. 1 § 1, AZ CONST Art. 8 Pt. 1 § 1

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Constitution of the State of Arizona (Refs & Annos)
Article VIII. Removal from Office
Part 1. Recall of Public Officers (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. Const. Art. 8 Pt. 1 § 2

§ 2. Recall petitions; contents; filing; signatures; oath

[Currentness](#)

Section 2. Every recall petition must contain a general statement, in not more than two hundred words, of the grounds of such demand, and must be filed in the office in which petitions for nominations to the office held by the incumbent are required to be filed. The signatures to such recall petition need not all be on one sheet of paper, but each signer must add to his signature the date of his signing said petition, and his place of residence, giving his street and number, if any, should he reside in a town or city. One of the signers of each sheet of such petition, or the person circulating such sheet, must make and subscribe an oath on said sheet, that the signatures thereon are genuine.

A. R. S. Const Art. 8 Pt. 1 § 2, AZ CONST Art. 8 Pt. 1 § 2
Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Constitution of the State of Arizona (Refs & Annos)
Article VIII. Removal from Office
Part 1. Recall of Public Officers (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. Const. Art. 8 Pt. 1 § 3

§ 3. Resignation of officer; special election

[Currentness](#)

Section 3. If such officer shall offer his resignation it shall be accepted, and the vacancy shall be filled as may be provided by law. If he shall not resign within five days after a recall petition is filed as provided by law, a special election shall be ordered to be held as provided by law, to determine whether such officer shall be recalled. On the ballots at such election shall be printed the reasons as set forth in the petition for demanding his recall, and, in not more than two hundred words, the officer's justification of his course in office. He shall continue to perform the duties of his office until the result of such election shall have been officially declared.

Credits

Amendment approved election Nov. 5, 1974, eff. Dec. 5, 1974.

A. R. S. Const Art. 8 Pt. 1 § 3, AZ CONST Art. 8 Pt. 1 § 3
Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Constitution of the State of Arizona (Refs & Annos)
Article VIII. Removal from Office
Part 1. Recall of Public Officers (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. Const. Art. 8 Pt. 1 § 4

§ 4. Special election; candidates; results; qualification of successor

[Currentness](#)

Section 4. Unless the incumbent otherwise requests, in writing, the incumbent's name shall be placed as a candidate on the official ballot without nomination. Other candidates for the office may be nominated to be voted for at said election. The candidate who receives the highest number of votes shall be declared elected for the remainder of the term. Unless the incumbent receives the highest number of votes, the incumbent shall be deemed to be removed from office, upon qualification of the successor. In the event that the successor shall not qualify within five days after the result of said election shall have been declared, the said office shall be vacant, and may be filled as provided by law.

Credits

Amendment approved election Nov. 8, 1988, eff. Dec. 5, 1988; approved election Nov. 3, 1992, eff. Nov. 23, 1992.

A. R. S. Const Art. 8 Pt. 1 § 4, AZ CONST Art. 8 Pt. 1 § 4
Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

End of Document

© 2017 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Constitution of the State of Arizona (Refs & Annos)
Article VIII. Removal from Office
Part 1. Recall of Public Officers (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. Const. Art. 8 Pt. 1 § 5

§ 5. Recall petitions; restrictions and conditions

[Currentness](#)

Section 5. No recall petition shall be circulated against any officer until he shall have held his office for a period of six months, except that it may be filed against a member of the legislature at any time after five days from the beginning of the first session after his election. After one recall petition and election, no further recall petition shall be filed against the same officer during the term for which he was elected, unless petitioners signing such petition shall first pay into the public treasury which has paid such election expenses, all expenses of the preceding election.

A. R. S. Const Art. 8 Pt. 1 § 5, AZ CONST Art. 8 Pt. 1 § 5
Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

End of Document

© 2017 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Constitution of the State of Arizona (Refs & Annos)
Article VIII. Removal from Office
Part 1. Recall of Public Officers (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. Const. Art. 8 Pt. 1 § 6

§ 6. Application of general election laws; implementary legislation

[Currentness](#)

Section 6. The general election laws shall apply to recall elections in so far as applicable. Laws necessary to facilitate the operation of the provisions of this article shall be enacted, including provision for payment by the public treasury of the reasonable special election campaign expenses of such officer.

A. R. S. Const Art. 8 Pt. 1 § 6, AZ CONST Art. 8 Pt. 1 § 6
Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

End of Document

© 2017 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Constitution of the State of Arizona (Refs & Annos)
Article VIII. Removal from Office
Part 2. Impeachment (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. Const. Art. 8 Pt. 2 § 1

§ 1. Power of impeachment in house of representatives; trial by senate

[Currentness](#)

Section 1. The house of representatives shall have the sole power of impeachment. The concurrence of a majority of all the members shall be necessary to an impeachment. All impeachments shall be tried by the senate, and, when sitting for that purpose, the senators shall be upon oath or affirmation to do justice according to law and evidence, and shall be presided over by the chief justice of the supreme court. Should the chief justice be on trial, or otherwise disqualified, the senate shall elect a judge of the supreme court to preside.

A. R. S. Const Art. 8 Pt. 2 § 1, AZ CONST Art. 8 Pt. 2 § 1
Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

End of Document

© 2017 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Constitution of the State of Arizona (Refs & Annos)
Article VIII. Removal from Office
Part 2. Impeachment (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. Const. Art. 8 Pt. 2 § 2

§ 2. Conviction; grounds for impeachment; judgment; liability to trial

[Currentness](#)

Section 2. No person shall be convicted without a concurrence of two-thirds of the senators elected. The governor and other state and judicial officers, except justices of courts not of record, shall be liable to impeachment for high crimes, misdemeanors, or malfeasance in office, but judgment in such cases shall extend only to removal from office and disqualification to hold any office of honor, trust, or profit in the state. The party, whether convicted or acquitted, shall, nevertheless, be liable to trial and punishment according to law.

A. R. S. Const Art. 8 Pt. 2 § 2, AZ CONST Art. 8 Pt. 2 § 2
Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

End of Document

© 2017 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 1. General Provisions
Chapter 2. Law and Statutes
Article 2. General Rules of Statutory Construction

A.R.S. § 1-215

§ 1-215. Definitions

Effective: August 6, 2016

Currentness

In the statutes and laws of this state, unless the context otherwise requires:

1. "Action" includes any matter or proceeding in a court, civil or criminal.
2. "Adopted rule" means a final rule as defined in § 41-1001.
3. "Adult" means a person who has attained eighteen years of age.
4. "Alternative fuel" means:
 - (a) Electricity.
 - (b) Solar energy.
 - (c) Liquefied petroleum gas, natural gas, hydrogen or a blend of hydrogen with liquefied petroleum or natural gas that complies with any of the following:
 - (i) Is used in an engine that is certified to meet at a minimum the United States environmental protection agency low emission vehicle standard pursuant to 40 Code of Federal Regulations section 88.104-94 or 88.105-94.
 - (ii) Is used in an engine that is certified by the engine modifier to meet the addendum to memorandum 1-A of the United States environmental protection agency as printed in the federal register, volume 62, number 207, October 27, 1997, pages 55635 through 55637.
 - (iii) Is used in an engine that is the subject of a waiver for that specific engine application from the United States environmental protection agency's memorandum 1-A addendum requirements and that waiver is documented to the reasonable satisfaction of the director of the department of environmental quality.

(d) Only for vehicles that use alcohol fuels before August 21, 1998, alcohol fuels that contain not less than eighty-five per cent alcohol by volume.

(e) A combination of at least seventy per cent alternative fuel and no more than thirty per cent petroleum based fuel that operates in an engine that meets the United States environmental protection agency low emission vehicle standard pursuant to [40 Code of Federal Regulations section 88.104-94](#) or [88.105-94](#) and that is certified by the engine manufacturer to consume at least seventy per cent alternative fuel during normal vehicle operations.

5. "Bribe" means anything of value or advantage, present or prospective, asked, offered, given, accepted or promised with a corrupt intent to influence, unlawfully, the person to whom it is given in that person's action, vote or opinion, in any public or official capacity.

6. "Child" or "children" as used in reference to age of persons means persons under eighteen years of age.

7. "Clean burning fuel" means:

(a) An emulsion of water-phased hydrocarbon fuel that contains not less than twenty per cent water by volume and that complies with any of the following:

(i) Is used in an engine that is certified to meet at a minimum the United States environmental protection agency low emission vehicle standard pursuant to [40 Code of Federal Regulations section 88.104-94](#) or [88.105-94](#).

(ii) Is used in an engine that is certified by the engine modifier to meet the addendum to memorandum 1-A of the United States environmental protection agency as printed in the federal register, volume 62, number 207, October 27, 1997, pages 55635 through 55637.

(iii) Is used in an engine that is the subject of a waiver for that specific engine application from the United States environmental protection agency's memorandum 1-A addendum requirements and that waiver is documented to the reasonable satisfaction of the director of the department of environmental quality.

(b) A diesel fuel substitute that is produced from nonpetroleum renewable resources if the qualifying volume of the nonpetroleum renewable resources meets the standards for California diesel fuel as adopted by the California air resources board pursuant to [13 California Code of Regulations sections 2281](#) and [2282](#) in effect on January 1, 2000, the diesel fuel substitute meets the registration requirement for fuels and additives established by the United States environmental protection agency pursuant to section 211 of the clean air act as defined in [§ 49-401.01](#) and the use of the diesel fuel substitute complies with the requirements listed in 10 Code of Federal Regulations part 490, as printed in the federal register, volume 64, number 96, May 19, 1999.

(c) A diesel fuel that complies with all of the following:

(i) Contains a maximum of fifteen parts per million by weight of sulfur.

(ii) Meets ASTM D975.

(iii) Meets the registration requirements for fuels and additives established by the United States environmental protection agency pursuant to section 211 of the clean air act as defined in § 49-401.01.

(iv) Is used in an engine that is equipped or has been retrofitted with a device that has been certified by the California air resources board diesel emission control strategy verification procedure, the United States environmental protection agency voluntary diesel retrofit program or the United States environmental protection agency verification protocol for retrofit catalyst, particulate filter and engine modification control technologies for highway and nonroad use diesel engines.

(d) A blend of unleaded gasoline that contains at minimum eighty-five per cent ethanol by volume or eighty-five per cent methanol by volume.

(e) Neat methanol.

(f) Neat ethanol.

8. "Corruptly" means a wrongful design to acquire or cause some pecuniary or other advantage to the person guilty of the act or omission referred to, or to some other person.

9. "Daytime" means the period between sunrise and sunset.

10. "Depose" includes every manner of written statement under oath or affirmation.

11. "Federal poverty guidelines" means the poverty guidelines as updated annually in the federal register by the United States department of health and human services.

12. "Grantee" includes every person to whom an estate or interest in real property passes, in or by a deed.

13. "Grantor" includes every person from or by whom an estate or interest in real property passes, in or by a deed.

14. "Includes" or "including" means not limited to and is not a term of exclusion.

15. "Inhabitant" means a resident of a city, town, village, district, county or precinct.

16. "Issue" as used in connection with descent of estates includes all lawful, lineal descendants of the ancestor.

17. “Knowingly”:

(a) Means only a knowledge that the facts exist that bring the act or omission within the provisions of the statute using such word.

(b) Does not require any knowledge of the unlawfulness of the act or omission.

18. “Magistrate” means an officer having power to issue a warrant for the arrest of a person charged with a public offense and includes the chief justice and justices of the supreme court, judges of the superior court, judges of the court of appeals, justices of the peace and judges of a municipal court.

19. “Majority” or “age of majority” as used in reference to age of persons means eighteen years of age or more.

20. “Malice” and “maliciously” mean a wish to vex, annoy or injure another person, or an intent to do a wrongful act, established either by proof or presumption of law.

21. “Minor” means a person under the age of eighteen years.

22. “Minor children” means persons under the age of eighteen years.

23. “Month” means a calendar month unless otherwise expressed.

24. “Neglect”, “negligence”, “negligent” and “negligently” import a want of such attention to the nature or probable consequence of the act or omission as a prudent man ordinarily bestows in acting in his own concerns.

25. “Nighttime” means the period between sunset and sunrise.

26. “Oath” includes an affirmation or declaration.

27. “Peace officers” means sheriffs of counties, constables, marshals, policemen of cities and towns, commissioned personnel of the department of public safety, personnel who are employed by the state department of corrections and the department of juvenile corrections and who have received a certificate from the Arizona peace officer standards and training board, peace officers who are appointed by a multicounty water conservation district and who have received a certificate from the Arizona peace officer standards and training board, police officers who are appointed by community college district governing boards and who have received a certificate from the Arizona peace officer standards and training board, police officers who are appointed by the Arizona board of regents and who have received a certificate from the Arizona peace officer standards and training board, police officers who are appointed by the governing body of a public airport pursuant to [§ 28-8426](#) and who have received a certificate from the Arizona peace officer standards and training board, peace officers who are appointed by a private postsecondary institution pursuant to [§ 15-1897](#) and

who have received a certificate from the Arizona peace officer standards and training board and special agents from the office of the attorney general, or of a county attorney, and who have received a certificate from the Arizona peace officer standards and training board.

28. "Person" includes a corporation, company, partnership, firm, association or society, as well as a natural person. When the word "person" is used to designate the party whose property may be the subject of a criminal or public offense, the term includes the United States, this state, or any territory, state or country, or any political subdivision of this state that may lawfully own any property, or a public or private corporation, or partnership or association. When the word "person" is used to designate the violator or offender of any law, it includes corporation, partnership or any association of persons.

29. "Personal property" includes money, goods, chattels, things in action and evidences of debt.

30. "Population" means the population according to the most recent United States decennial census.

31. "Process" means a citation, writ or summons issued in the course of judicial proceedings.

32. "Property" includes both real and personal property.

33. "Real property" is coextensive with lands, tenements and hereditaments.

34. "Registered mail" includes certified mail.

35. "Seal" as used in reference to a paper issuing from a court or public office to which the seal of such court or office is required to be affixed means an impression of the seal on that paper, an impression of the seal affixed to that paper by a wafer or wax, a stamped seal, a printed seal, a screened seal or a computer generated seal.

36. "Signature" or "subscription" includes a mark, if a person cannot write, with the person's name written near it and witnessed by a person who writes the person's own name as witness.

37. "State", as applied to the different parts of the United States, includes the District of Columbia, this state and the territories.

38. "Testify" includes every manner of oral statement under oath or affirmation.

39. "United States" includes the District of Columbia and the territories.

40. "Vessel", as used in reference to shipping, includes ships of all kinds, steamboats, steamships, barges, canal boats and every structure adapted to navigation from place to place for the transportation of persons or property.

41. “Wilfully” means, with respect to conduct or to a circumstance described by a statute defining an offense, that a person is aware or believes that the person's conduct is of that nature or that the circumstance exists.

42. “Will” includes codicils.

43. “Workers' compensation” means workmen's compensation as used in [article XVIII, section 8, Constitution of Arizona](#).

44. “Writ” means an order or precept in writing issued in the name of the state or by a court or judicial officer.

45. “Writing” includes printing.

Credits

Amended by Laws 1956, Ch. 30, § 1, eff. July 14, 1956; Laws 1959, Ch. 65, § 1; Laws 1972, Ch. 146, § 1; Laws 1978, Ch. 201, § 1, eff. Oct. 1, 1978; Laws 1981, Ch. 28, § 1; Laws 1984, Ch. 188, § 1; Laws 1985, Ch. 280, § 1; Laws 1995, Ch. 287, § 1; Laws 1996, 7th S.S., Ch. 6, § 1; Laws 1998, Ch. 57, § 1; Laws 1998, Ch. 221, § 1; Laws 1999, Ch. 168, § 1, eff. May 5, 1999; Laws 1999, Ch. 219, § 1; Laws 1999, Ch. 295, § 1; Laws 2000, Ch. 142, § 1; Laws 2000, Ch. 148, § 1; Laws 2000, Ch. 405, § 1, eff. April 28, 2000; Laws 2001, Ch. 344, § 1, eff. Oct. 1, 2001; Laws 2002, Ch. 76, § 1; Laws 2002, Ch. 211, § 1; Laws 2004, Ch. 82, § 1; Laws 2004, Ch. 95, § 1; Laws 2006, Ch. 245, § 1; Laws 2012, Ch. 355, § 1; Laws 2013, Ch. 84, § 1; Laws 2015, Ch. 276, § 1; Laws 2016, Ch. 310, § 1.

A. R. S. § 1-215, AZ ST § 1-215

Current through legislation effective March 23, 2018 of the Second Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2018)

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated

Title 10. Corporations and Associations (Refs & Annos)

Chapter 1. General Provisions (Refs & Annos)

Article 4. Definitions, Notice and Shareholders (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 10-140

§ 10-140. Definitions

Effective: August 9, 2017

[Currentness](#)

In chapters 1 through 17 of this title,¹ unless the context otherwise requires:

1. “Acknowledged” or “acknowledgment” means either an acknowledgment pursuant to title 33, chapter 4, article 5² or the signature, without more, of the person or persons signing the instrument, in which case the signature or signatures constitute the affirmation or acknowledgment of the signatory, under penalties of perjury, that the instrument is the act and deed of the signatory and that the facts stated in the instrument are true.

2. “Act of the board of directors” means either:

(a) An act of the majority of the directors present at a duly called meeting at which a quorum is present, unless the act of a greater number is required by chapters 1 through 17 of this title, the articles of incorporation or the bylaws.

(b) Action taken by written consent of the directors in accordance with chapters 1 through 17 of this title.

3. “Act of the shareholders” means either:

(a) An act adopted or rejected by a majority of the votes entitled to be cast by each class of shareholders entitled to vote on the act at a duly called meeting at which a quorum is present, unless a greater number of votes is required by chapters 1 through 17 of this title, the articles of incorporation or the bylaws.

(b) An action taken by written consent of the shareholders in accordance with chapters 1 through 17 of this title.

4. “Address” means a mailing address.

5. “Affiliate” means a person that directly or indirectly, through one or more intermediaries controls, is controlled by or is under common control with the person specified.

6. "Articles of incorporation" means the original or restated articles of incorporation or articles of merger and all amendments to the articles of incorporation or merger and includes amended and restated articles of incorporation and articles of amendment and merger.

7. "Authorized shares" means the shares of all classes that a domestic or foreign corporation is authorized to issue.

8. "Board of directors" means the group of persons vested with the management of the affairs of the corporation irrespective of the name by which the group is designated and includes the governing body or bodies of a water users' association if the articles of incorporation of such water users' association provide for a governing body or bodies denominated other than as a board of directors.

9. "Business day" means a day that is not a Saturday, a Sunday or any other legal holiday in this state.

10. "Bylaws" means the code of rules adopted for the regulation or management of the affairs of the corporation irrespective of the name by which those rules are designated.

11. "Certificate of disclosure" means the certificate of disclosure described in [§ 10-202](#).

12. "Commission" means the Arizona corporation commission.

13. "Conspicuous" means so written that a reasonable person against whom the writing is to operate should have noticed it. For example, printing in italics, boldface or contrasting color or typing in capitals or underlined is conspicuous.

14. "Corporation" or "domestic corporation" means a corporation for profit that is not a foreign corporation and that is incorporated under or subject to chapters 1 through 17 of this title.

15. "Court" means the superior court of this state.

16. "Deliver" includes sending by mail, private courier, fax or electronic transmission.

17. "Delivery" means actual receipt by the person or entity to which directed and for electronic transmissions means receipt as described in [§ 44-7015, subsection B](#).

18. "Dissolved" means the status of a corporation on either:

(a) Effectiveness of articles of dissolution pursuant to [§ 10-1403, subsection B](#) or [§ 10-1421, subsection B](#).

(b) A decree pursuant to [§ 10-1433, subsection B](#) becoming final.

19. "Distribution" means a direct or indirect transfer of money or other property, except its own shares, or incurrence of indebtedness by a corporation to or for the benefit of its shareholders in respect of any of its shares. A distribution may be in the form of any of the following:

- (a) A declaration or payment of a dividend.
- (b) Any purchase, redemption or other acquisition of shares.
- (c) A distribution of indebtedness.
- (d) Otherwise.

20. "Effective date of notice" is as prescribed in § 10-141.

21. "Electronic transmission" means an electronic record as defined in § 44-7002 that is sent pursuant to § 44-7015.

22. "Employee" includes an officer but not a director. A director may accept duties that make the director also an employee.

23. "Entity" includes a corporation, foreign corporation, not for profit corporation, profit and not for profit unincorporated association, nonprofit corporation, close corporation, corporation sole or limited liability company, a professional corporation, association or limited liability company, a business trust, estate, partnership, registered limited liability partnership, trust or joint venture, two or more persons having a joint or common economic interest, any person other than an individual and a state, the United States and a foreign government.

24. "Executed by the corporation" means executed by manual or facsimile signature on behalf of the corporation by a duly authorized officer or, if the corporation is in the hands of a receiver or trustee, by the receiver or trustee.

25. "Filing" means the commission completing the following procedure with respect to any document delivered for that purpose:

- (a) Determining that the filing fee requirements of § 10-122 have been satisfied.
- (b) Determining that the document appears in all respects to conform to the requirements of chapters 1 through 17 of this title.
- (c) On making the determinations, endorsement of the word "filed" with the applicable date on or attached to the document and the return of notice of the filing to the person who delivered the document or the person's representative.

26. "Foreign corporation" means a corporation for profit that is incorporated under a law other than the law of this state.
27. "Governmental subdivision" includes an authority, county, district, municipality and political subdivision.
28. "Includes" and "including" denotes a partial definition.
29. "Individual" includes the estate of an incompetent or deceased individual.
30. "Insolvent" means inability of a corporation to pay its debts as they become due in the usual course of its business.
31. "Known place of business" means the known place of business required to be maintained pursuant to § 10-501.
32. "Liquidate its assets and business" includes the distribution of assets, the payment of obligations and debts, the discontinuance of business or any one or more of the distribution, payment or discontinuance.
33. "Mail", "to mail" or "have mailed" means to deposit or have deposited a communication in the United States mail with first class or airmail postage prepaid.
34. "Means" denotes an exhaustive definition.
35. "Newspaper" has the meaning set forth in § 39-201.
36. "Notice" and "notify" are as prescribed in § 10-141.
37. "Person" includes an individual and entity.
38. "President" means that officer designated as the president in the articles of incorporation or bylaws or, if not so designated, that officer authorized in the articles of incorporation, bylaws or otherwise to perform the functions of the chief executive officer, irrespective of the name by which designated.
39. "Principal office" means the office, in or out of this state, so designated in the annual report where the principal executive offices of a domestic or foreign corporation are located or in any other document executed by the corporation by an officer and delivered to the commission for filing. If an office has not been so designated, principal office means the known place of business of the corporation.
40. "Proceeding" includes a civil suit and a criminal, administrative and investigatory action.

41. "Publish" means to publish in a newspaper of general circulation in the county of the known place of business for three consecutive publications.

42. "Record date" means the date established under chapter 6 or 7 of this title³ on which a corporation determines the identity of its shareholders and their shareholdings for purposes of chapters 1 through 17 of this title. The determinations shall be made as of the close of business on the record date unless another time for doing so is specified when the record date is fixed.

43. "Secretary" means that officer designated as the secretary in the articles of incorporation or bylaws or that officer authorized in the articles of incorporation, the bylaws or otherwise to perform the functions of secretary, irrespective of the name by which designated.

44. "Shareholder" means the person in whose name shares are registered in the records of a corporation or the beneficial owner of shares to the extent of the rights granted by a nominee certificate on file with a corporation.

45. "Shares" means the units into which the proprietary interests in a corporation are divided.

46. "State", if referring to a part of the United States, includes a state and commonwealth and their agencies and governmental subdivisions and a territory and insular possession of the United States and their agencies and governmental subdivisions.

47. "Subscriber" means a person who subscribes for shares in a corporation, whether before or after incorporation.

48. "Treasurer" means that officer designated as the treasurer in the articles of incorporation or bylaws or that officer authorized in the articles of incorporation or bylaws or otherwise to perform the functions of treasurer, irrespective of the name by which designated.

49. "United States" includes a district, authority, bureau, commission and department and any other agency of the United States.

50. "Vice-president" means an officer designated as the vice-president in the articles of incorporation or bylaws or an officer authorized in the articles of incorporation, the bylaws or otherwise to perform the functions of a vice-president, irrespective of the name by which designated.

51. "Voting group" means all shares of one or more classes or series that under the articles of incorporation or chapters 1 through 17 of this title are entitled to vote and be counted together collectively on a matter at a meeting of shareholders. All shares entitled by the articles of incorporation or chapters 1 through 17 of this title to vote generally on the matter are for that purpose a single voting group.

52. "Water users' association" means a corporation that operates a federal reclamation project pursuant to a contract with the United States.

Credits

Added by Laws 1994, Ch. 223, § 4, eff. Jan. 1, 1996. Amended by Laws 1995, Ch. 69, § 4, eff. Jan. 1, 1996; Laws 1999, Ch. 297, § 3, eff. May 18, 1999; Laws 2016, Ch. 354, § 1; Laws 2017, Ch. 18, § 4.

Footnotes

- 1 Section 10-120 et seq.
- 2 Section 33-501 et seq.
- 3 Sections 10-601 et seq.; 10-701 et seq.

A. R. S. § 10-140, AZ ST § 10-140

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

End of Document

© 2018 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 12. Courts and Civil Proceedings
Chapter 11. Extraordinary Legal Remedies
Article 3. Quo Warranto (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 12-2041

§ 12-2041. Action by attorney general; venue

Currentness

A. An action may be brought in the supreme court by the attorney general in the name of the state upon his relation, upon his own information or upon the verified complaint of any person, in cases where the supreme court has jurisdiction, or otherwise in the superior court of the county which has jurisdiction, against any person who usurps, intrudes into or unlawfully holds or exercises any public office or any franchise within this state.

B. The attorney general shall bring the action when he has reason to believe that any such office or franchise is being usurped, intruded into or unlawfully held or exercised.

A. R. S. § 12-2041, AZ ST § 12-2041

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 12. Courts and Civil Proceedings
Chapter 11. Extraordinary Legal Remedies
Article 3. Quo Warranto (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 12-2042

§ 12-2042. Action by county attorney

[Currentness](#)

An action may be brought in the superior court by the county attorney in the name of the state upon his own information or upon the verified complaint of any person, against any person who usurps, intrudes into or who unlawfully holds or exercises any public office or any franchise within his county. The county attorney shall bring the action when he has reason to believe that any such office or franchise is being usurped, intruded into or unlawfully held or exercised.

A. R. S. § 12-2042, AZ ST § 12-2042

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

End of Document

© 2017 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 12. Courts and Civil Proceedings
Chapter 11. Extraordinary Legal Remedies
Article 3. Quo Warranto (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 12-2043

§ 12-2043. Failure of attorney general or county attorney to bring action for claimant of office

Currentness

A. If the attorney general or the county attorney refuses to bring an action as provided for in §§ 12-2041 and 12-2042, upon information or at the request of any person claiming such office or franchise, the person may apply to the court for leave to bring the action in his own name and may so bring it if leave therefor is granted.

B. Notice of the application shall be given to the attorney general or the county attorney as the case may be.

A. R. S. § 12-2043, AZ ST § 12-2043

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 12. Courts and Civil Proceedings
Chapter 11. Extraordinary Legal Remedies
Article 3. Quo Warranto (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 12-2044

§ 12-2044. Adjudication of office; damages; several claimants

Currentness

A. When the action involves the right to an office, the complaint shall show the one who is entitled to the office, and the issues made thereon shall be tried. The judgment given shall adjudge who is entitled to the office. If judgment is given awarding the right to the office to the person alleged to be entitled thereto, he may recover the damages which he has sustained by reason of the usurpation of the office by defendant.

B. When several persons claim the same office or franchise, one action may be brought against all such persons to try their rights to the office or franchise.

A. R. S. § 12-2044, AZ ST § 12-2044

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

End of Document

© 2017 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 12. Courts and Civil Proceedings
Chapter 11. Extraordinary Legal Remedies
Article 3. Quo Warranto (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 12-2045

§ 12-2045. Judgment of usurpation; classification

[Currentness](#)

If a defendant is adjudged guilty of usurping or intruding into or unlawfully holding an office, franchise or privilege, such defendant is guilty of a petty offense and shall be excluded from the office, franchise or privilege.

Credits

Amended by Laws 1978, Ch. 201, § 84, eff. Oct. 1, 1978.

A. R. S. § 12-2045, AZ ST § 12-2045

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

End of Document

© 2017 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 13. Criminal Code (Refs & Annos)
Chapter 12. Assault and Related Offenses (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 13-1202

§ 13-1202. Threatening or intimidating; classification

Effective: September 19, 2007

[Currentness](#)

A. A person commits threatening or intimidating if the person threatens or intimidates by word or conduct:

1. To cause physical injury to another person or serious damage to the property of another; or
2. To cause, or in reckless disregard to causing, serious public inconvenience including, but not limited to, evacuation of a building, place of assembly or transportation facility; or
3. To cause physical injury to another person or damage to the property of another in order to promote, further or assist in the interests of or to cause, induce or solicit another person to participate in a criminal street gang, a criminal syndicate or a racketeering enterprise.

B. Threatening or intimidating pursuant to subsection A, paragraph 1 or 2 is a class 1 misdemeanor, except that it is a class 6 felony if:

1. The offense is committed in retaliation for a victim's either reporting criminal activity or being involved in an organization, other than a law enforcement agency, that is established for the purpose of reporting or preventing criminal activity.
2. The person is a criminal street gang member.

C. Threatening or intimidating pursuant to subsection A, paragraph 3 is a class 3 felony.

Credits

Added by Laws 1977, Ch. 142, § 61, eff. Oct. 1, 1978. Amended by Laws 1978, Ch. 201, § 128, eff. Oct. 1, 1978; Laws 1990, Ch. 366, § 1; Laws 1994, Ch. 200, § 11, eff. April 19, 1994; Laws 2003, Ch. 225, § 2; Laws 2007, Ch. 287, § 3.

A. R. S. § 13-1202, AZ ST § 13-1202

Current through legislation effective March 23, 2018 of the Second Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2018)

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated

Title 16. Elections and Electors (Refs & Annos)

Chapter 6. Campaign Contributions and Expenses (Refs & Annos)

Article 1. General Provisions (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 16-901

§ 16-901. Definitions

Effective: May 1, 2017

[Currentness](#)

In this chapter, unless the context otherwise requires:

1. "Advertisement" means information or materials, other than nonpaid social media messages, that are mailed, e-mailed, posted, distributed, published, displayed, delivered, broadcasted or placed in a communication medium and that are for the purpose of influencing an election.
2. "Affiliate" means any organization that controls, is controlled by or is under common control with a corporation, limited liability company or labor organization.
3. "Agent" means any person who has actual authority, either express or implied, to represent or make decisions on behalf of another person.
4. "Ballot measure expenditure" means an expenditure made by a person that expressly advocates the support or opposition of a clearly identified ballot measure.
5. "Best effort" means that a committee treasurer or treasurer's agent makes at least one written effort, including an attempt by e-mail, text message, private message through social media or other similar communication, or at least one oral effort that is documented in writing to identify the contributor of an incomplete contribution.
6. "Calendar quarter" means a period of three consecutive calendar months ending on March 31, June 30, September 30 or December 31.
7. "Candidate" means an individual who receives contributions or makes expenditures or who gives consent to another person to receive contributions or make expenditures on behalf of that individual in connection with the candidate's nomination, election or retention for any public office.
8. "Candidate committee" includes the candidate.

9. "Clearly identified candidate" means that the name or a description, image, photograph or drawing of the candidate appears or the identity of the candidate is otherwise apparent by unambiguous reference.

10. "Committee" means a candidate committee, a political action committee or a political party.

11. "Contribution" means any money, advance, deposit or other thing of value that is made to a person for the purpose of influencing an election. Contribution includes:

(a) A contribution that is made to retire campaign debt from a previous election cycle.

(b) Money or the fair market value of anything that is directly or indirectly provided to an elected official for the specific purpose of defraying the expense of communications with constituents.

(c) The full purchase price of any item from a committee.

(d) A loan that is made to a committee for the purpose of influencing an election, to the extent the loan remains outstanding.

12. "Control" means to possess, directly or indirectly, the power to direct or to cause the direction of the management or policies of another organization, whether through voting power, ownership, contract or otherwise.

13. "Coordinate", "coordinated" or "coordination" means the coordination of an expenditure as prescribed by § 16-922.

14. "Coordinated party expenditures" means expenditures that are made by a political party to directly pay for goods or services on behalf of its nominee.

15. "District office" means an elected office established or organized pursuant to title 15 or 48.¹

16. "Earmarked" means a designation, instruction or encumbrance between the transferor of a contribution and a transferee that requires the transferee to make a contribution to a clearly identified candidate.

17. "Election" means any election for any ballot measure in this state or any candidate election during a primary, general, recall, special or runoff election for any office in this state other than a federal office and a political party office prescribed by chapter 5, article 2 of this title.²

18. "Election cycle" means the two-year period beginning on January 1 in the year after a statewide general election and ending on December 31 in the year of a statewide general election or, for cities and towns, the two-year period beginning on the first day of the calendar quarter after the calendar quarter in which the city's or town's second, runoff or general election is scheduled and ending on the last day of the calendar quarter in which the city's or town's immediately

following second, runoff or general election is scheduled, however that election is designated by the city or town. For the purposes of a:

(a) Recall election, "election cycle" means the period between issuance of a recall petition serial number and the latest of the following:

(i) The date of the recall election that is called pursuant to § 19-209.

(ii) The date that a resignation is accepted pursuant to § 19-208.

(iii) The date that the receiving officer provides notice pursuant to § 19-208.01 that the number of signatures is insufficient.

(b) Special election, "election cycle" means the period between the date of issuance of a proclamation or order calling the special election and the last day of the calendar quarter in which the special election is held.

19. "Employee" means an individual who is entitled to compensation for labor or services performed for the individual's employer.

20. "Employer" means any person that pays compensation to and directs the labor or services of any individual in the course of employment.

21. "Enforcement officer" means the attorney general or the county, city or town attorney with authority to collect fines or issue penalties with respect to a given election pursuant to § 16-938.

22. "Entity" means a corporation, limited liability company, labor organization, partnership, trust, association, organization, joint venture, cooperative, unincorporated organization or association or other organized group that consists of more than one individual.

23. "Excess contribution" means a contribution that exceeds the applicable contribution limits for a particular election.

24. "Exclusive insurance contract" means an insurance producer's contract with an insurer that does either of the following:

(a) Prohibits the producer from soliciting insurance business for any other insurer.

(b) Requires a right of first refusal on all lines of insurance business written by the insurer and solicited by the producer.

25. "Expenditure" means any purchase, payment or other thing of value that is made by a person for the purpose of influencing an election.

26. "Family contribution" means any contribution that is provided to a candidate's committee by the parent, grandparent, aunt, uncle, child or sibling of the candidate or the candidate's spouse, including the spouse of any of the listed family members, regardless of whether the relation is established by marriage or adoption.

27. "Filing officer" means the secretary of state or the county, city or town officer in charge of elections for that jurisdiction who accepts statements and reports for those elections pursuant to § 16-928.

28. "Firewall" means a written policy that precludes one person from sharing information with another person.

29. "Identification" or "identify" means:

(a) For an individual, the individual's first and last name, residence location or street address and occupation and the name of the individual's primary employer.

(b) For any other person, the person's full name and physical location or street address.

30. "Incomplete contribution" means any contribution that is received by a committee for which the contributor's complete identification has not been obtained.

31. "Independent expenditure" means an expenditure by a person, other than a candidate committee, that complies with both of the following:

(a) Expressly advocates the election or defeat of a clearly identified candidate.

(b) Is not made in cooperation or consultation with or at the request or suggestion of the candidate or the candidate's agent.

32. "In-kind contribution" means a contribution of goods, services or anything of value that is provided without charge or at less than the usual and normal charge.

33. "Insurance producer" means a person that:

(a) Is required to be licensed to sell, solicit or negotiate insurance.

(b) Has an exclusive insurance contract with an insurer.

34. "Itemized" means that each contribution received or expenditure made is set forth separately.

35. "Labor organization" means any employee representation organization that exists for the purpose of dealing with employers concerning grievances, labor disputes, wages, rates of pay, hours of employment or other conditions of employment.

36. "Legislative office" means the office of representative in the state house of representatives or senator in the state senate.

37. "Mega PAC status" means official recognition that a political action committee has received contributions from five hundred or more individuals in amounts of ten dollars or more in the four-year period immediately before application to the secretary of state.

38. "Nominee" means a candidate who prevails in a primary election for partisan office and includes the nominee's candidate committee.

39. "Person" means an individual or a candidate, nominee, committee, corporation, limited liability company, labor organization, partnership, trust, association, organization, joint venture, cooperative or unincorporated organization or association.

40. "Personal monies" means any of the following:

(a) Assets to which the individual or individual's spouse has either legal title or an equitable interest.

(b) Salary and other earned income from bona fide employment of the individual or individual's spouse.

(c) Dividends and proceeds from the sale of investments of the individual or individual's spouse.

(d) Bequests to the individual or individual's spouse.

(e) Income to the individual or individual's spouse from revocable trusts for which the individual or individual's spouse is a beneficiary.

(f) Gifts of a personal nature to the individual or individual's spouse that would have been given regardless of whether the individual became a candidate or accepted a contribution.

(g) The proceeds of loans obtained by the individual or individual's spouse that are secured by collateral or security provided by the individual or individual's spouse.

(h) Family contributions.

41. "Political action committee" means an entity that is required to register as a political action committee pursuant to § 16-905.

42. "Political party" means a committee that meets the requirements for recognition as a political party pursuant to chapter 5 of this title.

43. "Primary purpose" means an entity's predominant purpose. Notwithstanding any other law or rule, an entity is not organized for the primary purpose of influencing an election if all of the following apply at the time the contribution or expenditure is made:

(a) The entity has tax exempt status under [section 501\(a\) of the internal revenue code](#).³

(b) Except for a religious organization, assembly or institution, the entity has properly filed a form 1023 or form 1024 with the internal revenue service or the equivalent successor form designated by the internal revenue service.

(c) The entity's tax exempt status has not been denied or revoked by the internal revenue service.

(d) The entity remains in good standing with the corporation commission.

(e) The entity has properly filed a form 990 with the internal revenue service or the equivalent successor form designated by the internal revenue service in compliance with the most recent filing deadline established by internal revenue service regulations or policies.

44. "Retention" means the election process by which a superior court judge, appellate court judge or supreme court justice is retained in office as prescribed by [article VI, section 38 or 40, Constitution of Arizona](#).

45. "Separate segregated fund" means a fund established by a corporation, limited liability company, labor organization or partnership that is required to register as a political action committee.

46. "Social media messages" means forms of communication, including internet sites for social networking or blogging, through which users create a personal profile and participate in online communities to share information, ideas and personal messages.

47. "Sponsor" means any person that establishes, administers or contributes financial support to the administration of a political action committee or that has common or overlapping membership or officers with that political action committee.

48. "Standing committee" means a political action committee or political party that is active in more than one reporting jurisdiction in this state and that files a statement of organization in a format prescribed by the secretary of state.

49. "Statewide office" means the office of governor, secretary of state, state treasurer, attorney general, superintendent of public instruction, corporation commissioner or mine inspector.

50. "Surplus monies" means those monies of a terminating committee that remain after all of the committee's expenditures have been made, all debts have been extinguished and the committee ceases accepting contributions.

Credits

Added by Laws 2016, Ch. 79, § 11, eff. Nov. 5, 2016. Amended by Laws 2016, Ch. 347, § 2, eff. Nov. 5, 2016; Laws 2017, Ch. 233, § 1, eff. May 1, 2017.

<For disposition of the subject matter or derivation of sections repealed, added, or transferred and renumbered by Laws 1979, Ch. 209, §§ 2 to 5, effective January 1, 1980, see Disposition and Derivation Tables preceding Chapter 1.>

Footnotes

1 Section 15-101 et seq. or 48-101 et seq.

2 Section 16-821 et seq.

3 Internal Revenue Code sections may be found in Title 26 of U.S.C.A.

A. R. S. § 16-901, AZ ST § 16-901

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated

Title 16. Elections and Electors (Refs & Annos)

Chapter 6. Campaign Contributions and Expenses (Refs & Annos)

Article 1.1. Establishment of Committee (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 16-905

§ 16-905. Committee qualification; requirements; exemption; adjustments

Effective: November 5, 2016

[Currentness](#)

A. A candidate for election or retention shall register as a candidate committee if the candidate receives contributions or makes expenditures, in any combination, of at least one thousand dollars in connection with that candidacy.

B. An entity shall register as a political action committee if both of the following apply:

1. The entity is organized for the primary purpose of influencing the result of an election.

2. The entity knowingly receives contributions or makes expenditures, in any combination, of at least one thousand dollars in connection with any election during a calendar year.

C. A filing officer or enforcement officer shall make a rebuttable presumption that an entity is organized for the primary purpose of influencing the result of an election if the entity meets any of the following:

1. Except for a religious organization, assembly or institution, claims tax exempt status but had not filed form 1023 or form 1024 with the internal revenue service, or the equivalent successor form designated by the internal revenue service, before making a contribution or expenditure.

2. Made a contribution or expenditure and at that time had its tax exempt status revoked by the internal revenue service.

3. Made a contribution or expenditure and at that time failed to file form 990 with the internal revenue service, or the equivalent successor form designated by the internal revenue service, if required by law.

4. At the time of making a contribution or expenditure was not registered with the corporation commission if required by law.

5. At the time of making a contribution or expenditure was registered with the corporation commission but was not in good standing.

D. A fund that is established by a corporation, limited liability company, labor organization or partnership for the purpose of influencing the result of an election shall register as a political action committee.

E. An entity may register as a political party committee only as prescribed in chapter 5 of this title.¹

F. A committee is not subject to state income tax and is not required to file a state income tax return.

G. The dollar amounts prescribed by this section shall be increased every two years pursuant to § 16-931.

Credits

Added by [Laws 2016, Ch. 79, § 12, eff. Nov. 5, 2016](#).

Footnotes

¹ Section 16-801 et seq.

A. R. S. § 16-905, AZ ST § 16-905

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 16. Elections and Electors (Refs & Annos)
Chapter 6. Campaign Contributions and Expenses (Refs & Annos)
Article 1.2. Contributions (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 16-911

§ 16-911. Exemption from definition of contribution

Effective: November 5, 2016

[Currentness](#)

- A.** A person may make any contribution not otherwise prohibited by law.
- B.** The following are not contributions:
1. The value of an individual's volunteer services or expenses that are provided without compensation or reimbursement, including the individual's:
 - (a) Travel expenses.
 - (b) Use of real or personal property.
 - (c) Cost of invitations, food or beverages.
 - (d) Use of e-mail, internet activity or social media messages, only if the individual's use is not paid for by the individual or any other person and if the e-mails, social media messages or other internet activities do not contain or include transmittal of a paid advertisement or paid fund-raising solicitation.
 2. The costs incurred for covering or carrying a news story, commentary or editorial by a broadcasting station or cable television operator, an internet website, a newspaper or another periodical publication, including an internet-based or electronic publication, if the cost for the news story, commentary or editorial is not paid for by and the medium is not owned or under the control of a candidate or committee.
 3. Any payment to defray the expense of an elected official meeting with constituents or attending an informational tour, conference, seminar or presentation, if the payor or the elected official does not attempt to influence the result of an election and the payment is reported if required pursuant to title 38, chapter 3.1 or title 41, chapter 7, article 8.1,¹ or both.
 4. The payment by a political party to support its nominee, including:

(a) The printing or distribution of, or postage expenses for, voter guides, sample ballots, pins, bumper stickers, handbills, brochures, posters, yard signs and other similar materials distributed through the party.

(b) Coordinated political party expenditures.

5. The payment by any person to defray a political party's operating expenses or party-building activities, including:

(a) Party staff and personnel.

(b) Studies and reports.

(c) Voter registration, recruitment, polling and turnout efforts.

(d) Party conventions and party meetings.

(e) Construction, purchase or lease of party buildings or facilities.

6. The value of any of the following to a committee:

(a) Interest earned on the committee's deposits or investments.

(b) Transfers between committees to reimburse expenses and distribute monies raised through a joint fund-raising effort, if the transfers comply with an agreement to reimburse and distribute monies that was executed before the joint fund-raising effort occurred.

(c) Payment of a committee's legal or accounting expenses by any person.

(d) An extension of credit for goods and services on a committee's behalf by a creditor if the terms are substantially similar to extensions of credit to nonpolitical debtors that are of similar risk and size of obligation. The creditor must make a commercially reasonable attempt to collect the debt, except that if an extension of credit remains unsatisfied by the committee after six months the committee is deemed to have received a contribution but the creditor is not deemed to have made a contribution.

7. The value of nonpartisan communications that are intended to encourage voter registration and turnout efforts.

8. Any payment to a filing officer for arguments in a publicity pamphlet.

9. The payment by any sponsor or its affiliate for the costs of establishing, administering and soliciting contributions from its employees, members, executives, stockholders and retirees and their families to the sponsor's separate segregated fund.

10. Any payment by any entity for the costs of communicating with its employees, members, executives, stockholders and retirees and their families about any subject, without regard to whether those communications are made in coordination with any candidate or candidate's agent.

11. The value of allowing a candidate or a committee's representative to appear at any private residence or at the facilities of any entity to speak about the candidate's campaign or about a ballot measure, if the venue is furnished by the venue's owner, is not paid for by a third party and is not a sports stadium, coliseum, convention center, hotel ballroom, concert hall or other similar arena that is generally open to the public.

12. The costs of hosting a debate or candidates' forum, if at least two opposing candidates, with respect to any given office sought, or representatives of at least two opposing ballot measure campaigns, with respect to any measure on the ballot, are invited with the same or similar advance notice and method of invitation.

13. The preparation and distribution of voter guides, subject to the following:

(a) A featured candidate or ballot measure shall not receive greater prominence or substantially more space in the voter guide than any other candidate or ballot measure.

(b) The voter guide shall not include any message that constitutes express advocacy.

14. Monies that are loaned by a financial institution in the ordinary course of business and not for the purpose of influencing the results of an election, except that the loan is deemed a pro rata contribution by any endorser or guarantor, other than the candidate's spouse.

15. The costs of publishing a book or producing a documentary, if the publication and production are for distribution to the general public through traditional distribution mechanisms or a fee is obtained for the purchase of the publication or viewing of the documentary.

C. This section does not imply that any transactions that are not specifically listed in subsection B of this section are contributions unless those transactions otherwise meet the definition of contribution as defined in § 16-901.

Credits

Added by [Laws 2016, Ch. 79, § 12, eff. Nov. 5, 2016](#). Amended by [Laws 2016, Ch. 346, § 1, eff. Nov. 5, 2016](#).

Footnotes

1 Section 38-541 et seq. or 41-1231 et seq.

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 16. Elections and Electors (Refs & Annos)
Chapter 6. Campaign Contributions and Expenses (Refs & Annos)
Article 1.2. Contributions (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 16-913

§ 16-913. Candidate committee contribution limits; requirements

Effective: November 5, 2016

[Currentness](#)

- A.** A candidate committee shall not make contributions to a candidate committee for another candidate.
- B.** A candidate committee may transfer unlimited contributions to any one or more other candidate committees for that same candidate under the following conditions:
1. A candidate committee for a city or town candidate shall not transfer contributions to that same candidate's committee for a statewide or legislative office.
 2. If a candidate committee for a city or town office transfers contributions to a candidate committee for a county office for that same candidate, the candidate committee for the county office shall not transfer contributions to a statewide or legislative candidate committee for that same candidate during the twenty-four months immediately following that transfer of contributions to the county candidate committee.
 3. Contributions originally made to the transferring candidate committee are deemed to be contributions to the receiving candidate committee. On transfer, an individual's aggregate contributions to both candidate committees during the election cycle shall not exceed the individual's contribution limit for that candidate.
- C.** A candidate committee shall not knowingly accept contributions in excess of the contribution limits prescribed by law. A candidate committee that unknowingly accepts an excess contribution shall refund or reattribute any excess contribution within sixty days after receipt of the contribution. A candidate committee may reattribute an excess contribution only if both of the following apply:
1. The excess contribution was received from an individual contributor.
 2. The individual contributor authorizes the candidate committee to reattribute the excess amount to another individual who was identified as a joint account holder in the original instrument used to make the excess contribution.
- D.** A candidate committee may accept contributions only from an individual, a partnership, a candidate committee, a political action committee or a political party.

E. A candidate committee may make unlimited contributions to a person other than a candidate's committee.

F. A candidate may contribute unlimited personal monies to the candidate's own candidate committee.

Credits

Added by [Laws 2016, Ch. 79, § 12, eff. Nov. 5, 2016](#). Amended by [Laws 2016, Ch. 347, § 5, eff. Nov. 5, 2016](#).

A. R. S. § 16-913, AZ ST § 16-913

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

End of Document

© 2018 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated

Title 16. Elections and Electors (Refs & Annos)

Chapter 6. Campaign Contributions and Expenses (Refs & Annos)

Article 1.2. Contributions (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 16-916

§ 16-916. Corporation, limited liability company and labor organization
contributions; separate segregated fund; limits; requirements

Effective: November 5, 2016

[Currentness](#)

A. A corporation, limited liability company or labor organization shall not make contributions to a candidate committee.

B. A corporation, limited liability company or labor organization may make unlimited contributions to persons other than candidate committees.

C. A corporation, limited liability company or labor organization may sponsor a separate segregated fund. Employees, members, executives, stockholders and retirees and their families of a corporation, limited liability company or labor organization and any subsidiary or affiliate of a corporation, limited liability company or labor organization may make contributions to the separate segregated fund, subject to the following:

1. The separate segregated fund must register as a political action committee.

2. The sponsor or its affiliate may pay the administrative, personnel and fund-raising expenses of its separate segregated fund, which shall not be deemed contributions to the fund.

3. The sponsor or its separate segregated fund may solicit contributions from the sponsor's, sponsor's affiliates' or sponsor's subsidiaries' employees, members, executives, stockholders and retirees and their families. The following additional restrictions apply:

(a) With respect to an insurer, an insurer or its separate segregated fund may also solicit contributions from an insurance producer's employees, members, executives, stockholders and retirees and their families.

(b) With respect to a trade association or membership organization, the association or organization may solicit contributions from its members' employees, executives, stockholders, subsidiaries and retirees and their families.

4. A sponsor or its affiliate or a trade association or membership organization may facilitate the making of contributions to its separate segregated fund by establishing a payroll deduction system or other similar payment transfer method.

5. A sponsor, trade association, membership organization or separate segregated fund may rely on the federal election commission's written guidance interpreting [52 United States Code § 30118\(b\)](#) and rules adopted under that section when interpreting this subsection, if otherwise consistent with this article and articles 1, 1.1, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6 and 1.7 of this chapter.¹

Credits

Added by [Laws 2016, Ch. 79, § 12, eff. Nov. 5, 2016](#).

Footnotes

¹ Sections 16-901 et seq.; 16-905 et seq.; 16-921 et seq.; 16-925 et seq.; 16-931 et seq.; 16-933 et seq.; 16-937 et seq.

A. R. S. § 16-916, AZ ST § 16-916

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 16. Elections and Electors (Refs & Annos)
Chapter 6. Campaign Contributions and Expenses (Refs & Annos)
Article 1.2. Contributions (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 16-918

§ 16-918. Earmarking prohibited

Effective: November 5, 2016

[Currentness](#)

A contributor shall not give and a committee shall not accept a contribution that has been earmarked for a candidate.

Credits

Added by [Laws 2016, Ch. 79, § 12, eff. Nov. 5, 2016](#).

A. R. S. § 16-918, AZ ST § 16-918

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 16. Elections and Electors (Refs & Annos)
Chapter 6. Campaign Contributions and Expenses (Refs & Annos)
Article 1.3. Expenditures (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 16-922

§ 16-922. Independent and coordinated expenditures

Effective: November 5, 2016

[Currentness](#)

A. Any person may make independent expenditures.

B. An expenditure is not an independent expenditure if either of the following applies:

1. There is actual coordination with respect to an expenditure between a candidate or candidate's agent and the person making the expenditure or that person's agent.

2. Both of the following apply:

(a) The expenditure is based on nonpublic information about a candidate's or candidate committee's plans or needs that the candidate or candidate's agent provides to the person making the expenditure or that person's agent.

(b) The candidate or candidate's agent provides the nonpublic information with an intent toward having the expenditure made.

C. In evaluating whether an expenditure is an independent expenditure, a filing officer or enforcement officer may consider the following to be rebuttable evidence of coordination:

1. Any agent of the person making the expenditure is also an agent of the candidate whose election or whose opponent's defeat is being advocated by the expenditure.

2. In the same election cycle, the person making the expenditure or that person's agent is or has been authorized to raise or spend monies on the candidate's behalf.

3. In the same election cycle, the candidate is or has been authorized to raise money or solicit contributions on behalf of the person making the expenditure.

D. Notwithstanding subsection C of this section, coordination does not exist under either of the following:

1. If the person making the expenditure maintains a firewall between the person and that person's agent in compliance with all of the following:

(a) The person's agent did not participate in deciding to make the expenditure or in deciding the content, timing or targeting of the expenditure.

(b) The person making the expenditure has a written policy establishing the firewall and its requirements.

(c) The person making the expenditure and the person's agent followed the written policy regarding the firewall.

2. Solely because an agent of a person making the expenditure serves or has served on a candidate's host committee for a fund-raising event.

E. An expenditure that is coordinated with a candidate, other than a coordinated party expenditure, is deemed an in-kind contribution to the candidate.

F. An entity that makes an independent expenditure, other than an individual or a committee, shall file independent expenditure reports pursuant to [§ 16-926, subsection H](#).

Credits

Added by [Laws 2016, Ch. 79, § 12, eff. Nov. 5, 2016](#). Amended by [Laws 2016, Ch. 346, § 3, eff. Nov. 5, 2016](#).

A. R. S. § 16-922, AZ ST § 16-922

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 16. Elections and Electors (Refs & Annos)
Chapter 6. Campaign Contributions and Expenses (Refs & Annos)
Article 1.4. Reporting Requirements and Disclosure Statements (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 16-926

§ 16-926. Campaign finance reports; contents

Effective: November 5, 2016

[Currentness](#)

A. A committee shall file campaign finance reports with the filing officer. The secretary of state's instructions and procedures manual adopted pursuant to [§ 16-452](#) shall prescribe the format for all reports and statements.

B. A campaign finance report shall set forth:

1. The amount of cash on hand at the beginning of the reporting period.

2. Total receipts during the reporting period, including:

(a) An itemized list of receipts in the following categories, including the source, amount and date of receipt, together with the total of all receipts in each category:

(i) Contributions from individuals whose contributions exceed fifty dollars for that election cycle, including identification of the contributor's occupation and employer.

(ii) Contributions from candidate committees.

(iii) Contributions from political action committees.

(iv) Contributions from political parties.

(v) Contributions from partnerships.

(vi) For a political action committee or political party, contributions from corporations and limited liability companies, including identification of the corporation's or limited liability company's file number issued by the corporation commission.

(vii) For a political action committee or political party, contributions from labor organizations, including identification of the labor organization's file number issued by the corporation commission.

(viii) For a candidate committee, a candidate's contribution of personal monies.

(ix) All loans, including identification of any endorser or guarantor other than a candidate's spouse, and the contribution amount endorsed or guaranteed by each.

(x) Rebates and refunds.

(xi) Interest on committee monies.

(xii) The fair market value of in-kind contributions received.

(xiii) Extensions of credit that remain outstanding, including identification of the creditor and the purpose of the extension.

(b) The aggregate amount of contributions from all individuals whose contributions do not exceed fifty dollars for the election cycle.

3. An itemized list of all disbursements in excess of two hundred fifty dollars during the reporting period in the following categories, including the recipient, the recipient's address, a description of the disbursement and the amount and date of the disbursement, together with the total of all disbursements in each category:

(a) Disbursements for operating expenses.

(b) Contributions to candidate committees.

(c) Contributions to political action committees.

(d) Contributions to political parties.

(e) Contributions to partnerships.

(f) For a political action committee or political party, contributions to corporations and limited liability companies, including identification of the corporation's or limited liability company's file number issued by the corporation commission.

(g) For a political action committee or political party, contributions to labor organizations, including identification of the labor organization's file number issued by the corporation commission.

(h) Repayment of loans.

(i) Refunds of contributions.

(j) Loans made.

(k) The value of in-kind contributions provided.

(l) Independent expenditures that are made to advocate the election or defeat of a candidate, including identification of the candidate, office sought by the candidate, election date, mode of advertising and distribution or publication date.

(m) Expenditures to advocate the passage or defeat of a ballot measure, including identification of the ballot measure, ballot measure serial number, election date, mode of advertising and distribution or publication date.

(n) Expenditures to advocate for or against the issuance of a recall election order or for the election or defeat of a candidate in a recall election, including identification of the officer to be recalled or candidate supported or opposed, mode of advertising and distribution or publication date.

(o) Any other disbursements or expenditures.

4. The total sum of all receipts and disbursements for the reporting period.

5. A certification by the committee treasurer, issued under penalty of perjury, that the contents of the report are true and correct.

C. For the purposes of reporting under subsection B of this section:

1. A contribution is deemed to be received either on the date the committee knowingly takes possession of the contribution or the date of the check or credit card payment. For an in-kind contribution of services, the contribution is deemed made either on the date the services are performed or the date the committee receives the services.

2. An expenditure or disbursement is deemed made either on the date the committee authorizes the monies to be spent or the date the monies are withdrawn from the committee's account. For a transaction by check, the expenditure or disbursement is deemed made on the date the committee signs the check. For a credit card transaction on paper, the expenditure or disbursement is deemed made on the date the committee signs the authorization to charge the credit card. For an electronic transaction, an expenditure or disbursement is deemed made on the date the committee electronically

authorizes the charge. For an agreement to purchase goods or services, the expenditure or disbursement is deemed made either on the date the parties enter into the agreement or the date the purchase order is issued.

3. A committee may record its transactions using any of the methods authorized by this subsection but for each type of contribution, expenditure or disbursement made or received, the committee shall use a consistent method of recording transactions throughout the election cycle.

D. The amount of an in-kind contribution of services shall be equal to the usual and normal charges for the services on the date performed.

E. If any receipt or disbursement is earmarked, the committee shall report the identity of the person to whom the receipt or disbursement is earmarked.

F. Candidate committee reports shall be cumulative for the election cycle to which they relate. Political action committee and political party reports shall be cumulative for a two-year election cycle ending in the year of a statewide general election. If there has been no change during the reporting period in an item listed in the immediately preceding report, only the amount need be carried forward.

G. For a political action committee that receives individual contributions through a payroll deduction plan, that committee is not required to separately itemize each contribution received from the contributor during the reporting period. In lieu of itemization, the committee may report all of the following:

1. The aggregate amount of contributions received from the contributor through the payroll deduction plan during the reporting period.

2. The individual's identity.

3. The amount deducted per pay period.

H. An entity that makes independent expenditures or ballot measure expenditures in excess of one thousand dollars during a reporting period shall file an expenditure report with the filing officer for the applicable reporting period. Expenditure reports shall identify the candidate or ballot measure supported or opposed, office sought by the candidate, if any, election date, mode of advertising and first date of publication, display, delivery or broadcast of the advertisement.

Credits

Added by [Laws 2016, Ch. 79, § 12, eff. Nov. 5, 2016](#). Amended by [Laws 2016, Ch. 346, § 4, eff. Nov. 5, 2016](#).

A. R. S. § 16-926, AZ ST § 16-926

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 18. Information Technology (Refs & Annos)
Chapter 4. Network Services (Refs & Annos)
Article 3. Secretary of State

A.R.S. § 18-444
Formerly cited as A.R.S. § 38-542

§ 18-444. Duty to file financial disclosure statement; contents; exceptions

Effective: January 1, 2017

[Currentness](#)

A. In addition to other statements and reports required by law, every public officer, as a matter of public record, shall file with the secretary of state on a form prescribed by the secretary of state a verified financial disclosure statement covering the preceding calendar year. The statement shall disclose:

1. The name and home or work address of the public officer, whether the public officer's spouse is a member of the public officer's household, the number of minor children who are members of the public officer's household and all names and addresses under which each does business. If disclosure of the identity of the public officer's spouse or minor child would otherwise be required, a public officer may comply with the identification requirement by using the term "spouse" or "minor child", as applicable.

2. The name and address of each employer and of each other source of compensation other than gifts amounting to more than one thousand dollars received during the preceding calendar year by the public officer and members of his household in their own names, or by any other person for the use or benefit of the public officer or members of his household, a description of the services for which the compensation was received and the nature of the employer's business. This paragraph shall not be construed to require the disclosure of individual items of compensation that constituted a portion of the gross income of the business from which the public officer or members of his household derived compensation.

3. For a controlled business, a description of the goods or services provided by the business, and if any single source of compensation to the business during the preceding calendar year amounts to more than ten thousand dollars and is more than twenty-five percent of the gross income of the business, the disclosure shall also include a description of the goods or services provided to the source of compensation. For a dependent business the statement shall disclose a description of the goods or services provided by the business and a description of the goods or services provided to the source of compensation from which the dependent business derived the amount of gross income described in § 38-541, paragraph 4. If the source of compensation for a controlled or dependent business is a business, the statement shall disclose a description of the business activities engaged in by the source of compensation.

4. The names and addresses of all businesses and trusts in which the public officer or members of his household, or any other person for the use or benefit of the public officer or members of his household, had an ownership or beneficial interest of over one thousand dollars at any time during the preceding calendar year, and the names and addresses of all businesses and trusts in which the public officer or any member of his household held any office or had a fiduciary relationship at any time during the preceding calendar year, together with the amount or value of the interest and a description of the interest, office or relationship.

5. All Arizona real property interests and real property improvements, including specific location and approximate size, in which the public officer, any member of his household or a controlled or dependent business held legal title or a beneficial interest at any time during the preceding calendar year, and the value of any such interest, except that this paragraph does not apply to a real property interest and improvements thereon used as the primary personal residence or for the personal recreational use of the public officer. If a public officer, any member of his household or a controlled or dependent business acquired or divested any such interest during the preceding calendar year, he shall also disclose that the transaction was made and the date it occurred. If the controlled or dependent business is in the business of dealing in real property interests or improvements, disclosure need not include individual parcels or transactions as long as the aggregate value of all parcels of such property is reported.

6. The names and addresses of all creditors to whom the public officer or members of his household, in their own names or in the name of any other person, owed a debt of more than one thousand dollars or to whom a controlled business or a dependent business owed a debt of more than ten thousand dollars which was also more than thirty percent of the total business indebtedness at any time during the preceding calendar year, listing each such creditor. This paragraph shall not be construed to require the disclosure of debts owed by the public officer or any member of his household resulting from the ordinary conduct of a business other than a controlled or dependent business nor shall disclosure be required of credit card transactions, retail installment contracts, debts on residences or recreational property exempt from disclosure under paragraph 5 of this subsection, debts on motor vehicles not used for commercial purposes, debts secured by cash values on life insurance or debts owed to relatives. It is sufficient disclosure of a creditor if the name and address of a person to whom payments are made is disclosed. If the public officer, any member of his household or a controlled or dependent business incurred or discharged a debt which is reportable under this subsection during the preceding calendar year, the report shall disclose that the transaction was made and the date it occurred.

7. The identification and amount of each debt exceeding one thousand dollars owed at any time during the preceding calendar year to the public officer and members of his household in their own names, or to any other person for the use or benefit of the public officer or any member of his household. The disclosure shall include the identification and amount of each debt exceeding ten thousand dollars to a controlled business or dependent business which was also more than thirty percent of the total indebtedness to the business at any time during the preceding calendar year. This paragraph shall not be construed to require the disclosure of debts from the ordinary conduct of a business other than a controlled or dependent business. If the public officer, any member of his household or a controlled or dependent business incurred or discharged a debt which is reportable under this subsection during the preceding year, the report shall disclose that the transaction was made and the date it occurred.

8. The name of each source of any gift, or accumulated gifts from a single source, of more than five hundred dollars received by the public officer and members of his household in their own names during the preceding calendar year, or by any other person for the use or benefit of the public officer or any member of his household except gifts received by will or by virtue of intestate succession, or received by way of distribution from any inter vivos or testamentary trust established by a spouse or by an ancestor, or gifts received from any other member of the household or relatives to the second degree of consanguinity.

9. A list of all business licenses issued to, held by or in which the public officer or any member of his household had an interest at any time during the preceding calendar year, including the name in which the license was issued, the type of business and its location.

10. A list of all bonds, together with their value, issued by this state or any political subdivision of this state and held at any time during the preceding calendar year by the public officer or any member of his household, which bonds issued by a single entity had a value in excess of one thousand dollars. If the public officer or any member of his household acquired or divested any bonds during the preceding calendar year which are reportable under this paragraph, the fact that the transaction occurred and the date shall also be shown.

11. The name of each meeting, conference or other event where the public officer is participating in the public officer's official capacity if travel-related expenses of one thousand dollars or more were incurred on behalf of the public officer and the travel-related expenses are not paid by the public officer.

B. If an amount or value is required to be reported pursuant to this section, it is sufficient to report whether the amount or value of the equity interest falls within:

1. Category 1, one thousand dollars to twenty-five thousand dollars.
2. Category 2, more than twenty-five thousand dollars to one hundred thousand dollars.
3. Category 3, more than one hundred thousand dollars.

C. This section does not require the disclosure of any information that is privileged by law.

D. The statement required to be filed pursuant to subsection A shall be filed by all persons who qualified as public officers at any time during the preceding calendar year on or before January 31 of each year with the exceptions that a public officer appointed to fill a vacancy shall, within sixty days following his taking of such office, file a financial disclosure statement covering as his annual period the twelve month period ending with the last full month prior to the date of his taking office, and a public officer whose final term expires less than thirty-one days into the immediately following calendar year may file the public officer's final financial disclosure at the same time as the disclosure for the last immediately preceding year.

E. The secretary of state shall prepare written guidelines, forms and samples for completing the financial disclosure statement required by this section. A copy of the guidelines, forms and samples shall be distributed to each public officer and shall be made available to each candidate required to file a financial disclosure statement pursuant to § 38-543.

F. Beginning January 1, 2017, the statement required to be filed in subsection D of this section may be filed by the public officer in a form prescribed by the secretary of state that includes authorization for future filings to be submitted in an electronic format. Any subsequent filings required to be filed in subsection D of this section may be filed in an electronic format as prescribed by the secretary of state. Beginning January 1, 2017, any statements that are required to be filed by a local public officer pursuant to an ordinance, rule, resolution or regulation adopted pursuant to § 38-545 may be filed in an electronic format as prescribed by the secretary of state.

Credits

Added as § 38-542 by Laws 1974, Ch. 199, § 5. Amended by Laws 1983, Ch. 328, § 7, eff. Jan. 1, 1984; [Laws 2011, Ch. 332, § 27](#); [Laws 2014, Ch. 149, § 1, eff. Jan. 1, 2017](#). Renumbered as § 18-444 by [Laws 2016, Ch. 80, § 3](#). Amended by [Laws 2016, Ch. 196, § 2, eff. Jan. 1, 2017](#).

A. R. S. § 18-444, AZ ST § 18-444

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

End of Document

© 2017 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
 Title 21. Juries (Refs & Annos)
 Chapter 4. Grand Juries (Refs & Annos)
 Article 2. State Grand Jury (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 21-422

§ 21-422. Powers and duties

Currentness

A. The law applicable to county grand juries, including their powers, duties and functions, applies to the state grand juries except insofar as it is in conflict with this article. The supreme court shall adopt rules to govern the procedures of state grand juries.

B. The state grand jury shall investigate and return indictments for only those offenses or violations of law arising out of or in connection with:

1. The determination or collection of state taxes, the registration or failure to register securities, the offer or sale of securities, the offer or sale of interests in land, the formation or operation of banks, insurance companies, pension funds, labor unions, professional sports enterprises, corporate enterprises, or business enterprises, the making or collecting of loans, events leading to receivership or declaration of bankruptcy by a business enterprise, the sale or purchase of goods or services by or for the state or political subdivisions, bribery, obstruction of justice, hindering prosecution or any form of intentional, knowing or corrupt misconduct involving any person compensated by public funds.

2. Any fraud, theft or possession, receipt, sale or transportation of stolen property or other contraband, or gambling or prostitution or narcotics, which occurs in more than one county or which occurs in one county and affects the residents of another county or which may be prosecuted by more than one county attorney.

3. Perjury, false swearing, unsworn falsification, or any violation of title 13, chapter 28¹ in connection with any state grand jury proceeding, committed by any person testifying before it or in any trial or other proceeding involving any indictment returned by a state grand jury.

4. Any perjury by subornation or attempted perjury by subornation relating to testimony before it or in any trial or other proceeding involving any indictment returned by a state grand jury.

5. Any violation of title 13, chapter 23² or § 38-421 or 39-161.

6. Any violation of title 13, chapter 35.1 if committed using a computer or network as defined in § 13-2301 and if any part of the conduct either:

(a) Occurs in more than one county, state or country.

(b) Affects the residents of another county, state or country.

(c) May be prosecuted by more than one county, state or country.

7. Any criminal wrongdoing that is referred in writing by a county attorney and that is accepted in writing by the attorney general.

C. If a state grand jury, pursuant to an investigation under subsection B of this section, learns of an offense for which it lacks jurisdiction to indict, the grand jury shall direct the attorney general to inform the appropriate prosecutorial authority.

D. Nothing in this article shall be construed to limit the jurisdiction of the county grand juries or county attorneys, nor shall an investigation by a state grand jury be deemed preemptive of a previously instituted investigation by another grand jury or agency having jurisdiction under the same subject matter unless good cause is shown.

Credits

Added by Laws 1975, Ch. 124, § 1. Amended by Laws 1977, Ch. 154, § 11; Laws 1978, Ch. 201, § 329, eff. Oct. 1, 1978; Laws 1980, Ch. 229, § 36, eff. April 23, 1980; Laws 1984, Ch. 304, § 4; [Laws 2000, Ch. 189, § 34](#).

Footnotes

1 Section 13-2801 et seq.

2 Section 13-2301 et seq.

A. R. S. § 21-422, AZ ST § 21-422

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated

Title 38. Public Officers and Employees (Refs & Annos)

Chapter 2. Qualification and Tenure

Article 7. Impeachment of State and Judicial Officers (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 38-311

§ 38-311. Officers subject to impeachment

Currentness

The governor, every state and judicial officer, except justices of courts not of record, shall be liable to impeachment for high crimes, misdemeanors or malfeasance in office.

A. R. S. § 38-311, AZ ST § 38-311

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

End of Document

© 2017 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated

Title 38. Public Officers and Employees (Refs & Annos)

Chapter 2. Qualification and Tenure

Article 7. Impeachment of State and Judicial Officers (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 38-312

§ 38-312. Articles of impeachment

[Currentness](#)

Impeachment shall be instituted in the house of representatives by resolution, and shall be conducted by managers elected by the house of representatives, who shall prepare articles of impeachment, present them at the bar of the senate and prosecute them. The hearing shall be heard before the senate sitting as a court of impeachment.

A. R. S. § 38-312, AZ ST § 38-312

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

End of Document

© 2017 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 38. Public Officers and Employees (Refs & Annos)
Chapter 3. Conduct of Office
Article 3.1. Public Meetings and Proceedings (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 38-431

§ 38-431. Definitions

Effective: August 2, 2012

[Currentness](#)

In this article, unless the context otherwise requires:

1. "Advisory committee" or "subcommittee" means any entity, however designated, that is officially established, on motion and order of a public body or by the presiding officer of the public body, and whose members have been appointed for the specific purpose of making a recommendation concerning a decision to be made or considered or a course of conduct to be taken or considered by the public body.
2. "Executive session" means a gathering of a quorum of members of a public body from which the public is excluded for one or more of the reasons prescribed in § 38-431.03. In addition to the members of the public body, officers, appointees and employees as provided in § 38-431.03 and the auditor general as provided in § 41-1279.04, only individuals whose presence is reasonably necessary in order for the public body to carry out its executive session responsibilities may attend the executive session.
3. "Legal action" means a collective decision, commitment or promise made by a public body pursuant to the constitution, the public body's charter, bylaws or specified scope of appointment and the laws of this state.
4. "Meeting" means the gathering, in person or through technological devices, of a quorum of members of a public body at which they discuss, propose or take legal action, including any deliberations by a quorum with respect to such action.
5. "Political subdivision" means all political subdivisions of this state, including without limitation all counties, cities and towns, school districts and special districts.
6. "Public body" means the legislature, all boards and commissions of this state or political subdivisions, all multimember governing bodies of departments, agencies, institutions and instrumentalities of this state or political subdivisions, including without limitation all corporations and other instrumentalities whose boards of directors are appointed or elected by this state or political subdivision. Public body includes all quasi-judicial bodies and all standing, special or advisory committees or subcommittees of, or appointed by, the public body. Public body includes all commissions and other public entities established by the Arizona Constitution or by way of ballot initiative, including the independent redistricting commission, and this article applies except and only to the extent that specific constitutional provisions supersede this article.

7. "Quasi-judicial body" means a public body, other than a court of law, possessing the power to hold hearings on disputed matters between a private person and a public agency and to make decisions in the general manner of a court regarding such disputed claims.

Credits

Added by Laws 1962, Ch. 138, § 2. Amended by Laws 1974, Ch. 196, § 1, eff. May 22, 1974; Laws 1978, Ch. 86, § 1; Laws 1982, Ch. 278, § 1; Laws 1985, Ch. 203, § 1; Laws 2000, Ch. 358, § 1; Laws 2007, Ch. 71, § 1; Laws 2012, Ch. 131, § 1.

A. R. S. § 38-431, AZ ST § 38-431

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

End of Document

© 2017 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 38. Public Officers and Employees (Refs & Annos)
Chapter 3. Conduct of Office
Article 3.1. Public Meetings and Proceedings (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 38-431.01

§ 38-431.01. Meetings shall be open to the public

Effective: July 29, 2010

[Currentness](#)

A. All meetings of any public body shall be public meetings and all persons so desiring shall be permitted to attend and listen to the deliberations and proceedings. All legal action of public bodies shall occur during a public meeting.

B. All public bodies shall provide for the taking of written minutes or a recording of all their meetings, including executive sessions. For meetings other than executive sessions, such minutes or recording shall include, but not be limited to:

1. The date, time and place of the meeting.

2. The members of the public body recorded as either present or absent.

3. A general description of the matters considered.

4. An accurate description of all legal actions proposed, discussed or taken, and the names of members who propose each motion. The minutes shall also include the names of the persons, as given, making statements or presenting material to the public body and a reference to the legal action about which they made statements or presented material.

C. Minutes of executive sessions shall include items set forth in subsection B, paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 of this section, an accurate description of all instructions given pursuant to [§ 38-431.03, subsection A](#), paragraphs 4, 5 and 7 and such other matters as may be deemed appropriate by the public body.

D. The minutes or a recording of a meeting shall be available for public inspection three working days after the meeting except as otherwise specifically provided by this article.

E. A public body of a city or town with a population of more than two thousand five hundred persons shall:

1. Within three working days after a meeting, except for subcommittees and advisory committees, post on its website, if applicable, either:

(a) A statement describing the legal actions taken by the public body of the city or town during the meeting.

(b) Any recording of the meeting.

2. Within two working days following approval of the minutes, post approved minutes of city or town council meetings on its website, if applicable, except as otherwise specifically provided by this article.

3. Within ten working days after a subcommittee or advisory committee meeting, post on its website, if applicable, either:

(a) A statement describing legal action, if any.

(b) A recording of the meeting.

F. All or any part of a public meeting of a public body may be recorded by any person in attendance by means of a tape recorder or camera or any other means of sonic reproduction, provided that there is no active interference with the conduct of the meeting.

G. The secretary of state for state public bodies, the city or town clerk for municipal public bodies and the county clerk for all other local public bodies shall conspicuously post open meeting law materials prepared and approved by the attorney general on their website. A person elected or appointed to a public body shall review the open meeting law materials at least one day before the day that person takes office.

H. A public body may make an open call to the public during a public meeting, subject to reasonable time, place and manner restrictions, to allow individuals to address the public body on any issue within the jurisdiction of the public body. At the conclusion of an open call to the public, individual members of the public body may respond to criticism made by those who have addressed the public body, may ask staff to review a matter or may ask that a matter be put on a future agenda. However, members of the public body shall not discuss or take legal action on matters raised during an open call to the public unless the matters are properly noticed for discussion and legal action.

I. A member of a public body shall not knowingly direct any staff member to communicate in violation of this article.

J. Any posting required by subsection E of this section must remain on the applicable website for at least one year after the date of the posting.

Credits

Added by Laws 1962, Ch. 138, § 2. Amended by Laws 1974, Ch. 196, § 2, eff. May 22, 1974; Laws 1975, Ch. 48, § 1; Laws 1978, Ch. 86, § 2; Laws 1982, Ch. 278, § 2; Laws 2000, Ch. 358, § 2; Laws 2006, Ch. 294, § 1; Laws 2007, Ch. 71, § 2; Laws 2009, Ch. 27, § 1; Laws 2010, Ch. 88, § 1.

A. R. S. § 38-431.01, AZ ST § 38-431.01

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

End of Document

© 2017 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 38. Public Officers and Employees (Refs & Annos)
Chapter 3. Conduct of Office
Article 3.1. Public Meetings and Proceedings (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 38-431.02

§ 38-431.02. Notice of meetings

Effective: July 29, 2010

[Currentness](#)

A. Public notice of all meetings of public bodies shall be given as follows:

1. The public bodies of this state, including governing bodies of charter schools, shall:

(a) Conspicuously post a statement on their website stating where all public notices of their meetings will be posted, including the physical and electronic locations, and shall give additional public notice as is reasonable and practicable as to all meetings.

(b) Post all public meeting notices on their website and give additional public notice as is reasonable and practicable as to all meetings. A technological problem or failure that either prevents the posting of public notices on a website or that temporarily or permanently prevents the use of all or part of the website does not preclude the holding of the meeting for which the notice was posted if the public body complies with all other public notice requirements required by this section.

2. The public bodies of the counties and school districts shall:

(a) Conspicuously post a statement on their website stating where all public notices of their meetings will be posted, including the physical and electronic locations, and shall give additional public notice as is reasonable and practicable as to all meetings.

(b) Post all public meeting notices on their website and give additional public notice as is reasonable and practicable as to all meetings. A technological problem or failure that either prevents the posting of public notices on a website or that temporarily or permanently prevents the use of all or part of the website does not preclude the holding of the meeting for which the notice was posted if the public body complies with all other public notice requirements required by this section.

3. Special districts that are formed pursuant to title 48:¹

(a) May conspicuously post a statement on their website stating where all public notices of their meetings will be posted, including the physical and electronic locations, and shall give additional public notice as is reasonable and practicable as to all meetings.

(b) May post all public meeting notices on their website and shall give additional public notice as is reasonable and practicable as to all meetings. A technological problem or failure that either prevents the posting of public notices on a website or that temporarily or permanently prevents the use of all or part of the website does not preclude the holding of the meeting for which the notice was posted if the public body complies with all other public notice requirements required by this section.

(c) If a statement or notice is not posted pursuant to subdivision (a) or (b) of this paragraph, shall file a statement with the clerk of the board of supervisors stating where all public notices of their meetings will be posted and shall give additional public notice as is reasonable and practicable as to all meetings.

4. The public bodies of the cities and towns shall:

(a) Conspicuously post a statement on their website or on a website of an association of cities and towns stating where all public notices of their meetings will be posted, including the physical and electronic locations, and shall give additional public notice as is reasonable and practicable as to all meetings.

(b) Post all public meeting notices on their website or on a website of an association of cities and towns and give additional public notice as is reasonable and practicable as to all meetings. A technological problem or failure that either prevents the posting of public notices on a website or that temporarily or permanently prevents the use of all or part of the website does not preclude the holding of the meeting for which the notice was posted if the public body complies with all other public notice requirements required by this section.

B. If an executive session is scheduled, a notice of the executive session shall state the provision of law authorizing the executive session, and the notice shall be provided to the:

1. Members of the public body.

2. General public.

C. Except as provided in subsections D and E of this section, meetings shall not be held without at least twenty-four hours' notice to the members of the public body and to the general public. The twenty-four hour period includes Saturdays if the public has access to the physical posted location in addition to any website posting, but excludes Sundays and other holidays prescribed in § 1-301.

D. In case of an actual emergency, a meeting, including an executive session, may be held on such notice as is appropriate to the circumstances. If this subsection is utilized for conduct of an emergency session or the consideration of an emergency measure at a previously scheduled meeting the public body must post a public notice within twenty-four hours declaring that an emergency session has been held and setting forth the information required in subsections H and I of this section.

E. A meeting may be recessed and resumed with less than twenty-four hours' notice if public notice of the initial session of the meeting is given as required in subsection A of this section, and if, before recessing, notice is publicly given as to the time and place of the resumption of the meeting or the method by which notice shall be publicly given.

F. A public body that intends to meet for a specified calendar period, on a regular day, date or event during the calendar period, and at a regular place and time, may post public notice of the meetings at the beginning of the period. The notice shall specify the period for which notice is applicable.

G. Notice required under this section shall include an agenda of the matters to be discussed or decided at the meeting or information on how the public may obtain a copy of such an agenda. The agenda must be available to the public at least twenty-four hours before the meeting, except in the case of an actual emergency under subsection D of this section. The twenty-four hour period includes Saturdays if the public has access to the physical posted location in addition to any website posting, but excludes Sundays and other holidays prescribed in § 1-301.

H. Agendas required under this section shall list the specific matters to be discussed, considered or decided at the meeting. The public body may discuss, consider or make decisions only on matters listed on the agenda and other matters related thereto.

I. Notwithstanding the other provisions of this section, notice of executive sessions shall be required to include only a general description of the matters to be considered. The agenda shall provide more than just a recital of the statutory provisions authorizing the executive session, but need not contain information that would defeat the purpose of the executive session, compromise the legitimate privacy interests of a public officer, appointee or employee or compromise the attorney-client privilege.

J. Notwithstanding subsections H and I of this section, in the case of an actual emergency a matter may be discussed and considered and, at public meetings, decided, if the matter was not listed on the agenda and a statement setting forth the reasons necessitating the discussion, consideration or decision is placed in the minutes of the meeting and is publicly announced at the public meeting. In the case of an executive session, the reason for consideration of the emergency measure shall be announced publicly immediately before the executive session.

K. Notwithstanding subsection H of this section, the chief administrator, presiding officer or a member of a public body may present a brief summary of current events without listing in the agenda the specific matters to be summarized, if:

1. The summary is listed on the agenda.

2. The public body does not propose, discuss, deliberate or take legal action at that meeting on any matter in the summary unless the specific matter is properly noticed for legal action.

Credits

Added by Laws 1974, Ch. 196, § 4, eff. May 22, 1974. Amended by Laws 1978, Ch. 86, § 3; Laws 1982, Ch. 278, § 3; Laws 2000, Ch. 358, § 3; Laws 2002, Ch. 247, § 1; Laws 2006, Ch. 294, § 2; Laws 2009, Ch. 27, § 2; Laws 2010, Ch. 88, § 2.

Footnotes

1 Section 48-101 et seq.

A. R. S. § 38-431.02, AZ ST § 38-431.02

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

End of Document

© 2017 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 38. Public Officers and Employees (Refs & Annos)
Chapter 3. Conduct of Office
Article 3.1. Public Meetings and Proceedings (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 38-431.03

§ 38-431.03. Executive sessions

Currentness

A. Upon a public majority vote of the members constituting a quorum, a public body may hold an executive session but only for the following purposes:

1. Discussion or consideration of employment, assignment, appointment, promotion, demotion, dismissal, salaries, disciplining or resignation of a public officer, appointee or employee of any public body, except that, with the exception of salary discussions, an officer, appointee or employee may demand that the discussion or consideration occur at a public meeting. The public body shall provide the officer, appointee or employee with written notice of the executive session as is appropriate but not less than twenty-four hours for the officer, appointee or employee to determine whether the discussion or consideration should occur at a public meeting.

2. Discussion or consideration of records exempt by law from public inspection, including the receipt and discussion of information or testimony that is specifically required to be maintained as confidential by state or federal law.

3. Discussion or consultation for legal advice with the attorney or attorneys of the public body.

4. Discussion or consultation with the attorneys of the public body in order to consider its position and instruct its attorneys regarding the public body's position regarding contracts that are the subject of negotiations, in pending or contemplated litigation or in settlement discussions conducted in order to avoid or resolve litigation.

5. Discussions or consultations with designated representatives of the public body in order to consider its position and instruct its representatives regarding negotiations with employee organizations regarding the salaries, salary schedules or compensation paid in the form of fringe benefits of employees of the public body.

6. Discussion, consultation or consideration for international and interstate negotiations or for negotiations by a city or town, or its designated representatives, with members of a tribal council, or its designated representatives, of an Indian reservation located within or adjacent to the city or town.

7. Discussions or consultations with designated representatives of the public body in order to consider its position and instruct its representatives regarding negotiations for the purchase, sale or lease of real property.

B. Minutes of and discussions made at executive sessions shall be kept confidential except from:

1. Members of the public body which met in executive session.

2. Officers, appointees or employees who were the subject of discussion or consideration pursuant to subsection A, paragraph 1 of this section.

3. The auditor general on a request made in connection with an audit authorized as provided by law.

4. A county attorney or the attorney general when investigating alleged violations of this article.

C. The public body shall instruct persons who are present at the executive session regarding the confidentiality requirements of this article.

D. Legal action involving a final vote or decision shall not be taken at an executive session, except that the public body may instruct its attorneys or representatives as provided in subsection A, paragraphs 4, 5 and 7 of this section. A public vote shall be taken before any legal action binds the public body.

E. Except as provided in § 38-431.02, subsections I and J, a public body shall not discuss any matter in an executive session which is not described in the notice of the executive session.

F. Disclosure of executive session information pursuant to this section or § 38-431.06 does not constitute a waiver of any privilege, including the attorney-client privilege. Any person receiving executive session information pursuant to this section or § 38-431.06 shall not disclose that information except to the attorney general or county attorney, by agreement with the public body or to a court in camera for purposes of enforcing this article. Any court that reviews executive session information shall take appropriate action to protect privileged information.

Credits

Added by Laws 1974, Ch. 196, § 6, eff. May 22, 1974. Amended by Laws 1978, Ch. 86, § 4; Laws 1982, Ch. 278, § 4; Laws 1983, Ch. 274, § 2, eff. April 27, 1983; Laws 1990, Ch. 56, § 1, eff. April 12, 1990; Laws 2000, Ch. 358, § 4.

A. R. S. § 38-431.03, AZ ST § 38-431.03

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 38. Public Officers and Employees (Refs & Annos)
Chapter 3. Conduct of Office
Article 3.1. Public Meetings and Proceedings (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 38-431.04

§ 38-431.04. Writ of mandamus

Currentness

Where the provisions of this article are not complied with, a court of competent jurisdiction may issue a writ of mandamus requiring that a meeting be open to the public.

Credits

Added as § 38-431.03 by Laws 1962, Ch. 138, § 2. Renumbered as § 38-431.04 by Laws 1974, Ch. 196, § 6, eff. May 22, 1974.

A. R. S. § 38-431.04, AZ ST § 38-431.04

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

End of Document

© 2017 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 38. Public Officers and Employees (Refs & Annos)
Chapter 3. Conduct of Office
Article 3.1. Public Meetings and Proceedings (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 38-431.05

§ 38-431.05. Meeting held in violation of article; business transacted null and void; ratification

Currentness

A. All legal action transacted by any public body during a meeting held in violation of any provision of this article is null and void except as provided in subsection B.

B. A public body may ratify legal action taken in violation of this article in accordance with the following requirements:

1. Ratification shall take place at a public meeting within thirty days after discovery of the violation or after such discovery should have been made by the exercise of reasonable diligence.

2. The notice for the meeting shall include a description of the action to be ratified, a clear statement that the public body proposes to ratify a prior action and information on how the public may obtain a detailed written description of the action to be ratified.

3. The public body shall make available to the public a detailed written description of the action to be ratified and all deliberations, consultations and decisions by members of the public body that preceded and related to such action. The written description shall also be included as part of the minutes of the meeting at which ratification is taken.

4. The public body shall make available to the public the notice and detailed written description required by this section at least seventy-two hours in advance of the public meeting at which the ratification is taken.

Credits

Added as § 38-431.04 by Laws 1962, Ch. 138, § 2. Renumbered as § 38-431.05 by Laws 1974, Ch. 196, § 6, eff. May 22, 1974. Amended by Laws 1978, Ch. 86, § 5; Laws 1982, Ch. 278, § 5.

A. R. S. § 38-431.05, AZ ST § 38-431.05

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 38. Public Officers and Employees (Refs & Annos)
Chapter 3. Conduct of Office
Article 3.1. Public Meetings and Proceedings (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 38-431.06

§ 38-431.06. Investigations; written investigative demands

Currentness

A. On receipt of a written complaint signed by a complainant alleging a violation of this article or on their own initiative, the attorney general or the county attorney for the county in which the alleged violation occurred may begin an investigation.

B. In addition to other powers conferred by this article, in order to carry out the duties prescribed in this article, the attorney general or the county attorney for the county in which the alleged violation occurred, or their designees, may:

1. Issue written investigative demands to any person.
2. Administer an oath or affirmation to any person for testimony.
3. Examine under oath any person in connection with the investigation of the alleged violation of this article.
4. Examine by means of inspecting, studying or copying any account, book, computer, document, minutes, paper, recording or record.
5. Require any person to file on prescribed forms a statement or report in writing and under oath of all the facts and circumstances requested by the attorney general or county attorney.

C. The written investigative demand shall:

1. Be served on the person in the manner required for service of process in this state or by certified mail, return receipt requested.
2. Describe the class or classes of documents or objects with sufficient definiteness to permit them to be fairly identified.
3. Prescribe a reasonable time at which the person shall appear to testify and within which the document or object shall be produced and advise the person that objections to or reasons for not complying with the demand may be filed with the attorney general or county attorney on or before that time.

4. Specify a place for the taking of testimony or for production of a document or object and designate a person who shall be the custodian of the document or object.

D. If a person objects to or otherwise fails to comply with the written investigation demand served on the person pursuant to subsection C, the attorney general or county attorney may file an action in the superior court for an order to enforce the demand. Venue for the action to enforce the demand shall be in Maricopa county or in the county in which the alleged violation occurred. Notice of hearing the action to enforce the demand and a copy of the action shall be served on the person in the same manner as that prescribed in the Arizona rules of civil procedure. If a court finds that the demand is proper, including that the compliance will not violate a privilege and that there is not a conflict of interest on the part of the attorney general or county attorney, that there is reasonable cause to believe there may have been a violation of this article and that the information sought or document or object demanded is relevant to the violation, the court shall order the person to comply with the demand, subject to modifications the court may prescribe. If the person fails to comply with the court's order, the court may issue any of the following orders until the person complies with the order:

1. Adjudging the person in contempt of court.

2. Granting injunctive relief against the person to whom the demand is issued to restrain the conduct that is the subject of the investigation.

3. Granting other relief the court deems proper.

Credits

Added by [Laws 2000, Ch. 358, § 5](#).

A. R. S. § 38-431.06, AZ ST § 38-431.06

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 38. Public Officers and Employees (Refs & Annos)
Chapter 3. Conduct of Office
Article 3.1. Public Meetings and Proceedings (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 38-431.07

§ 38-431.07. Violations; enforcement; removal from office; in camera review

Currentness

A. Any person affected by an alleged violation of this article, the attorney general or the county attorney for the county in which an alleged violation of this article occurred may commence a suit in the superior court in the county in which the public body ordinarily meets, for the purpose of requiring compliance with, or the prevention of violations of, this article, by members of the public body, or to determine the applicability of this article to matters or legal actions of the public body. For each violation the court may impose a civil penalty not to exceed five hundred dollars against a person who violates this article or who knowingly aids, agrees to aid or attempts to aid another person in violating this article and order such equitable relief as it deems appropriate in the circumstances. The civil penalties awarded pursuant to this section shall be deposited into the general fund of the public body concerned. The court may also order payment to a successful plaintiff in a suit brought under this section of the plaintiff's reasonable attorney fees, by the defendant state, the political subdivision of the state or the incorporated city or town of which the public body is a part or to which it reports. If the court determines that a public officer with intent to deprive the public of information violated any provision of this article the court may remove the public officer from office and shall assess the public officer or a person who knowingly aided, agreed to aid or attempted to aid the public officer in violating this article, or both, with all of the costs and attorney fees awarded to the plaintiff pursuant to this section.

B. A public body shall not expend public monies to employ or retain legal counsel to provide legal services or representation to the public body or any of its officers in any legal action commenced pursuant to any provisions of this article, unless the public body has authority to make such expenditure pursuant to other provisions of law and takes a legal action at a properly noticed open meeting approving such expenditure prior to incurring any such obligation or indebtedness.

C. In any action brought pursuant to this section challenging the validity of an executive session, the court may review in camera the minutes of the executive session, and if the court in its discretion determines that the minutes are relevant and that justice so demands, the court may disclose to the parties or admit in evidence part or all of the minutes.

Credits

Added by Laws 1974, Ch. 196, § 7, eff. May 22, 1974. Amended by Laws 1978, Ch. 86, § 6; Laws 1982, Ch. 278, § 7; Laws 2000, Ch. 358, § 6.

A. R. S. § 38-431.07, AZ ST § 38-431.07

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 38. Public Officers and Employees (Refs & Annos)
Chapter 3. Conduct of Office
Article 3.1. Public Meetings and Proceedings (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 38-431.08

§ 38-431.08. Exceptions; limitation

Effective: August 2, 2012

[Currentness](#)

A. This article does not apply to:

1. Any judicial proceeding of any court or any political caucus of the legislature.
2. Any conference committee of the legislature, except that all such meetings shall be open to the public.
3. The commissions on appellate and trial court appointments and the commission on judicial qualifications.
4. Good cause exception and central registry exception determinations and hearings conducted by the board of fingerprinting pursuant to §§ [41-619.55](#) and [41-619.57](#).

B. A hearing held within a prison facility by the board of executive clemency is subject to this article, except that the director of the state department of corrections may:

1. Prohibit, on written findings that are made public within five days of so finding, any person from attending a hearing whose attendance would constitute a serious threat to the life or physical safety of any person or to the safe, secure and orderly operation of the prison.
2. Require a person who attends a hearing to sign an attendance log. If the person is over sixteen years of age, the person shall produce photographic identification that verifies the person's signature.
3. Prevent and prohibit any articles from being taken into a hearing except recording devices and, if the person who attends a hearing is a member of the media, cameras.
4. Require that a person who attends a hearing submit to a reasonable search on entering the facility.

C. The exclusive remedies available to any person who is denied attendance at or removed from a hearing by the director of the state department of corrections in violation of this section shall be those remedies available in § [38-431.07](#), as against the director only.

D. Either house of the legislature may adopt a rule or procedure pursuant to [article IV, part 2, section 8, Constitution of Arizona](#), to provide an exemption to the notice and agenda requirements of this article or to allow standing or conference committees to meet through technological devices rather than only in person.

Credits

Added by Laws 1974, Ch. 196, § 7, eff. May 22, 1974. Amended by Laws 1975, Ch. 71, § 1, eff. May 20, 1975; Laws 1977, Ch. 128, § 1; Laws 1982, Ch. 278, § 8; Laws 1990, Ch. 298, § 1, eff. June 16, 1990; Laws 1998, Ch. 232, § 8; Laws 1998, Ch. 270, § 12, eff. August 17, 1999; Laws 1999, Ch. 211, § 33; Laws 2000, Ch. 251, § 14; Laws 2000, Ch. 358, § 7; Laws 2012, Ch. 188, § 3.

A. R. S. § 38-431.08, AZ ST § 38-431.08

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

End of Document

© 2017 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 38. Public Officers and Employees (Refs & Annos)
Chapter 3. Conduct of Office
Article 3.1. Public Meetings and Proceedings (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 38-431.09

§ 38-431.09. Declaration of public policy

Effective: September 26, 2008

[Currentness](#)

A. It is the public policy of this state that meetings of public bodies be conducted openly and that notices and agendas be provided for such meetings which contain such information as is reasonably necessary to inform the public of the matters to be discussed or decided. Toward this end, any person or entity charged with the interpretations of this article shall construe this article in favor of open and public meetings.

B. Notwithstanding subsection A, it is not a violation of this article if a member of a public body expresses an opinion or discusses an issue with the public either at a venue other than at a meeting that is subject to this article, personally, through the media or other form of public broadcast communication or through technological means if:

1. The opinion or discussion is not principally directed at or directly given to another member of the public body.
2. There is no concerted plan to engage in collective deliberation to take legal action.

Credits

Added by Laws 1978, Ch. 86, § 7. Amended by Laws 1982, Ch. 278, § 9; [Laws 2000, Ch. 358, § 8](#); [Laws 2008, Ch. 135, § 1](#).

A. R. S. § 38-431.09, AZ ST § 38-431.09

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 38. Public Officers and Employees (Refs & Annos)
Chapter 3. Conduct of Office
Article 4. Official Acts (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 38-441

§ 38-441. Discharge of duties of another office; attestation

Currentness

When an officer discharges ex officio the duties of another office, his official signature and the attestation shall be in the name of the office which he discharges.

A. R. S. § 38-441, AZ ST § 38-441

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

End of Document

© 2017 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 38. Public Officers and Employees (Refs & Annos)
Chapter 3. Conduct of Office
Article 4. Official Acts (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 38-442

§ 38-442. Persons acting as public officers without qualifying; classification; effect of acts

Currentness

A. A person who exercises a function of a public office without taking the oath of office, or without giving the required bond, is guilty of a class 2 misdemeanor.

B. This section shall not affect the validity of acts done by a person exercising the functions of a public office in fact, where persons other than himself are interested in maintaining the validity of such acts.

Credits

Amended by Laws 1978, Ch. 201, § 678, eff. Oct. 1, 1978.

A. R. S. § 38-442, AZ ST § 38-442

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 38. Public Officers and Employees (Refs & Annos)
Chapter 3. Conduct of Office
Article 4. Official Acts (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 38-443

§ 38-443. Nonfeasance in public office; classification

[Currentness](#)

A public officer or person holding a position of public trust or employment who knowingly omits to perform any duty the performance of which is required of him by law is guilty of a class 2 misdemeanor unless special provision has been made for punishment of such omission.

Credits

Amended by Laws 1978, Ch. 201, § 679, eff. Oct. 1, 1978.

A. R. S. § 38-443, AZ ST § 38-443

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

End of Document

© 2017 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 38. Public Officers and Employees (Refs & Annos)
Chapter 3. Conduct of Office
Article 4. Official Acts (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 38-444

§ 38-444. Asking or receiving illegal gratuity or reward; classification

[Currentness](#)

A public officer who knowingly asks or receives any emolument, gratuity or reward, or any promise thereof, excepting those authorized by law, for doing any official act, is guilty of a class 6 felony.

Credits

Amended by Laws 1978, Ch. 201, § 680, eff. Oct. 1, 1978.

A. R. S. § 38-444, AZ ST § 38-444

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

End of Document

© 2017 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 38. Public Officers and Employees (Refs & Annos)
Chapter 3. Conduct of Office
Article 4. Official Acts (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 38-445

§ 38-445. Using pass or obtaining special rates for transportation; classification; exception

Currentness

A public officer, except a notary public or a member of the national guard of Arizona traveling under orders, who knowingly accepts or uses a pass or purchases transportation from a common carrier, other than as such transportation may be purchased by the general public, is guilty of a class 2 misdemeanor.

Credits

Amended by Laws 1978, Ch. 201, § 681, eff. Oct. 1, 1978.

A. R. S. § 38-445, AZ ST § 38-445

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

End of Document

© 2017 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 38. Public Officers and Employees (Refs & Annos)
Chapter 3. Conduct of Office
Article 4. Official Acts (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 38-446

§ 38-446. Acts based on written opinions; immunity

Effective: September 21, 2006

[Currentness](#)

Notwithstanding any provision of law to the contrary, no public officer or employee is personally liable for acts done in his official capacity in good faith reliance on written opinions of the attorney general issued pursuant to § 41-193, written opinions of a county attorney of the county, written opinions of the city or town attorney of the city or town or written opinions of any authorized private attorney for any independent public retirement trust fund or system for which the officer or employee serves or is employed.

Credits

Added by Laws 1987, Ch. 288, § 1. Amended by [Laws 2006, Ch. 264, § 1](#).

A. R. S. § 38-446, AZ ST § 38-446

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 38. Public Officers and Employees (Refs & Annos)
Chapter 3. Conduct of Office
Article 4. Official Acts (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 38-447

§ 38-447. Violation of prohibition against acquisition of certain interests by public officers; classification

[Currentness](#)

An officer or person prohibited by the laws of this state from making or being interested in contracts, or from becoming a vendor or purchaser at sales, or from purchasing evidences of indebtedness, who violates any provision of such laws, is guilty of a class 5 felony, and is forever disqualified from holding any office in this state.

Credits

Amended by Laws 1978, Ch. 201, § 682, eff. Oct. 1, 1978.

A. R. S. § 38-447, AZ ST § 38-447

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

End of Document

© 2017 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 38. Public Officers and Employees (Refs & Annos)
Chapter 3. Conduct of Office
Article 4. Official Acts (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 38-448

§ 38-448. State employees; access to internet pornography prohibited; cause for dismissal; definitions

Effective: September 29, 2012

[Currentness](#)

A. Except to the extent required in conjunction with a bona fide, agency approved research project or other agency approved undertaking, an employee of an agency shall not knowingly use agency owned or agency leased computer equipment to access, download, print or store any information infrastructure files or services that depict nudity, sexual activity, sexual excitement or ultimate sexual acts as defined in § 13-3501. Agency heads shall give, in writing, any agency approvals. Agency approvals are available for public inspection pursuant to § 39-121.

B. An employee who violates this section may be subject to discipline or dismissal.

C. All agencies shall immediately furnish their current employees with copies of this section. All agencies shall furnish all new employees with copies of this section at the time of authorizing an employee to use an agency computer.

D. For the purposes of this section:

1. "Agency" means:

(a) All offices, agencies, departments, boards, councils or commissions of this state.

(b) All state universities.

(c) All community college districts.

(d) All legislative agencies.

(e) All departments or agencies of the state supreme court or the court of appeals.

2. "Information infrastructure" means telecommunications, cable and computer networks and includes the internet, the world wide web, usenet, bulletin board systems, on-line systems and telephone networks.

Credits

Added by [Laws 2003, Ch. 80, § 1](#). Amended by [Laws 2012, Ch. 321, § 90](#), eff. Sept. 29, 2012.

A. R. S. § 38-448, AZ ST § 38-448

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

End of Document

© 2017 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 38. Public Officers and Employees (Refs & Annos)
Chapter 3. Conduct of Office
Article 4. Official Acts (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 38-449

§ 38-449. Display of POW/MIA flag

Effective: July 29, 2010

[Currentness](#)

A. The POW/MIA flag shall be displayed on or in front of the locations prescribed in subsection B on any day when the United States flag is displayed.

B. The locations for the display of the POW/MIA flag pursuant to subsection A are the following:

1. The state capitol building.
2. The building that serves as the location of the superior court in a county.
3. The building that serves as the city or town hall of each incorporated city or town.
4. The building that serves as the main administrative building of each county.

C. Notwithstanding any other law, when displayed with the United States flag on a single staff the POW/MIA flag shall be displayed below the Arizona state flag. When flags are displayed on multiple staffs the Arizona flag shall always be displayed to the honor of the United States flag.

Credits

Added by [Laws 2010, Ch. 217, § 1](#).

A. R. S. § 38-449, AZ ST § 38-449

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 38. Public Officers and Employees (Refs & Annos)
Chapter 3. Conduct of Office
Article 4. Official Acts (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 38-450

§ 38-450. Display of honor and remember flag

Effective: August 2, 2012

[Currentness](#)

A. The honor and remember flag shall be displayed on or in front of the locations prescribed in subsection B of this section on any day when the United States flag is flown at half-staff because of the death of a member of the United States armed forces.

B. The locations for the display of the honor and remember flag pursuant to subsection A of this section are the following:

1. The state capitol building.
2. The building that serves as the location of the superior court in a county.
3. The building that serves as the city or town hall of each incorporated city or town.

C. Notwithstanding any other law, when displayed with the United States flag on a single staff the honor and remember flag shall be displayed below the POW/MIA flag.

Credits

Added by [Laws 2012, Ch. 111, § 1](#).

A. R. S. § 38-450, AZ ST § 38-450

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated

Title 38. Public Officers and Employees (Refs & Annos)

Chapter 3. Conduct of Office

Article 8. Conflict of Interest of Officers and Employees (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 38-501

§ 38-501. Application of article

Currentness

A. This article shall apply to all public officers and employees of incorporated cities or towns, of political subdivisions and of the state and any of its departments, commissions, agencies, bodies or boards.

B. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, or the provisions of any charter or ordinance of any incorporated city or town to the contrary, the provisions of this article shall be exclusively applicable to all officers and employees of every incorporated city or town or political subdivision or the state and any of its departments, commissions, agencies, bodies or boards and shall supersede the provisions of any other such law, charter provision or ordinance.

C. Other prohibitions in the state statutes against any specific conflict of interests shall be in addition to this article if consistent with the intent and provisions of this article.

Credits

Added by Laws 1968, Ch. 88, § 1. Amended by Laws 1978, Ch. 208, § 1, eff. Oct. 1, 1978; Laws 1992, Ch. 140, § 1.

A. R. S. § 38-501, AZ ST § 38-501

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 38. Public Officers and Employees (Refs & Annos)
Chapter 3. Conduct of Office
Article 8. Conflict of Interest of Officers and Employees (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 38-502

§ 38-502. Definitions

Effective: August 6, 2016

Currentness

In this article, unless the context otherwise requires:

1. "Compensation" means money, a tangible thing of value or a financial benefit.
2. "Employee" means all persons who are not public officers and who are employed on a full-time, part-time or contract basis by an incorporated city or town, a political subdivision or the state or any of its departments, commissions, agencies, bodies or boards for remuneration.
3. "Make known" means the filing of a paper which is signed by a public officer or employee and which fully discloses a substantial interest or the filing of a copy of the official minutes of a public agency which fully discloses a substantial interest. The filing shall be in the special file established pursuant to § 38-509.
4. "Official records" means the minutes or papers, records and documents maintained by a public agency for the specific purpose of receiving disclosures of substantial interests required to be made known by this article.
5. "Political subdivision" means all political subdivisions of the state and county, including all school districts.
6. "Public agency" means:
 - (a) All courts.
 - (b) Any department, agency, board, commission, institution, instrumentality or legislative or administrative body of the state, a county, an incorporated town or city and any other political subdivision.
 - (c) The state, county and incorporated cities or towns and any other political subdivisions.
7. "Public competitive bidding" means the method of purchasing prescribed by title 41, chapter 23,¹ or procedures substantially equivalent to such method of purchasing, or as provided by local charter or ordinance.

8. "Public officer" means all elected and appointed officers of a public agency established by charter, ordinance, resolution, state constitution or statute.

9. "Relative" means the spouse, child, child's child, parent, grandparent, brother or sister of the whole or half blood and their spouses and the parent, brother, sister or child of a spouse.

10. "Remote interest" means:

(a) That of a nonsalaried officer of a nonprofit corporation.

(b) That of a landlord or tenant of the contracting party.

(c) That of an attorney of a contracting party.

(d) That of a member of a nonprofit cooperative marketing association.

(e) The ownership of less than three percent of the shares of a corporation for profit, provided the total annual income from dividends, including the value of stock dividends, from the corporation does not exceed five percent of the total annual income of such officer or employee and any other payments made to him by the corporation do not exceed five percent of his total annual income.

(f) That of a public officer or employee in being reimbursed for his actual and necessary expenses incurred in the performance of official duty.

(g) That of a recipient of public services generally provided by the incorporated city or town, political subdivision or state department, commission, agency, body or board of which he is a public officer or employee, on the same terms and conditions as if he were not an officer or employee.

(h) That of a public school board member when the relative involved is not a dependent, as defined in § 43-1001, or a spouse.

(i) That of a public officer or employee, or that of a relative of a public officer or employee, unless the contract or decision involved would confer a direct economic benefit or detriment on the officer, the employee or his relative, of any of the following:

(i) Another political subdivision.

(ii) A public agency of another political subdivision.

(iii) A public agency except if it is the same governmental entity.

(j) That of a member of a trade, business, occupation, profession or class of persons consisting of at least ten members which is no greater than the interest of the other members of that trade, business, occupation, profession or class of persons.

(k) That of a relative who is an employee of any business entity or governmental entity that employs at least twenty-five employees within this state and who, in the capacity as an employee, does not assert control or decision-making authority over the entity's management or budget decisions.

(l) The ownership of any publicly traded investments that are held in an account or fund, including a mutual fund, that is managed by one or more qualified investment professionals who are not employed or controlled by the officer or employee and that the officer or employee owns shares or interest together with other investors.

11. "Substantial interest" means any nonspeculative pecuniary or proprietary interest, either direct or indirect, other than a remote interest.

Credits

Added by Laws 1968, Ch. 88, § 1. Amended by Laws 1973, Ch. 116, § 6; Laws 1974, Ch. 199, § 1; Laws 1977, Ch. 164, § 17; Laws 1978, Ch. 151, § 7; Laws 1978, Ch. 208, § 2, eff. Oct. 1, 1978; Laws 1979, Ch. 145, § 36; Laws 1992, Ch. 140, § 2; Laws 2016, Ch. 289, § 2.

Footnotes

1 Section 41-2501 et seq.

A. R. S. § 38-502, AZ ST § 38-502

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 38. Public Officers and Employees (Refs & Annos)
Chapter 3. Conduct of Office
Article 8. Conflict of Interest of Officers and Employees (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 38-503

§ 38-503. Conflict of interest; exemptions; employment prohibition

Currentness

A. Any public officer or employee of a public agency who has, or whose relative has, a substantial interest in any contract, sale, purchase or service to such public agency shall make known that interest in the official records of such public agency and shall refrain from voting upon or otherwise participating in any manner as an officer or employee in such contract, sale or purchase.

B. Any public officer or employee who has, or whose relative has, a substantial interest in any decision of a public agency shall make known such interest in the official records of such public agency and shall refrain from participating in any manner as an officer or employee in such decision.

C. Notwithstanding the provisions of subsections A and B of this section, no public officer or employee of a public agency shall supply to such public agency any equipment, material, supplies or services, unless pursuant to an award or contract let after public competitive bidding, except that:

1. A school district governing board may purchase, as provided in §§ 15-213 and 15-323, supplies, materials and equipment from a school board member.

2. Political subdivisions other than school districts may purchase through their governing bodies, without using public competitive bidding procedures, supplies, materials and equipment not exceeding three hundred dollars in cost in any single transaction, not to exceed a total of one thousand dollars annually, from a member of the governing body if the policy for such purchases is approved annually.

D. Notwithstanding subsections A and B of this section and as provided in §§ 15-421 and 15-1441, the governing board of a school district or a community college district may not employ a person who is a member of the governing board or who is the spouse of a member of the governing board.

Credits

Added by Laws 1968, Ch. 88, § 1. Amended by Laws 1978, Ch. 208, § 3, eff. Oct. 1, 1978; Laws 1980, Ch. 170, § 3; Laws 1986, Ch. 17, § 3; Laws 1986, Ch. 246, § 1; Laws 1987, Ch. 138, § 2.

A. R. S. § 38-503, AZ ST § 38-503

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

§ 38-503. Conflict of interest; exemptions; employment prohibition, AZ ST § 38-503

End of Document

© 2017 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 38. Public Officers and Employees (Refs & Annos)
Chapter 3. Conduct of Office
Article 8. Conflict of Interest of Officers and Employees (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 38-504

§ 38-504. Prohibited acts

Currentness

A. A public officer or employee shall not represent another person for compensation before a public agency by which the officer or employee is or was employed within the preceding twelve months or on which the officer or employee serves or served within the preceding twelve months concerning any matter with which the officer or employee was directly concerned and in which the officer or employee personally participated during the officer's or employee's employment or service by a substantial and material exercise of administrative discretion.

B. During the period of a public officer's or employee's employment or service and for two years thereafter, a public officer or employee shall not disclose or use for the officer's or employee's personal profit, without appropriate authorization, any information acquired by the officer or employee in the course of the officer's or employee's official duties which has been clearly designated to the officer or employee as confidential when such confidential designation is warranted because of the status of the proceedings or the circumstances under which the information was received and preserving its confidentiality is necessary for the proper conduct of government business. A public officer or employee shall not disclose or use, without appropriate authorization, any information that is acquired by the officer or employee in the course of the officer's or employee's official duties and that is declared confidential by law.

C. A public officer or employee shall not use or attempt to use the officer's or employee's official position to secure any valuable thing or valuable benefit for the officer or employee that would not ordinarily accrue to the officer or employee in the performance of the officer's or employee's official duties if the thing or benefit is of such character as to manifest a substantial and improper influence on the officer or employee with respect to the officer's or employee's duties.

Credits

Added by Laws 1974, Ch. 199, § 3. Amended by Laws 1995, Ch. 76, § 5; Laws 1999, Ch. 40, § 1.

A. R. S. § 38-504, AZ ST § 38-504

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 38. Public Officers and Employees (Refs & Annos)
Chapter 3. Conduct of Office
Article 8. Conflict of Interest of Officers and Employees (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 38-505

§ 38-505. Additional income prohibited for services

Currentness

A. No public officer or employee may receive or agree to receive directly or indirectly compensation other than as provided by law for any service rendered or to be rendered by him personally in any case, proceeding, application, or other matter which is pending before the public agency of which he is a public officer or employee.

B. This section shall not be construed to prohibit the performance of ministerial functions including, but not limited to, the filing, or amendment of tax returns, applications for permits and licenses, incorporation papers, and other documents.

Credits

Added by Laws 1974, Ch. 199, § 3.

A. R. S. § 38-505, AZ ST § 38-505

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 38. Public Officers and Employees (Refs & Annos)
Chapter 3. Conduct of Office
Article 8. Conflict of Interest of Officers and Employees (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 38-506

§ 38-506. Remedies

Currentness

A. In addition to any other remedies provided by law, any contract entered into by a public agency in violation of this article is voidable at the instance of the public agency.

B. Any person affected by a decision of a public agency may commence a civil suit in the superior court for the purpose of enforcing the civil provisions of this article. The court may order such equitable relief as it deems appropriate in the circumstances including the remedies provided in this section.

C. The court may in its discretion order payment of costs, including reasonable attorney's fees, to the prevailing party in an action brought under subsection B.

Credits

Added by Laws 1978, Ch. 208, § 5, eff. Oct. 1, 1978.

A. R. S. § 38-506, AZ ST § 38-506

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

End of Document

© 2017 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 38. Public Officers and Employees (Refs & Annos)
Chapter 3. Conduct of Office
Article 8. Conflict of Interest of Officers and Employees (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 38-507

§ 38-507. Opinions of the attorney general, county attorneys,
city or town attorneys and house and senate ethics committee

Currentness

Requests for opinions from either the attorney general, a county attorney, a city or town attorney, the senate ethics committee or the house of representatives ethics committee concerning violations of this article shall be confidential, but the final opinions shall be a matter of public record. The county attorneys shall file opinions with the county recorder, the city or town attorneys shall file opinions with the city or town clerk, the senate ethics committee shall file opinions with the senate secretary and the house of representatives ethics committee shall file opinions with the chief clerk of the house of representatives.

Credits

Added by Laws 1978, Ch. 208, § 5, eff. Oct. 1, 1978. Amended by Laws 1992, Ch. 140, § 3.

A. R. S. § 38-507, AZ ST § 38-507

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 38. Public Officers and Employees (Refs & Annos)
Chapter 3. Conduct of Office
Article 8. Conflict of Interest of Officers and Employees (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 38-508**§ 38-508. Authority of public officers and employees to act****Currentness**

A. If the provisions of § 38-503 prevent an appointed public officer or a public employee from acting as required by law in his official capacity, such public officer or employee shall notify his superior authority of the conflicting interest. The superior authority may empower another to act or such authority may act in the capacity of the public officer or employee on the conflicting matter.

B. If the provisions of § 38-503 prevent a public agency from acting as required by law in its official capacity, such action shall not be prevented if members of the agency who have apparent conflicts make known their substantial interests in the official records of their public agency.

Credits

Added by Laws 1978, Ch. 208, § 5, eff. Oct. 1, 1978.

A. R. S. § 38-508, AZ ST § 38-508

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated

Title 38. Public Officers and Employees (Refs & Annos)

Chapter 3. Conduct of Office

Article 8. Conflict of Interest of Officers and Employees (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 38-509

§ 38-509. Filing of disclosures

Currentness

Every political subdivision and public agency subject to this article shall maintain for public inspection in a special file all documents necessary to memorialize all disclosures of substantial interest made known pursuant to this article.

Credits

Added by Laws 1978, Ch. 208, § 5, eff. Oct. 1, 1978.

A. R. S. § 38-509, AZ ST § 38-509

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

End of Document

© 2017 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 38. Public Officers and Employees (Refs & Annos)
Chapter 3. Conduct of Office
Article 8. Conflict of Interest of Officers and Employees (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 38-510

§ 38-510. Penalties

Currentness

A. A person who:

1. Intentionally or knowingly violates any provision of §§ 38-503 through 38-505 is guilty of a class 6 felony.
2. Recklessly or negligently violates any provision of §§ 38-503 through 38-505 is guilty of a class 1 misdemeanor.

B. A person found guilty of an offense described in subsection A of this section shall forfeit his public office or employment if any.

C. It is no defense to a prosecution for a violation of §§ 38-503 through 38-505 that the public officer or employee to whom a benefit is offered, conferred or agreed to be conferred was not qualified or authorized to act in the desired way.

D. It is a defense to a prosecution for a violation of §§ 38-503 through 38-505 that the interest charged to be substantial was a remote interest.

Credits

Added by Laws 1978, Ch. 208, § 5, eff. Oct. 1, 1978.

A. R. S. § 38-510, AZ ST § 38-510

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 38. Public Officers and Employees (Refs & Annos)
Chapter 3. Conduct of Office
Article 8. Conflict of Interest of Officers and Employees (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 38-511

§ 38-511. Cancellation of political subdivision and state contracts; definition

Currentness

A. The state, its political subdivisions or any department or agency of either may, within three years after its execution, cancel any contract, without penalty or further obligation, made by the state, its political subdivisions, or any of the departments or agencies of either if any person significantly involved in initiating, negotiating, securing, drafting or creating the contract on behalf of the state, its political subdivisions or any of the departments or agencies of either is, at any time while the contract or any extension of the contract is in effect, an employee or agent of any other party to the contract in any capacity or a consultant to any other party of the contract with respect to the subject matter of the contract.

B. Leases of state trust land for terms longer than ten years cancelled under this section shall respect those rights given to mortgagees of the lessee by § 37-289 and other lawful provisions of the lease.

C. The cancellation under this section by the state or its political subdivisions shall be effective when written notice from the governor or the chief executive officer or governing body of the political subdivision is received by all other parties to the contract unless the notice specifies a later time.

D. The cancellation under this section by any department or agency of the state or its political subdivisions shall be effective when written notice from such party is received by all other parties to the contract unless the notice specifies a later time.

E. In addition to the right to cancel a contract as provided in subsection A of this section, the state, its political subdivisions or any department or agency of either may recoup any fee or commission paid or due to any person significantly involved in initiating, negotiating, securing, drafting or creating the contract on behalf of the state, its political subdivisions or any department or agency of either from any other party to the contract arising as the result of the contract.

F. Notice of this section shall be included in every contract to which the state, its political subdivisions, or any of the departments or agencies of either is a party.

G. For purposes of this section, “political subdivisions” do not include entities formed or operating under title 48, chapter 11, 12, 13, 17, 18, 19 or 22.¹

Credits

Added as § 38-507 by Laws 1978, Ch. 189, § 1. Renumbered as § 38-511. Amended by Laws 1985, Ch. 155, § 1; Laws 1988, Ch. 169, § 1; Laws 1992, Ch. 45, § 1.

Footnotes

¹ Sections 48-1501 et seq., 48-1701 et seq., 48-1901 et seq., 48-2301 et seq., 48-2601 et seq., 48-2901 et seq., 48-3701 et seq.

A. R. S. § 38-511, AZ ST § 38-511

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

End of Document

© 2017 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 38. Public Officers and Employees (Refs & Annos)
Chapter 3.1. Standards for Financial Disclosure (Refs & Annos)
Article 1. General Provisions (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 38-541

§ 38-541. Definitions

Effective: January 1, 2017

[Currentness](#)

In this chapter, unless the context otherwise requires:

1. "Business" includes any enterprise, organization, trade, occupation or profession, whether or not operated as a legal entity or for profit, including any business trust, corporation, partnership, joint venture or sole proprietorship.
2. "Compensation" means anything of value or advantage, present or prospective, including the forgiveness of debt.
3. "Controlled business" means any business in which the public officer or any member of his household has an ownership or beneficial interest, individually or combined, amounting to more than a fifty percent interest.
4. "Dependent business" means any business in which the public officer or any member of his household has an ownership or beneficial interest, individually or combined, amounting to more than a ten percent interest, and during the preceding calendar year the business received from a single source more than ten thousand dollars and more than fifty percent of its gross income.
5. "Gift" includes any gratuity, special discount, favor, hospitality, service, economic opportunity, loan or other benefit received without equivalent consideration and not provided to members of the public at large. Gift does not include:
 - (a) Travel-related expenses that are publicly reported pursuant to this article.
 - (b) Political campaign contributions that are publicly reported pursuant to title 16, chapter 6.
6. "Local public officer" means a person holding an elective office of an incorporated city or town, a county or a groundwater replenishment district established under title 48, chapter 27.¹
7. "Member of household" means a public officer's spouse and any minor child of whom the public officer has legal custody.

8. "Public officer" means a member of the legislature and any judge of the court of appeals or the superior court, or a person holding an elective office the constituency of which embraces the entire geographical limits of this state. Members of Congress are not public officers as defined in this paragraph.

9. "Travel-related expenses" means any costs associated with transportation, food, lodging and registration fees and other expenses directly related to travel to or from a meeting, conference or other event where the public officer is participating in the public officer's official capacity.

Credits

Added by Laws 1983, Ch. 328, § 6, eff. Jan. 1, 1984. Amended by Laws 1991, Ch. 211, § 1; Laws 2016, Ch. 196, § 1, eff. Jan. 1, 2017.

Footnotes

1 Section 48-4401 et seq.

A. R. S. § 38-541, AZ ST § 38-541

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated

Title 38. Public Officers and Employees (Refs & Annos)

Chapter 3.1. Standards for Financial Disclosure (Refs & Annos)

Article 1. General Provisions (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 38-543

§ 38-543. Duty to file financial disclosure statement by candidate for public office

Effective: August 6, 2016

[Currentness](#)

A candidate for public office as specified in [§ 38-541](#), paragraph 8 shall file a financial disclosure statement covering the preceding twelve month period and containing the information described in [§ 18-444](#) on a form prescribed by the secretary of state at the time of filing of nomination papers.

Credits

Added by Laws 1974, Ch. 199, § 5. Amended by Laws 1976, Ch. 162, § 65; Laws 1983, Ch. 328, § 8, eff. Jan. 1, 1984; Laws 2016, Ch. 80, § 19.

A. R. S. § 38-543, AZ ST § 38-543

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

End of Document

© 2017 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 38. Public Officers and Employees (Refs & Annos)
Chapter 3.1. Standards for Financial Disclosure (Refs & Annos)
Article 1. General Provisions (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 38-544

§ 38-544. Violation; classification

Effective: November 5, 2016

[Currentness](#)

A. Any public officer, local public officer or candidate who knowingly fails to file a financial disclosure statement required pursuant to [§ 18-444](#), [38-543](#) or [38-545](#), who knowingly files an incomplete financial disclosure statement or who knowingly files a false financial disclosure statement is guilty of a class 1 misdemeanor.

B. Any public officer, local public officer or candidate who violates this chapter is subject to a civil penalty of fifty dollars for each day of noncompliance but not more than five hundred dollars that may be imposed as prescribed in [§§ 16-937](#) and [16-938](#).

Credits

Added by Laws 1974, Ch. 199, § 5. Amended by Laws 1978, Ch. 201, § 689, eff. Oct. 1, 1978; Laws 1983, Ch. 328, § 9, eff. Jan. 1, 1984; Laws 1993, Ch. 226, § 18, eff. Jan. 2, 1994; Laws 2016, Ch. 79, § 27, eff. Nov. 5, 2016; Laws 2016, Ch. 80, § 20.

A. R. S. § 38-544, AZ ST § 38-544

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

End of Document

© 2017 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 38. Public Officers and Employees (Refs & Annos)
Chapter 3.1. Standards for Financial Disclosure (Refs & Annos)
Article 1. General Provisions (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 38-545

§ 38-545. Local public officers financial disclosure

[Currentness](#)

Notwithstanding the provisions of any law, charter or ordinance to the contrary, every incorporated city or town or county shall by ordinance, rule, resolution or regulation adopt standards of financial disclosure consistent with the provisions of this chapter applicable to local public officers.

Credits

Added by Laws 1974, Ch. 199, § 5. Amended by Laws 1983, Ch. 328, § 10, eff. Jan. 1, 1984.

A. R. S. § 38-545, AZ ST § 38-545

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

End of Document

© 2017 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 39. Public Records, Printing and Notices
Chapter 1. Public Records (Refs & Annos)
Article 2. Searches and Copies (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 39-121

§ 39-121. Inspection of public records

Currentness

Public records and other matters in the custody of any officer shall be open to inspection by any person at all times during office hours.

Credits

Amended by [Laws 2000, Ch. 88, § 53](#).

A. R. S. § 39-121, AZ ST § 39-121

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

End of Document

© 2017 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 39. Public Records, Printing and Notices
Chapter 1. Public Records (Refs & Annos)
Article 2. Searches and Copies (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 39-121.01

§ 39-121.01. Definitions; maintenance of records; copies, printouts
or photographs of public records; examination by mail; index

Effective: July 20, 2011

[Currentness](#)

A. In this article, unless the context otherwise requires:

1. "Officer" means any person elected or appointed to hold any elective or appointive office of any public body and any chief administrative officer, head, director, superintendent or chairman of any public body.

2. "Public body" means this state, any county, city, town, school district, political subdivision or tax-supported district in this state, any branch, department, board, bureau, commission, council or committee of the foregoing, and any public organization or agency, supported in whole or in part by monies from this state or any political subdivision of this state, or expending monies provided by this state or any political subdivision of this state.

B. All officers and public bodies shall maintain all records, including records as defined in [§ 41-151.18](#), reasonably necessary or appropriate to maintain an accurate knowledge of their official activities and of any of their activities which are supported by monies from this state or any political subdivision of this state.

C. Each public body shall be responsible for the preservation, maintenance and care of that body's public records, and each officer shall be responsible for the preservation, maintenance and care of that officer's public records. It shall be the duty of each such body to carefully secure, protect and preserve public records from deterioration, mutilation, loss or destruction, unless disposed of pursuant to [§§ 41-151.15](#) and [41-151.19](#).

D. Subject to [§ 39-121.03](#):

1. Any person may request to examine or be furnished copies, printouts or photographs of any public record during regular office hours or may request that the custodian mail a copy of any public record not otherwise available on the public body's website to the requesting person. The custodian may require any person requesting that the custodian mail a copy of any public record to pay in advance for any copying and postage charges. The custodian of such records shall promptly furnish such copies, printouts or photographs and may charge a fee if the facilities are available, except that public records for purposes listed in [§ 39-122](#) or [39-127](#) shall be furnished without charge.

2. If requested, the custodian of the records of an agency shall also furnish an index of records or categories of records that have been withheld and the reasons the records or categories of records have been withheld from the requesting

person. The custodian shall not include in the index information that is expressly made privileged or confidential in statute or a court order. This paragraph shall not be construed by an administrative tribunal or a court of competent jurisdiction to prevent or require an order compelling a public body other than an agency to furnish an index. For the purposes of this paragraph, "agency" has the same meaning prescribed in § 41-1001, but does not include the department of public safety, the department of transportation motor vehicle division, the department of juvenile corrections and the state department of corrections.

3. If the custodian of a public record does not have facilities for making copies, printouts or photographs of a public record which a person has a right to inspect, such person shall be granted access to the public record for the purpose of making copies, printouts or photographs. The copies, printouts or photographs shall be made while the public record is in the possession, custody and control of the custodian of the public record and shall be subject to the supervision of such custodian.

E. Access to a public record is deemed denied if a custodian fails to promptly respond to a request for production of a public record or fails to provide to the requesting person an index of any record or categories of records that are withheld from production pursuant to subsection D, paragraph 2 of this section.

Credits

Added by Laws 1975, Ch. 147, § 1. Amended by Laws 1976, Ch. 104, § 17; Laws 1977, Ch. 54, § 2, eff. May 17, 1977; Laws 2000, Ch. 88, § 54; Laws 2002, Ch. 211, § 2; Laws 2004, Ch. 158, § 1; Laws 2006, Ch. 167, § 1; Laws 2011, Ch. 18, § 28.

A. R. S. § 39-121.01, AZ ST § 39-121.01

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 39. Public Records, Printing and Notices
Chapter 1. Public Records (Refs & Annos)
Article 2. Searches and Copies (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 39-121.02

§ 39-121.02. Action on denial of access; costs and attorney fees; damages

Effective: January 1, 2013

[Currentness](#)

A. Any person who has requested to examine or copy public records pursuant to this article, and who has been denied access to or the right to copy such records, may appeal the denial through a special action in the superior court, pursuant to the rules of procedure for special actions against the officer or public body.

B. The court may award attorney fees and other legal costs that are reasonably incurred in any action under this article if the person seeking public records has substantially prevailed. Nothing in this subsection shall limit the rights of any party to recover attorney fees, expenses and double damages pursuant to [§ 12-349](#).

C. Any person who is wrongfully denied access to public records pursuant to this article has a cause of action against the officer or public body for any damages resulting from the denial.

Credits

Added by Laws 1975, Ch. 147, § 1. Amended by [Laws 2006, Ch. 249, § 1](#); [Laws 2012, Ch. 305, § 3](#), eff. Jan. 1, 2013.

A. R. S. § 39-121.02, AZ ST § 39-121.02

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 39. Public Records, Printing and Notices
Chapter 1. Public Records (Refs & Annos)
Article 2. Searches and Copies (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 39-121.03

§ 39-121.03. Request for copies, printouts or photographs; statement of purpose; commercial purpose as abuse of public record; determination by governor; civil penalty; definition

Currentness

A. When a person requests copies, printouts or photographs of public records for a commercial purpose, the person shall provide a statement setting forth the commercial purpose for which the copies, printouts or photographs will be used. Upon being furnished the statement the custodian of such records may furnish reproductions, the charge for which shall include the following:

1. A portion of the cost to the public body for obtaining the original or copies of the documents, printouts or photographs.
2. A reasonable fee for the cost of time, materials, equipment and personnel in producing such reproduction.
3. The value of the reproduction on the commercial market as best determined by the public body.

B. If the custodian of a public record determines that the commercial purpose stated in the statement is a misuse of public records or is an abuse of the right to receive public records, the custodian may apply to the governor requesting that the governor by executive order prohibit the furnishing of copies, printouts or photographs for such commercial purpose. The governor, upon application from a custodian of public records, shall determine whether the commercial purpose is a misuse or an abuse of the public record. If the governor determines that the public record shall not be provided for such commercial purpose the governor shall issue an executive order prohibiting the providing of such public records for such commercial purpose. If no order is issued within thirty days of the date of application, the custodian of public records shall provide such copies, printouts or photographs upon being paid the fee determined pursuant to subsection A.

C. A person who obtains a public record for a commercial purpose without indicating the commercial purpose or who obtains a public record for a noncommercial purpose and uses or knowingly allows the use of such public record for a commercial purpose or who obtains a public record for a commercial purpose and uses or knowingly allows the use of such public record for a different commercial purpose or who obtains a public record from anyone other than the custodian of such records and uses it for a commercial purpose shall in addition to other penalties be liable to the state or the political subdivision from which the public record was obtained for damages in the amount of three times the amount which would have been charged for the public record had the commercial purpose been stated plus costs and reasonable attorney fees or shall be liable to the state or the political subdivision for the amount of three times the actual damages if it can be shown that the public record would not have been provided had the commercial purpose of actual use been stated at the time of obtaining the records.

D. For the purposes of this section, “commercial purpose” means the use of a public record for the purpose of sale or resale or for the purpose of producing a document containing all or part of the copy, printout or photograph for sale or the obtaining of names and addresses from public records for the purpose of solicitation or the sale of names and addresses to another for the purpose of solicitation or for any purpose in which the purchaser can reasonably anticipate the receipt of monetary gain from the direct or indirect use of the public record. Commercial purpose does not mean the use of a public record as evidence or as research for evidence in an action in any judicial or quasi-judicial body.

Credits

Added by Laws 1977, Ch. 54, § 3, eff. May 17, 1977. Amended by Laws 1985, Ch. 213, § 4; [Laws 2000, Ch. 88, § 55](#).

A. R. S. § 39-121.03, AZ ST § 39-121.03

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

End of Document

© 2017 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 39. Public Records, Printing and Notices
Chapter 1. Public Records (Refs & Annos)
Article 2. Searches and Copies (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 39-121.04

§ 39-121.04. Public access to law enforcement records depicting certain witnesses or crime victims; victim rights

Effective: August 6, 2016

[Currentness](#)

A. In a special action brought pursuant to this article for the release of any record created or received by or in the possession of a law enforcement or prosecution agency that relates to a criminal investigation or prosecution and that visually depicts the image of a witness under eighteen years of age or a victim as defined in § 13-4401, the petitioner shall establish that the public's interest in disclosure outweighs the witness's or victim's right to privacy.

B. A victim whose image is depicted in a record described in subsection A of this section has the right to be present at and to be heard in any action brought pursuant to this article for the release of records described in subsection A of this section.

Credits

Added by [Laws 2016, Ch. 194, § 1](#).

A. R. S. § 39-121.04, AZ ST § 39-121.04

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 39. Public Records, Printing and Notices
Chapter 1. Public Records (Refs & Annos)
Article 2. Searches and Copies (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 39-122

§ 39-122. Free searches for and copies of public records to be used in claims against United States; liability for noncompliance

Currentness

A. No state, county or city, or any officer or board thereof shall demand or receive a fee or compensation for issuing certified copies of public records or for making search for them, when they are to be used in connection with a claim for a pension, allotment, allowance, compensation, insurance or other benefits which is to be presented to the United States or a bureau or department thereof.

B. Notaries public shall not charge for an acknowledgment to a document which is to be so filed or presented.

C. The services specified in subsections A and B shall be rendered on request of an official of the United States, a claimant, his guardian or attorney. For each failure or refusal so to do, the officer so failing shall be liable on his official bond.

A. R. S. § 39-122, AZ ST § 39-122

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

End of Document

© 2017 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 39. Public Records, Printing and Notices
Chapter 1. Public Records (Refs & Annos)
Article 2. Searches and Copies (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 39-123

§ 39-123. Information identifying eligible persons; confidentiality; definitions

Effective: July 3, 2015

[Currentness](#)

A. Nothing in this chapter requires disclosure from a personnel file by a law enforcement agency or employing state or local governmental entity of the home address or home telephone number of eligible persons.

B. The agency or governmental entity may release the information in subsection A of this section only if either:

1. The person consents in writing to the release.

2. The custodian of records of the agency or governmental entity determines that release of the information does not create a reasonable risk of physical injury to the person or the person's immediate family or damage to the property of the person or the person's immediate family.

C. A law enforcement agency may release a photograph of a peace officer if either:

1. The peace officer has been arrested or has been formally charged by complaint, information or indictment for a misdemeanor or a felony offense.

2. The photograph is requested by a representative of a newspaper for a specific newsworthy event unless:

(a) The peace officer is serving in an undercover capacity or is scheduled to be serving in an undercover capacity within sixty days.

(b) The release of the photograph is not in the best interest of this state after taking into consideration the privacy, confidentiality and safety of the peace officer.

(c) An order pursuant to [§ 28-454](#) is in effect.

D. This section does not prohibit the use of a peace officer's photograph that is either:

1. Used by a law enforcement agency to assist a person who has a complaint against an officer to identify the officer.
2. Obtained from a source other than the law enforcement agency.

E. This section does not apply to a certified peace officer or code enforcement officer who is no longer employed as a peace officer or code enforcement officer by a state or local government entity.

F. For the purposes of this section:

1. "Code enforcement officer" means a person who is employed by a state or local government and whose duties include performing field inspections of buildings, structures or property to ensure compliance with and enforce national, state and local laws, ordinances and codes.
2. "Commissioner" means a commissioner of the superior court.
3. "Corrections support staff member" means an adult or juvenile corrections employee who has direct contact with inmates.
4. "Eligible person" means a former public official, peace officer, spouse of a peace officer, spouse or minor child of a deceased peace officer, border patrol agent, justice, judge, commissioner, public defender, prosecutor, code enforcement officer, adult or juvenile corrections officer, corrections support staff member, probation officer, member of the board of executive clemency, law enforcement support staff member, employee of the department of child safety who has direct contact with families in the course of employment, national guard member who is acting in support of a law enforcement agency, person who is protected under an order of protection or injunction against harassment, firefighter who is assigned to the Arizona counterterrorism center in the department of public safety or victim of domestic violence or stalking who is protected under an order of protection or injunction against harassment.
5. "Former public official" means a person who was duly elected or appointed to Congress, the legislature or a statewide office, who ceased serving in that capacity and who was the victim of a dangerous offense as defined in § 13-105 while in office.
6. "Judge" means a judge or former judge of the United States district court, the United States court of appeals, the United States magistrate court, the United States bankruptcy court, the United States immigration court, the Arizona court of appeals, the superior court or a municipal court.
7. "Justice" means a justice of the United States or Arizona supreme court or a justice of the peace.
8. "Law enforcement support staff member" means a person who serves in the role of an investigator or prosecutorial assistant in an agency that investigates or prosecutes crimes, who is integral to the investigation or prosecution of crimes and whose name or identity will be revealed in the course of public proceedings.

9. "Peace officer" has the same meaning prescribed in § 13-105.

10. "Prosecutor" means a county attorney, a municipal prosecutor, the attorney general or a United States attorney and includes an assistant or deputy United States attorney, county attorney, municipal prosecutor or attorney general.

11. "Public defender" means a federal public defender, county public defender, county legal defender or county contract indigent defense counsel and includes an assistant or deputy federal public defender, county public defender or county legal defender.

Credits

Added by Laws 1995, Ch. 103, § 1. Amended by Laws 2001, Ch. 124, § 7; Laws 2003, Ch. 106, § 6; Laws 2004, Ch. 180, § 1; Laws 2006, Ch. 298, § 4; Laws 2007, Ch. 141, § 7; Laws 2011, Ch. 173, § 4; Laws 2013, Ch. 211, § 7; Laws 2014, Ch. 164, § 5, eff. April 23, 2014; Laws 2015, Ch. 79, § 5; Laws 2015, Ch. 259, § 7.

A. R. S. § 39-123, AZ ST § 39-123

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

End of Document

© 2017 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 39. Public Records, Printing and Notices
Chapter 1. Public Records (Refs & Annos)
Article 2. Searches and Copies (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 39-123.01

§ 39-123.01. Personal identifying information of crime witnesses; confidentiality; definition

Effective: August 6, 2016

[Currentness](#)

A. The personal identifying information of a witness to a crime contained in a record that is created or received by a law enforcement or prosecution agency and that is related to a criminal investigation or prosecution may not be disclosed by a public body pursuant to this article unless any of the following applies:

1. The witness consents in writing to the disclosure.
2. A court of competent jurisdiction orders the disclosure.
3. The witness's address is the location where the crime occurred.

B. This section does not affect any records that are transmitted between law enforcement and prosecution agencies, a court or a clerk of the court or any provision of law that governs the discovery process or the conduct of trials.

C. For the purposes of this section, "personal identifying information" includes a witness's date of birth, social security number, personal telephone number, home address, personal e-mail address and official state or government-issued driver license or identification number.

Credits

Added by [Laws 2016, Ch. 194, § 1](#).

A. R. S. § 39-123.01, AZ ST § 39-123.01

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 39. Public Records, Printing and Notices
Chapter 1. Public Records (Refs & Annos)
Article 2. Searches and Copies (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 39-124

§ 39-124. Releasing information identifying an eligible person; violations; classification; definitions

Effective: July 3, 2015

[Currentness](#)

A. Any person who is employed by a state or local government entity and who, in violation of § 39-123, knowingly releases the home address or home telephone number of an eligible person with the intent to hinder an investigation, cause physical injury to an eligible person or the eligible person's immediate family or cause damage to the property of an eligible person or the eligible person's immediate family is guilty of a class 6 felony.

B. Any person who is employed by a state or local government entity and who, in violation of § 39-123, knowingly releases a photograph of a peace officer with the intent to hinder an investigation, cause physical injury to a peace officer or the peace officer's immediate family or cause damage to the property of a peace officer or the peace officer's immediate family is guilty of a class 6 felony.

C. For the purposes of this section:

1. "Code enforcement officer" means a person who is employed by a state or local government and whose duties include performing field inspections of buildings, structures or property to ensure compliance with and enforce national, state and local laws, ordinances and codes.

2. "Commissioner" means a commissioner of the superior court.

3. "Corrections support staff member" means an adult or juvenile corrections employee who has direct contact with inmates.

4. "Eligible person" means a former public official, peace officer, spouse of a peace officer, spouse or minor child of a deceased peace officer, border patrol agent, justice, judge, commissioner, public defender, prosecutor, code enforcement officer, adult or juvenile corrections officer, corrections support staff member, probation officer, member of the board of executive clemency, law enforcement support staff member, employee of the department of child safety who has direct contact with families in the course of employment, national guard member who is acting in support of a law enforcement agency, person who is protected under an order of protection or injunction against harassment, firefighter who is assigned to the Arizona counterterrorism center in the department of public safety or victim of domestic violence or stalking who is protected under an order of protection or injunction against harassment.

5. "Former public official" means a person who was duly elected or appointed to Congress, the legislature or a statewide office, who ceased serving in that capacity and who was the victim of a dangerous offense as defined in § 13-105 while in office.
6. "Judge" means a judge or former judge of the United States district court, the United States court of appeals, the United States magistrate court, the United States bankruptcy court, the United States immigration court, the Arizona court of appeals, the superior court or a municipal court.
7. "Justice" means a justice of the United States or Arizona supreme court or a justice of the peace.
8. "Law enforcement support staff member" means a person who serves in the role of an investigator or prosecutorial assistant in an agency that investigates or prosecutes crimes, who is integral to the investigation or prosecution of crimes and whose name or identity will be revealed in the course of public proceedings.
9. "Peace officer" has the same meaning prescribed in § 13-105.
10. "Prosecutor" means a county attorney, a municipal prosecutor, the attorney general or a United States attorney and includes an assistant or deputy United States attorney, county attorney, municipal prosecutor or attorney general.
11. "Public defender" means a federal public defender, county public defender, county legal defender or county contract indigent defense counsel and includes an assistant or deputy federal public defender, county public defender or county legal defender.

Credits

Added by Laws 1995, Ch. 103, § 1. Amended by Laws 2001, Ch. 124, § 8; Laws 2003, Ch. 106, § 7; Laws 2004, Ch. 180, § 2; Laws 2006, Ch. 298, § 5; Laws 2007, Ch. 141, § 8; Laws 2011, Ch. 173, § 5; Laws 2013, Ch. 211, § 8; Laws 2014, Ch. 164, § 6, eff. April 23, 2014; Laws 2015, Ch. 79, § 6; Laws 2015, Ch. 259, § 8.

A. R. S. § 39-124, AZ ST § 39-124

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 39. Public Records, Printing and Notices
Chapter 1. Public Records (Refs & Annos)
Article 2. Searches and Copies (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 39-125

§ 39-125. Information relating to location of archaeological discoveries and places or objects included or eligible for inclusion on the Arizona register of historic places; confidentiality

Currentness

Nothing in this chapter requires the disclosure of public records or other matters in the office of any officer that relate to the location of archaeological discoveries as described in § 41-841 or 41-844 or places or objects that are included on or may qualify for inclusion on the Arizona register of historic places as described in § 41-511.04, subsection A, paragraph 9. An officer may decline to release this information if the officer determines that the release of the information creates a reasonable risk of vandalism, theft or other damage to the archaeological discoveries or the places or objects that are included on or may qualify for inclusion on the register. In making a decision to disclose public records pursuant to this section, an officer may consult with the director of the Arizona state museum or the state historic preservation officer.

Credits

Added by [Laws 1998, Ch. 197, § 1](#).

A. R. S. § 39-125, AZ ST § 39-125

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 39. Public Records, Printing and Notices
Chapter 1. Public Records (Refs & Annos)
Article 2. Searches and Copies (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 39-126

§ 39-126. Federal risk assessments of infrastructure; confidentiality

[Currentness](#)

Nothing in this chapter requires the disclosure of a risk assessment that is performed by or on behalf of a federal agency to evaluate critical energy, water or telecommunications infrastructure to determine its vulnerability to sabotage or attack.

Credits

Added by [Laws 2003, Ch. 118, § 1](#).

A. R. S. § 39-126, AZ ST § 39-126

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

End of Document

© 2017 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 39. Public Records, Printing and Notices
Chapter 1. Public Records (Refs & Annos)
Article 2. Searches and Copies (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 39-126.01

§ 39-126.01. Local government; telecommunications infrastructure records; nondisclosure; exceptions

Effective: September 13, 2013

[Currentness](#)

A. Except as provided in subsection **B**, a city, town or county shall not disclose any records relating to the construction of wireline telecommunications infrastructure, including the location of lines, equipment and plants used for telecommunications services on or along public streets or highways.

B. A city, town or county may disclose information relating to the location of lines, equipment and plants used for telecommunications services for any of the following:

1. As part of the bid, design or construction process of a capital project.
2. To provide information on the availability of telecommunications services for economic development purposes.
3. To provide general information to residents regarding construction activity within the city, town or county.

CreditsAdded by [Laws 2013, Ch. 92, § 1](#).

A. R. S. § 39-126.01, AZ ST § 39-126.01

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 39. Public Records, Printing and Notices
Chapter 1. Public Records (Refs & Annos)
Article 2. Searches and Copies (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 39-127

§ 39-127. Free copies of police reports and transcripts for crime victims; definition

Effective: July 3, 2015

[Currentness](#)

A. A victim of a criminal offense that is a part I crime under the statewide uniform crime reporting program, the victim's attorney on behalf of the victim or an immediate family member of the victim if the victim is killed or incapacitated has the right to receive one copy of the police report from the investigating law enforcement agency at no charge and, on request of the victim, the court or the clerk of the court shall provide, at no charge, the minute entry or portion of the record of any proceeding in the case that arises out of the offense committed against the victim and that is reasonably necessary for the purpose of pursuing a claimed victim's right. For the purposes of this subsection, "criminal offense", "immediate family" and "victim" have the same meanings prescribed in [§ 13-4401](#).

B. A victim of a delinquent act that is a part I crime under the statewide uniform crime reporting program, the victim's attorney on behalf of the victim or an immediate family member of the victim if the victim is killed or incapacitated has the right to receive one copy of the police report from the investigating law enforcement agency at no charge and, on request of the victim, the court or the clerk of the court shall provide, at no charge, the minute entry or portion of the record of any proceeding in the case that arises out of the offense committed against the victim and that is reasonably necessary for the purpose of pursuing a claimed victim's right. For the purposes of this subsection, "delinquent act", "immediate family" and "victim" have the same meanings prescribed in [§ 8-382](#).

C. For the purposes of this section, "attorney" means any person who is a member in good standing of the bar of the highest court of any state, possession, territory, commonwealth or district of the United States and who is not under any order of any court suspending, enjoining, restraining, disbaring or otherwise restricting the person in the practice of law.

Credits

Added by [Laws 2006, Ch. 167, § 2](#). Amended by [Laws 2007, Ch. 290, § 11](#); [Laws 2014, Ch. 269, § 15](#); [Laws 2015, Ch. 303, § 1](#).

A. R. S. § 39-127, AZ ST § 39-127

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 39. Public Records, Printing and Notices
Chapter 1. Public Records (Refs & Annos)
Article 2. Searches and Copies (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 39-128

§ 39-128. Disciplinary records of public officers and employees; disclosure; exceptions

Effective: September 26, 2008

[Currentness](#)

A. A public body shall maintain all records that are reasonably necessary or appropriate to maintain an accurate knowledge of disciplinary actions, including the employee responses to all disciplinary actions, involving public officers or employees of the public body. The records shall be open to inspection and copying pursuant to this article, unless inspection or disclosure of the records or information in the records is contrary to law.

B. This section does not:

1. Require disclosure of the home address, home telephone number or photograph of any person who is protected pursuant to §§ 39-123 and 39-124.
2. Limit the duty of a public body or officer to make public records open to inspection and copying pursuant to this article.

Credits

Added by [Laws 2008, Ch. 277, § 1](#).

A. R. S. § 39-128, AZ ST § 39-128

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 39. Public Records, Printing and Notices
Chapter 1. Public Records (Refs & Annos)
Article 3. Lost Records

A.R.S. § 39-141

§ 39-141. Proof of certain lost or destroyed documents or instruments

Currentness

Any deed, bond, bill of sale, mortgage, deed of trust, power of attorney or conveyance which is required or permitted by law to be acknowledged or recorded which has been so acknowledged or recorded, or any judgment, order or decree of a court of record in this state or the record or minute containing such judgment, which is lost or destroyed, may be supplied by parol proof of its contents.

A. R. S. § 39-141, AZ ST § 39-141

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

End of Document

© 2017 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 39. Public Records, Printing and Notices
Chapter 1. Public Records (Refs & Annos)
Article 3. Lost Records

A.R.S. § 39-142

§ 39-142. Action for restoration and substitution of lost or destroyed documents

[Currentness](#)

Upon loss or destruction of an instrument as indicated in [§ 39-141](#), a person interested therein may bring an action in the superior court of the county where the loss or destruction occurred for restoration and substitution of such instrument against the grantor in a deed, or the parties interested in the instrument, or the parties who were interested adversely to plaintiff at the time of the rendition of judgment, or who are then adversely interested, or the heirs and legal representatives of such parties.

A. R. S. § 39-142, AZ ST § 39-142

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 39. Public Records, Printing and Notices
Chapter 1. Public Records (Refs & Annos)
Article 3. Lost Records

A.R.S. § 39-143

§ 39-143. Judgment of restoration; recording of judgment; judgment as substitute for original instrument

Currentness

A. If upon the trial of the action provided for in § 39-142, the court finds that such instrument existed, and has been lost or destroyed and determines the contents thereof, it shall enter a judgment containing the finding and a description of the lost instrument and contents thereof.

B. A certified copy of the judgment may be recorded, and shall be substituted for and have the same force and effect as the original instrument.

A. R. S. § 39-143, AZ ST § 39-143

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

End of Document

© 2017 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 39. Public Records, Printing and Notices
Chapter 1. Public Records (Refs & Annos)
Article 3. Lost Records

A.R.S. § 39-144

§ 39-144. Recording of certified copies of lost or destroyed records or records of a former county

[Currentness](#)

Certified copies from a record of a county, the record of which has been lost or destroyed, and certified copies from records of the county from which a new county was created, may be recorded in such county when the loss of the original has been first established.

A. R. S. § 39-144, AZ ST § 39-144

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

End of Document

© 2017 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 39. Public Records, Printing and Notices
Chapter 1. Public Records (Refs & Annos)
Article 3. Lost Records

A.R.S. § 39-145

§ 39-145. Re-recording of original papers when record destroyed

[Currentness](#)

When the original papers have been preserved but the record thereof has been lost or destroyed, they may again be recorded within four years from the loss or destruction of such record. The last registration shall have force and effect from the date of the original registration.

A. R. S. § 39-145, AZ ST § 39-145

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

End of Document

© 2017 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 39. Public Records, Printing and Notices
Chapter 1. Public Records (Refs & Annos)
Article 4. False Instruments and Records

A.R.S. § 39-161

§ 39-161. Presentment of false instrument for filing; classification

Currentness

A person who acknowledges, certifies, notarizes, procures or offers to be filed, registered or recorded in a public office in this state an instrument he knows to be false or forged, which, if genuine, could be filed, registered or recorded under any law of this state or the United States, or in compliance with established procedure is guilty of a class 6 felony. As used in this section "instrument" includes a written instrument as defined in § 13-2001.

Credits

Amended by Laws 1978, Ch. 201, § 695, eff. Oct. 1, 1978; Laws 1980, Ch. 229, § 44, eff. April 23, 1980.

A. R. S. § 39-161, AZ ST § 39-161

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

End of Document

© 2017 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 40. Public Utilities and Carriers
Chapter 1. Corporation Commission (Refs & Annos)
Article 1. In General

A.R.S. § 40-101

§ 40-101. Interest of commissioner or employee prohibited in corporation subject to regulation

Effective: August 6, 2016

[Currentness](#)

Notwithstanding any other law, a person in the employ of, or holding an official relation to a corporation or person subject to regulation by the commission, or a person owning stocks or bonds of a corporation subject to regulation, or a person who is pecuniarily interested therein, shall not be elected, appointed to, or hold the office of commissioner or be appointed or employed by the commission. If a commissioner, or appointee or employee of the commission becomes the owner of such stocks or bonds, or becomes pecuniarily interested in such a corporation involuntarily, he shall within a reasonable time divest himself of such stocks, bonds or interest. If he fails to do so, he thereby vacates his office or employment.

Credits

Amended by [Laws 2016, Ch. 289, § 3](#).

A. R. S. § 40-101, AZ ST § 40-101

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

End of Document

© 2017 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated

Title 41. State Government (Refs & Annos)

Chapter 4. Department of Administration and Personnel Board (Refs & Annos)

Article 4. State Personnel System (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 41-753

§ 41-753. Unlawful acts; violation; classification

Effective: July 24, 2014

[Currentness](#)

A. A person shall not make any false statement, certificate, mark, rating or report with regard to any test, certification or appointment made under this article or in any manner commit any fraud preventing the impartial execution of this article or rules adopted under this article.

B. A person shall not, directly or indirectly, give, render, pay, offer, solicit or accept any money, service or other valuable consideration for or on account of any appointment, proposed appointment, promotion or proposed promotion to, or any advantage in, a position in the state personnel system.

C. An employee of any state agency, examiner or other person shall not obstruct any person in the person's right to examination, eligibility, certification or appointment under this article, or furnish to any person any special or secret information for the purpose of affecting the rights or prospects of any person with respect to employment in the state personnel system.

D. An employee of any agency as defined in § 41-1001, including the office of the governor, who has a significant role in the procurement of materials, services or construction shall not accept an offer of employment from or have employment discussions with any person or entity lobbying for or potentially responding to a solicitation during a period beginning on signature of the first nondisclosure agreement pertaining to a particular solicitation or at the time of request for a sole source procurement or competition impracticable procurement and ending at the time of the contract award. An employee of any agency as defined in § 41-1001, including the office of the governor, who has a significant role in the procurement of materials, services or construction shall not accept an offer of employment from or have employment discussions with the successful offeror or offerors and their lobbyists during a period beginning on signature of the first nondisclosure agreement pertaining to a particular solicitation or at the time of request for a sole source procurement or competition impracticable procurement and ending one year after the purchased materials are delivered or the purchase of services or construction begins. The director of the department of administration may waive any or all of the waiting period in excess of twenty-four months for a procurement officer or an employee with a significant procurement role if the period of time that follows the signature of the nondisclosure agreement exceeds twenty-four months. A procurement officer or an employee seeking a waiver shall make a written request to the officer's or employee's state agency director, and the director of the state agency shall forward the request with a written recommendation to the director of the department of administration. The director of the department of administration shall provide a written decision and justification within fifteen business days after the receipt of the complete request. The director of the department of administration may not approve waiver requests for matters still in evaluation or within six months following the contract award. If the requesting party is the director or a deputy director of a state agency, the request for a waiver and all written materials, including a director recommendation, must be forwarded to the governor for a final decision, except that the director may not make any recommendation or determination on the director's own request. An agency as defined in §

41-1001, including the office of the governor, shall inform its employees when the first nondisclosure agreement is signed on a particular solicitation, and the agency shall notify the state procurement administrator who shall post information regarding the date of the first nondisclosure agreement pertaining to a particular procurement activity on the department of administration's website. This subsection does not apply to a procurement officer or an employee who in good faith relies on a determination issued by the director pursuant to § 41-2517, subsection D¹ that the procurement officer or employee has not had a significant procurement role.

E. Any person who knowingly violates subsection A, B, C or D of this section is guilty of a class 2 misdemeanor.

F. An elected or appointed official shall not with corrupt intent use the official's political influence or position to cause the firing, promotion or demotion of any public employee or the hiring of or failure to hire any applicant for public employment.

G. An elected or appointed official who knowingly and with corrupt intent violates subsection F of this section is guilty of a class 2 misdemeanor.

H. Any person who is convicted of a class 2 misdemeanor under this article, for a period of five years, is ineligible for appointment to or employment in a position in the state personnel system and, if the person is an employee of this state at the time of conviction, is subject to suspension for not less than ninety days or dismissal.

I. A contact by an elected or appointed official with a public agency regarding the qualifications of an applicant shall not be construed as illegally using political influence or position.

Credits

Added by Laws 2012, Ch. 321, § 115, eff. Sept. 29, 2012. Amended by Laws 2013, Ch. 190, § 3; Laws 2014, Ch. 145, § 2.

Footnotes

¹ So in original. Probably should read "subsection E".

A. R. S. § 41-753, AZ ST § 41-753

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 41. State Government (Refs & Annos)
Chapter 7. Legislature (Refs & Annos)
Article 8.1. Registration and Regulation of Lobbyists (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 41-1231

§ 41-1231. Definitions

Effective: July 24, 2014

[Currentness](#)

In this article, unless the context otherwise requires:

1. "Authorized lobbyist" means any person, other than a designated lobbyist or lobbyist for compensation, who is employed by, retained by or representing a principal, with or without compensation, for the purpose of lobbying and who is listed as an authorized lobbyist by the principal in its registration pursuant to [§ 41-1232](#).
2. "Authorized public lobbyist" means a person, other than a designated public lobbyist, who is employed by, retained by or representing a public body, with or without compensation, for the purpose of lobbying and who is listed as an authorized public lobbyist by the public body in its registration pursuant to [§ 41-1232.01](#).
3. "Designated lobbyist" means the person who is designated by a principal as the single point of contact for the principal and who is listed as the designated lobbyist by the principal in its registration pursuant to [§ 41-1232](#).
4. "Designated public lobbyist" means the person who is designated by a public body as the single point of contact for the public body and who is listed as the designated public lobbyist by the public body in its registration pursuant to [§ 41-1232.01](#).
5. "Entertainment" means the amount of any expenditure paid or incurred for admission to any sporting or cultural event or for participation in any sporting or cultural activity.
6. "Expenditure" means a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit or gift of money or anything of value and includes a contract, promise or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure that provides a benefit to an individual state officer or state employee and that is incurred by or on behalf of one or more principals, public bodies, lobbyists, designated public lobbyists or authorized public lobbyists.
7. "Family gift" means a gift to a state officer or employee or a member of the officer's or employee's household from a principal, lobbyist, designated public lobbyist or authorized public lobbyist who is a relative of the state officer or employee or a member of the household of the state officer or employee if the donor is not acting as the agent or intermediary for someone other than a person covered by this paragraph.

8. "Food or beverage" means the amount of any expenditure paid or incurred for food or beverages for a state officer or employee provided at a location at which the principal, public body, lobbyist, designated public lobbyist or authorized public lobbyist who made the expenditure is present.

9. "Gift" means a payment, distribution, expenditure, advance, deposit or donation of money, any intangible personal property or any kind of tangible personal or real property. For the purposes of this article, gift does not include:

(a) A gift, devise or inheritance from an individual's spouse, child, parent, grandparent, grandchild, brother, sister, parent-in-law, brother-in-law, sister-in-law, nephew, niece, aunt, uncle or first cousin or the spouse of any such individual if the donor is not acting as the agent or intermediary for someone other than a person covered by this subdivision.

(b) Expenditures that are either properly reported or exempt from reporting under this chapter for:

(i) A speaking engagement.

(ii) Food or beverages.

(iii) Travel and lodging.

(iv) Flowers.

(c) Salary, compensation or employer-reimbursed expenses lawfully paid to a public official.

(d) The value, cost or price of professional or consulting services that are not rendered to obtain a benefit for any registered principal, public body, lobbyist, designated public lobbyist or authorized public lobbyist or the clients of a principal or lobbyist.

(e) Expenses relating to a special event or function to which all members of the legislature, either house of the legislature or any committee of the legislature is invited.

(f) A plaque or other form of recognition similar to a plaque to a state officer or state employee to signify the honorary recognition of a service or other notable accomplishment.

(g) Informational material such as books, reports, pamphlets, calendars or periodicals.

(h) An item that is not used and that is returned within fifteen days of receipt to the donor or that is delivered within fifteen days of receipt to a charitable organization and that is not claimed as a charitable contribution for state or federal income tax purposes.

(i) A campaign contribution that is properly received and reported as required by law.

(j) An item that is given to a state officer or employee if the state officer or employee gives an item of approximately the same value to the giver of the item at the same time that the item is given or on a similar occasion as the one that prompted the original item to be given.

(k) Gifts of a personal nature that were customarily received by an individual from the donor before the individual became a state officer or employee.

(l) An item that is given to the general public at an event.

10. "Legislation" means bills, resolutions, memorials, amendments, nominations and other matters that are pending or proposed in either house of the legislature of this state.

11. "Lobbying":

(a) Means attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation by directly communicating with any legislator or attempting to influence any formal rulemaking proceeding pursuant to chapter 6 of this title ¹ or rulemaking proceedings that are exempt from chapter 6 of this title by directly communicating with any state officer or employee.

(b) Includes, for a person who is otherwise required to be registered as a lobbyist for compensation pursuant to this article, attempting to influence the procurement of materials, services or construction by an agency as defined in § 41-1001, including the office of the governor.

(c) Does not include:

(i) Interagency communications between state agency employees.

(ii) Communications between a public official or employee of a public body, designated public lobbyist or authorized public lobbyist and any state officer, except for a member of the legislature, or an employee of the legislature.

(iii) Oral questions or comments made by a person to a state officer or employee regarding a proposed rule and made in public at a meeting or workshop that is open to the public and that is sponsored by a state agency, board, commission, council or office.

(iv) Communications between a public body and a self-employed person or person employed by a partnership or company regarding the procurement of materials, services or construction unless the self-employed person or person employed by a partnership or company is otherwise required to register pursuant to this article or is employed by, supervised by at any level or contracted by a person who is otherwise required to register as a lobbyist for compensation pursuant to this article.

12. "Lobbyist" means any person, other than a designated public lobbyist or authorized public lobbyist, who is employed by, retained by or representing a person other than himself, with or without compensation, for the purpose of lobbying and who is listed as a lobbyist by the principal in its registration pursuant to § 41-1232. Lobbyist includes a lobbyist for compensation, designated lobbyist and authorized lobbyist.

13. "Lobbyist for compensation" means a lobbyist who is compensated for the primary purpose of lobbying on behalf of a principal and who is listed by the principal in its registration pursuant to § 41-1232.

14. "Person" means an individual, partnership, committee, association or corporation and any other organization or group of persons, except legislators and political parties qualified for representation on the ballot pursuant to § 16-801 or 16-804.

15. "Personal hospitality" means hospitality, meals, beverages, transportation or lodging furnished but not commercially provided by a person on property or facilities owned or possessed by the person or the person's family.

16. "Principal" means any person, other than a public body, that employs, retains, engages or uses, with or without compensation, a lobbyist. Principal includes any subsidiary of a corporation.

17. "Procurement" has the same meaning prescribed in § 41-2503.

18. "Public body" means the Arizona board of regents, a university under the jurisdiction of the Arizona board of regents, the judicial department, any state agency, board, commission or council, any county, any county elected officer who elects to appoint a designated public lobbyist or any city, town, district or other political subdivision of this state that receives and uses tax revenues and that employs, retains, engages or uses, with or without compensation, a designated public lobbyist or authorized public lobbyist.

19. "Public official" means a person who is duly elected, appointed or retained through election to an elected state, county or local office.

20. "Single expenditure" means an expenditure that provides a benefit of more than twenty dollars to an individual state officer or state employee and that is incurred by or on behalf of one or more principals, public bodies, lobbyists, designated public lobbyists or authorized public lobbyists.

21. "Speaking engagement":

(a) Means the amount of any expense paid or incurred for entrance fees, lodging, food and beverage, entertainment, travel and other expenses for the state officer's or employee's attendance at an event, committee, meeting, conference or seminar, including meetings of state, regional or national organizations or their committees concerned with legislative or governmental activities if the state officer or employee participates in the event as a speaker or panel participant

by presenting information relating to the state officer's or employee's legislative or official duties or by performing a ceremonial function appropriate to the state officer's or employee's position.

(b) Does not include expenditures for an honorarium or any other similar fee paid to a speaker.

22. "State employee" means an employee of the legislature, a university under the jurisdiction of the Arizona board of regents, the judicial department or a state office, agency, board, commission or council.

23. "State officer" means a person who is duly elected, appointed or retained through election to any state office, or a member of any state board, commission or council, and includes a member of the legislature.

Credits

Added by Laws 1974, Ch. 198, § 1. Amended by Laws 1978, Ch. 214, § 1, eff. Jan. 1, 1979; Laws 1991, 3rd S.S., Ch. 2, § 1, eff. June 1, 1992; Laws 1992, Ch. 106, § 1, eff. Sept. 30, 1992, retroactively effective to June 1, 1992; Laws 1993, Ch. 93, § 1; Laws 1993, Ch. 146, § 1, eff. April 20, 1993; Laws 1994, Ch. 380, § 1; Laws 1998, 5th S.S., Ch. 1, § 42, eff. July 9, 1998; Laws 2000, Ch. 364, § 1, eff. Jan. 1, 2001; Laws 2013, Ch. 190, § 4; Laws 2014, Ch. 145, § 3.

A. R. S. § 41-1231, AZ ST § 41-1231

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 41. State Government (Refs & Annos)
Chapter 7. Legislature (Refs & Annos)
Article 8.1. Registration and Regulation of Lobbyists (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 41-1232

§ 41-1232. Registration of principals; fee

Effective: April 28, 2010

[Currentness](#)

A. Except as provided in subsection B, before any principal causes any lobbying to occur on its behalf, the principal shall register with the secretary of state by filing a written statement in a format prescribed by the secretary of state, subscribed under oath, containing the following information:

1. The name and business address of the principal.
2. The name and business address of a person who is the designated lobbyist for the principal, regardless of whether such person is engaged to lobby for compensation.
3. The name and business address of each lobbyist for compensation or authorized lobbyist employed by, retained by or representing the principal.
4. For each lobbyist for compensation, designated lobbyist or authorized lobbyist that is not an individual, the name and business address of all employees of that lobbyist who lobby on the principal's behalf.
5. The nature of the primary business or activity, issue, interest or purpose of the principal.
6. The duration of the engagement of any lobbyist.
7. A description of the expenses for which each lobbyist is to be reimbursed by the principal.
8. A listing of the state entities the lobbyist has been engaged or designated to lobby including the legislature and state agencies, boards, commissions or councils.

B. If a registration as required by subsection A cannot be accomplished or is not practicable in advance of the first attempt or occasion to lobby, registration must occur within five business days after the day on which the first lobbying attempt, occasion or activity occurs.

C. Each principal shall reregister no later than 5:00 p.m. on the second Monday in January of each odd numbered year unless at that time the principal no longer engages any lobbyist. A principal shall file its registration at any time beginning December 1 in the even numbered year until 5:00 p.m. on the second Monday in January in the odd numbered year. Each principal shall amend its registration statement within five business days of any change in the information required by subsection A.

D. A principal shall provide notice to each lobbyist for compensation, authorized lobbyist and designated lobbyist who is named in the principal's registration or reregistration statement. The notice shall state that the principal has listed the lobbyist for compensation, authorized lobbyist or designated lobbyist on the principal's registration or reregistration statement and that this listing obligates the lobbyist for compensation or designated lobbyist to register and file all reports required by this article. The notice shall be accompanied by a summary of the lobbyist laws published by the secretary of state, the first page of the principal's registration and the page of the schedule on which the name of the lobbyist for compensation, authorized lobbyist or designated lobbyist appears.

E. Each principal that registers a lobbyist for compensation or a designated lobbyist who receives compensation for lobbying from the principal, at the time of registering or reregistering, shall pay a registration or reregistration fee of twenty-five dollars to the secretary of state. No principal may be charged more than one twenty-five dollar fee per registration period. Registration and reregistration fees collected by the secretary of state shall be deposited, pursuant to §§ 35-146 and 35-147, in the state general fund, and, subject to legislative appropriation, the registration and reregistration fees for principals shall be used to reduce the costs associated with enforcing the lobbyist registration laws.

Credits

Added by Laws 1974, Ch. 198, § 1. Amended by Laws 1976, Ch. 162, § 67; Laws 1978, Ch. 214, § 2, eff. Jan. 1, 1979; Laws 1984, Ch. 296, § 3; Laws 1989, Ch. 231, § 1; Laws 1991, 3rd S.S., Ch. 2, § 2, eff. June 1, 1992; Laws 1992, Ch. 106, § 2, eff. Sept. 30, 1992, retroactively effective to June 1, 1992; Laws 1992, Ch. 319, § 36, eff. Nov. 1, 1992; Laws 1993, Ch. 93, § 2; Laws 1993, Ch. 146, § 2, eff. April 20, 1993; Laws 1994, Ch. 380, § 2; Laws 2000, Ch. 193, § 438; Laws 2010, Ch. 209, § 26, eff. April 28, 2010.

A. R. S. § 41-1232, AZ ST § 41-1232

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 41. State Government (Refs & Annos)
Chapter 7. Legislature (Refs & Annos)
Article 8.1. Registration and Regulation of Lobbyists (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 41-1232.01

§ 41-1232.01. Registration by public bodies; fee

Effective: April 28, 2010

[Currentness](#)

A. Except as provided in subsection B, before any public body causes any lobbying to occur on its behalf, the public body shall register with the secretary of state by filing a written statement in a format prescribed by the secretary of state, subscribed under oath, containing the following information:

1. The name and business address of the public body.
2. The name and business address of a person who is the designated public lobbyist for the public body, regardless of whether this person is engaged to lobby for compensation.
3. The name and business address of each authorized public lobbyist employed by, retained by or representing the public body.
4. For each designated public lobbyist or authorized public lobbyist that is not an individual, the name and business address of all employees of such designated public lobbyist or authorized public lobbyist who may lobby on the public body's behalf.
5. A description of the expenses for which each designated public lobbyist and authorized public lobbyist is to be reimbursed by the public body.

B. If a registration as required by subsection A cannot be accomplished or is not practicable in advance of the first attempt or occasion to lobby, registration must occur within five business days after the day on which the first lobbying attempt, occasion or activity occurs.

C. Each public body shall reregister no later than 5:00 p.m. on the second Monday in January of each odd numbered year unless at that time the public body no longer engages any designated public lobbyist or authorized public lobbyist. A public body shall file its registration at any time beginning December 1 in the even numbered year until 5:00 p.m. on the second Monday in January in the odd numbered year. Each public body shall amend its registration statement within five business days of any change in the information required by subsection A.

D. A public body shall provide notice to each designated public lobbyist or authorized public lobbyist who is named in the public body's registration or reregistration statement. The notice shall state that the public body has listed the designated public lobbyist or authorized public lobbyist on the public body's registration or reregistration statement and that this listing obligates the designated public lobbyist to register and file all reports required by this article. The notice shall be accompanied by a summary of the lobbyist laws published by the secretary of state, the first page of the public body's registration and the page of the schedule on which the designated or authorized public lobbyist's name appears.

E. Each public body that registers a designated public lobbyist who receives compensation for lobbying from the public body, at the time of registering or reregistering, shall pay a registration or reregistration fee of twenty-five dollars to the secretary of state. No public body may be charged more than one twenty-five dollar fee per registration period. Registration and reregistration fees collected by the secretary of state shall be deposited, pursuant to §§ 35-146 and 35-147, in the state general fund, and, subject to legislative appropriation, the registration and reregistration fees for public bodies shall be used to reduce the costs associated with enforcing the lobbyist registration laws.

Credits

Added by [Laws 1994, Ch. 380, § 3](#). Amended by [Laws 2000, Ch. 193, § 439](#); [Laws 2010, Ch. 209, § 27](#), eff. April 28, 2010.

A. R. S. § 41-1232.01, AZ ST § 41-1232.01

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated

Title 41. State Government (Refs & Annos)

Chapter 7. Legislature (Refs & Annos)

Article 8.1. Registration and Regulation of Lobbyists (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 41-1232.02

§ 41-1232.02. Expenditure reporting; principals and lobbyists; gifts

Currentness

A. Each principal shall report annually all single expenditures, whether or not the expenditures were made in the course of lobbying. These single expenditures shall be itemized separately, and each itemization shall include the date of the expenditure, the amount of the expenditure, the name of each state officer or employee receiving or benefitting from the expenditure, the category of the expenditure and the name of the lobbyist or other person who made the expenditure on behalf of the principal. In addition each principal shall report annually the aggregate of all expenditures of twenty dollars or less received by or benefitting a state officer or employee, whether or not the expenditures were made in the course of lobbying. The report shall be filed by March 1 and shall list the annual expenditures made on behalf of the principal. If March 1 is a Saturday, Sunday or other legal holiday, the report shall be filed on the next business day.

B. Each lobbyist for compensation and designated lobbyist shall report quarterly all single expenditures incurred in the preceding calendar quarter by the lobbyist for compensation or designated lobbyist, whether or not the single expenditures were made in the course of lobbying. These single expenditures shall be itemized separately, and each itemization shall include the date of the expenditure, the amount of the expenditure, the name of the state officer or employee receiving or benefitting from the expenditure, the category of the expenditure and the principal on whose behalf the expenditure was made. If the expenditure was made by the lobbyist and was not made on behalf of a principal, it shall be itemized separately. The quarterly report shall be filed no later than the last day of the month following the end of the calendar quarter, unless the last day of the month is a Saturday, Sunday or other legal holiday. In that case, the report shall be filed on the next business day.

C. Each lobbyist for compensation and designated lobbyist shall also report quarterly the aggregate of all expenditures of twenty dollars or less received by or benefitting a state officer or employee, whether or not the expenditures were made in the course of lobbying. The report shall list separately the aggregate of expenditures made on behalf of each principal and the aggregate not made on behalf of any principal. In the fourth calendar quarter, these expenditures shall also be listed by cumulative total for the calendar year. Each quarterly lobbyist report shall include all reportable expenditures made by any employee of the lobbyist for compensation or designated lobbyist, regardless of whether that employee is listed as a lobbyist on any registration filed by a principal engaging the lobbyist. The quarterly report shall be filed no later than the last day of the month following the end of the calendar quarter, unless the last day of the month is a Saturday, Sunday or other legal holiday. In that case, the report shall be filed the next business day.

D. The reports required by subsections A and B of this section shall identify each single expenditure according to the following categories:

1. Food or beverages.

2. Speaking engagement.

3. Travel and lodging.

4. Flowers.

5. Other expenditures.

E. Expenditures by principals and lobbyists such as those for the lobbyist's personal sustenance, office expenses, filing fees, legal fees, employees' compensation, lodging and travel are not required to be reported. In addition, expenditures by a principal or a lobbyist for family gifts, personal hospitality or those items excluded from the definition of gift pursuant to § 41-1231, paragraph 9, subdivision (a), (c), (d), (f), (g), (h), (i), (j), (k) or (l) are not required to be reported.

F. All expenditures incurred by a principal or lobbyist in the case of special events for legislators, including parties, dinners, athletic events, entertainment and other functions, to which all members of the legislature, either house of the legislature or any committee of the legislature are invited shall be reported. Expenditures are not required to be allocated to individual legislators, but for each such event a description of the event and the date, location, name of the legislative body invited and total expenditures incurred shall be reported. Expenditures for special events held in conjunction with state, national or regional meetings of an organization or association concerned or dealing with legislative or other governmental activities to which all state officers or state employees in attendance at such event are invited shall be reported in the same manner.

G. All information required to be filed pursuant to this section with the secretary of state shall be filed in that office and preserved by the secretary of state for five years from the date of filing, after which time the information shall be destroyed. The information is a public record and open to public inspection.

H. If a principal, lobbyist for compensation or designated lobbyist makes no expenditures that it would otherwise be required to report during a specified reporting period, the principal, lobbyist for compensation or designated lobbyist may sign a notarized form prescribed by the secretary of state indicating that there were no expenditures during the specific reporting period.

I. A person or organization shall not make a gift to or an expenditure on behalf of a state officer or employee through another person or organization for the purpose of disguising the identity of the person making the gift or expenditure.

J. A principal or lobbyist or any other person acting on behalf of a principal or lobbyist shall not give to any state officer or state employee and a state officer or state employee shall not accept from a principal or lobbyist either of the following:

1. Gifts with a total value of more than ten dollars during any calendar year.

2. Gifts that are designed to influence the state officer's or state employee's official conduct.

Credits

Added by [Laws 1994, Ch. 380, § 5](#). Amended by [Laws 2000, Ch. 364, § 2](#), eff. Jan. 1, 2001.

A. R. S. § 41-1232.02, AZ ST § 41-1232.02

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

End of Document

© 2017 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 41. State Government (Refs & Annos)
Chapter 7. Legislature (Refs & Annos)
Article 8.1. Registration and Regulation of Lobbyists (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 41-1232.03

§ 41-1232.03. Expenditure reporting; public bodies and public lobbyists; gifts

Currentness

A. Each public body shall report annually all single expenditures received by or benefitting a member of the legislature whether or not the expenditures were made in the course of lobbying. These expenditures shall be itemized separately, and each itemization shall include the date of the expenditure, the amount of the expenditure, the name of each member of the legislature receiving or benefitting from the expenditure, the category of the expenditure and the name of the designated public lobbyist or authorized public lobbyist who made the expenditure on behalf of the public body. In addition each public body shall report annually the aggregate of all expenditures of twenty dollars or less received by or benefitting a member of the legislature, whether or not the expenditures were made in the course of lobbying. The report shall list all expenditures by the public body made in the course of lobbying for the personal sustenance, filing fee, legal fees, employees' compensation, meals, lodging and travel of the designated public lobbyist and all authorized public lobbyists employed or retained by, and representing, the public body. The public body shall apportion expenditures that are attributable both to lobbying and to other activities of the public body and shall report only the portion attributable to lobbying. For the purpose of reporting employee compensation, a public body, on establishing a time allocation schedule for apportioned lobbying activity based on actual experience under this article, may submit after the 1993 calendar year an affidavit to the secretary of state stating the compensation attributable to lobbying for subsequent years for the designated public lobbyist and all authorized public lobbyists whose job responsibilities have not been significantly altered since the time allocation schedule was established. The report shall be filed by March 1 and shall list the annual expenditures made on behalf of the public body. If March 1 is a Saturday, Sunday or other legal holiday, the report shall be filed on the next business day.

B. Each designated public lobbyist shall report quarterly all single expenditures received by or benefitting a member of the legislature and incurred in the preceding calendar quarter by the designated public lobbyist, whether or not the single expenditures were made in the course of lobbying. Each designated public lobbyist's report shall also include all single expenditures incurred in the preceding calendar quarter by each authorized public lobbyist who is registered pursuant to § 41-1232.01 by the same public body that registered the designated public lobbyist. This subsection does not apply to an expenditure that was made by a designated public lobbyist or authorized public lobbyist and that was received by or benefitted an employee of a public body, if the employee is not a member or employee of the legislature or a member of the household of a member or employee of the legislature. These expenditures shall be itemized separately, and each itemization shall include the date of the expenditure, the amount of the expenditure, the name of the member or employee receiving or benefitting from the expenditure, the category of the expenditure and the public body on whose behalf the expenditure was made. If the expenditure was made by the designated public lobbyist or authorized public lobbyist and was not made on behalf of a public body, it shall be itemized separately. The quarterly report shall be filed no later than the last day of the month following the end of the calendar quarter, unless the last day of the month is a Saturday, Sunday or other legal holiday. In that case, the report shall be filed on the next business day.

C. Each designated public lobbyist shall also report quarterly the aggregate of all expenditures of twenty dollars or less received by or benefitting a member of the legislature, whether or not the expenditures were made in the course of

lobbying. Each designated public lobbyist's report shall also include the aggregate of all expenditures of twenty dollars or less that were received by or benefitted a member of the legislature and that were made by an authorized public lobbyist who is registered pursuant to § 41-1232.01 by the same public body that registered the designated public lobbyist. This subsection does not apply to an expenditure that was made by a designated public lobbyist or authorized public lobbyist and that was received by or benefitted an employee of a public body, if the employee is not a member or employee of the legislature or a member of the household of a member or employee of the legislature. The report shall list separately the aggregate of expenditures made on behalf of each public body and the aggregate not made on behalf of any public body. In the fourth calendar quarter, these expenditures shall also be listed by cumulative total for the calendar year. Each quarterly lobbyist report shall include all reportable expenditures made by any employee of the designated public lobbyist or authorized public lobbyist, regardless of whether that employee is listed as a designated public lobbyist or authorized public lobbyist on any registration filed by a public body engaging the designated public lobbyist or authorized public lobbyist. The quarterly report shall be filed no later than the last day of the month following the end of the calendar quarter, unless the last day of the month is a Saturday, Sunday or other legal holiday. In that case, the report shall be filed on the next business day.

D. The reports required by subsections A and B of this section shall identify the nature of each single expenditure according to the following categories:

1. Food or beverages.
2. Speaking engagement.
3. Travel and lodging.
4. Flowers.
5. Other expenditures.

E. Expenditures by a public body, designated public lobbyist or authorized public lobbyist for personal sustenance, family gifts, personal hospitality or those items excluded from the definition of gift pursuant to § 41-1231, paragraph 9, subdivision (a), (c), (d), (f), (g), (h), (i), (j), (k) or (l) are not required to be reported.

F. All expenditures incurred by a public body, designated public lobbyist or authorized public lobbyist in the case of special events for legislators, including parties, dinners, athletic events, entertainment and other functions, to which all members of the legislature, either house of the legislature or any committee of the legislature are invited shall be reported. Expenditures are not required to be allocated to individual legislators, but for each such event a description of the event and the date, location, name of the legislative body invited and total expenditures incurred shall be reported. Expenditures for special events held in conjunction with state, national or regional meetings of an organization or association concerned or dealing with legislative or other governmental activities to which all members or employees of the legislature in attendance at such event are invited shall be reported in the same manner.

G. All information required to be filed pursuant to this section with the secretary of state shall be filed in that office and preserved by the secretary of state for five years from the date of filing, after which time the information shall be destroyed. The information is a public record and open to public inspection.

H. If a public body or designated public lobbyist makes no expenditures that it would otherwise be required to report during a specified reporting period, the public body or designated public lobbyist may sign a notarized form prescribed by the secretary of state indicating that there were no expenditures during the specific reporting period.

I. A person or organization shall not make a gift to or an expenditure on behalf of a member or employee of the legislature through another person or organization for the purpose of disguising the identity of the person making the gift or expenditure.

J. A public body, designated public lobbyist or authorized public lobbyist or any other person acting on behalf of a public body, designated public lobbyist or authorized public lobbyist shall not give to any member of the legislature and a member of the legislature shall not accept from a public body, designated public lobbyist or authorized public lobbyist either of the following:

1. Gifts with a total value of more than ten dollars during any calendar year.
2. Gifts that are designed to influence the member's or employee's official conduct.

K. Subsection J of this section does not apply to gifts given by a public body, designated public lobbyist or authorized public lobbyist to an employee of a public body, if the employee is not a public official or a member of the household of a public official or if the gift is accepted on behalf of the public body and remains the property of the public body.

Credits

Added by [Laws 1994, Ch. 380, § 5](#). Amended by [Laws 2000, Ch. 364, § 3](#), eff. Jan. 1, 2001.

A. R. S. § 41-1232.03, AZ ST § 41-1232.03

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 41. State Government (Refs & Annos)
Chapter 7. Legislature (Refs & Annos)
Article 8.1. Registration and Regulation of Lobbyists (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 41-1232.04

§ 41-1232.04. Registration; exceptions

Effective: September 13, 2013

[Currentness](#)

Sections [41-1232](#), [41-1232.01](#), [41-1232.02](#) and [41-1232.03](#) do not apply to a person if that person is acting in the following capacity:

1. A natural person who merely appears for himself before a committee of the legislature or before a state officer or employee or a state agency, board, commission or council to lobby in support of or in opposition to legislation or official action.
2. A natural person who, acting in his own behalf, sends a letter to, converses on the telephone with or has a personal conversation with a state officer or employee for the purpose of supporting or opposing any legislation or official action.
3. A duly elected or retained public official, judge or justice, a person duly appointed to an elective public office, or an appointed member of a state, county or local board, advisory committee, commission or council acting in his official capacity on matters pertaining to his office, board, advisory committee, commission or council.
4. A person who answers technical questions or provides technical information at the request of a lobbyist, designated public lobbyist, authorized public lobbyist or legislator and who makes no expenditures required to be reported by this article.
5. A person who performs professional services in drafting bills or in advising and rendering opinions to clients as to the construction and effect of proposed or pending legislation.
6. An attorney who represents clients before any court or before any quasi-judicial body.
7. A person who contacts a state officer or state employee solely for the purpose of acquiring information.
8. A natural person who is a member of an association, who is not the lobbyist for compensation, designated lobbyist or authorized lobbyist for the association and who does not make any expenditures that would otherwise be required to be reported by this article if the natural person were a lobbyist, a designated public lobbyist or an authorized public lobbyist.

Credits

Added as § 41-1232.02 by Laws 1991, 3rd S.S., Ch. 2, § 4. Amended by Laws 1992, Ch. 106, § 4, eff. Sept. 30, 1992, retroactively effective to June 1, 1992; Laws 1993, Ch. 146, § 3, eff. April 20, 1993. Renumbered as § 41-1232.04 and amended by Laws 1994, Ch. 380, §§ 4, 6; Laws 2009, 3rd S.S., Ch. 12, § 48. Amended by Laws 2013, Ch. 190, § 5.

A. R. S. § 41-1232.04, AZ ST § 41-1232.04

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

End of Document

© 2017 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 41. State Government (Refs & Annos)
Chapter 7. Legislature (Refs & Annos)
Article 8.1. Registration and Regulation of Lobbyists (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 41-1232.05

§ 41-1232.05. Lobbyist registration; handbook; requirement

Effective: April 28, 2010

[Currentness](#)

A. A person who is listed by a principal or public body on a registration form pursuant to § 41-1232 or 41-1232.01 as a lobbyist for compensation, designated lobbyist or designated public lobbyist shall file a lobbyist registration form with the secretary of state in a format prescribed by the secretary of state no later than 5:00 p.m. on the second Monday in January of each even numbered year and shall read a handbook containing statutes and rules governing lobbyists for compensation, designated lobbyists and designated public lobbyists, written guidelines and forms and samples for completing the lobbyist disclosure forms. A person shall file the registration at any time beginning December 1 in the odd numbered year until 5:00 p.m. on the second Monday in January in the even numbered year. The lobbyist handbook shall be written and prescribed by the secretary of state. A person who is originally listed as a lobbyist for compensation, designated lobbyist or designated public lobbyist for a month other than January shall file, within thirty days, a registration form and shall file a registration form for January of each even numbered year thereafter if the person continues to be listed as a lobbyist for compensation, designated lobbyist or designated public lobbyist.

B. The lobbyist registration form shall include:

1. The name of the lobbyist for compensation, designated lobbyist or designated public lobbyist.
2. The business name and address of the lobbyist for compensation, designated lobbyist or designated public lobbyist.
3. A statement that the lobbyist for compensation, designated lobbyist or designated public lobbyist has read the lobbyist handbook prescribed in subsection A of this section.

Credits

Added as § 41-1232.03 by Laws 1991, 3rd S.S., Ch. 2, § 4, eff. June 1, 1992. Amended by Laws 1992, Ch. 106, § 5, eff. Sept. 30, 1992, retroactively effective to June 1, 1992. Renumbered as § 41-1232.05 and amended by Laws 1994, Ch. 380, §§ 4, 7. Amended by Laws 2010, Ch. 209, § 28, eff. April 28, 2010.

A. R. S. § 41-1232.05, AZ ST § 41-1232.05

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated

Title 41. State Government (Refs & Annos)

Chapter 7. Legislature (Refs & Annos)

Article 8.1. Registration and Regulation of Lobbyists (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 41-1232.06

§ 41-1232.06. Exemption; unpaid volunteers

[Currentness](#)

This article does not apply to expenditures made for or gifts given to members of any state agency, board, commission, committee or council who are not publicly elected and who serve without compensation provided that the expenditure or gift is not made in the course of lobbying that member. If the expenditure or gift is made in the course of lobbying, the reporting requirements of §§ 41-1232 and 41-1232.01 shall apply. Payments made to a member of any state agency, board, commission, committee or council pursuant to title 38, chapter 4, article 2¹ shall not be considered compensation for the purposes of this section.

Footnotes

¹ Section 38-621 et seq.

A. R. S. § 41-1232.06, AZ ST § 41-1232.06

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 41. State Government (Refs & Annos)
Chapter 7. Legislature (Refs & Annos)
Article 8.1. Registration and Regulation of Lobbyists (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 41-1232.07

§ 41-1232.07. Electronic filings

Currentness

A. Any report or registration form that is required to be filed pursuant to this article may be filed in an electronic format that is approved by the secretary of state. The secretary of state may require that reports or registration forms be filed with an additional written or printed copy.

B. Notwithstanding § 41-1236, a report or registration form that is filed in electronic format pursuant to this section is not required to bear a notarized signature but is deemed to be filed under penalty of perjury.

C. An electronic filing made pursuant to this section is sufficient to comply with the filing requirements of this article if the filing is properly formatted as prescribed by this article and the information contained in the filing is complete and correct.

Credits

Added by [Laws 2000, Ch. 18, § 1](#).

A. R. S. § 41-1232.07, AZ ST § 41-1232.07

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated

Title 41. State Government (Refs & Annos)

Chapter 7. Legislature (Refs & Annos)

Article 8.1. Registration and Regulation of Lobbyists (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 41-1232.08

§ 41-1232.08. Entertainment ban; state and political subdivisions; exceptions

Effective: September 13, 2013

[Currentness](#)

A. A principal, designated lobbyist, authorized lobbyist, lobbyist for compensation, public body, designated public lobbyist or authorized public lobbyist or any other person acting on that person's behalf shall not make an expenditure or single expenditure for entertainment for a state officer or state employee. A state officer or state employee shall not accept an expenditure or single expenditure for entertainment from a principal, designated lobbyist, authorized lobbyist, lobbyist for compensation, public body, designated public lobbyist or authorized public lobbyist or any other person acting on that person's behalf.

B. A person who for compensation attempts to influence the procurement of materials, services or construction by an agency as defined in § 41-1001, including the office of the governor, or the passage or defeat of legislation, ordinances, rules, regulations, nominations and other matters that are pending or proposed or that are subject to formal approval by the corporation commission, a county board of supervisors, a city or town governing body or a school district governing board or any person acting on that person's behalf shall not make an expenditure or single expenditure for entertainment for an elected or appointed member of the corporation commission, a county board of supervisors, a city or town governing body or a school district governing board. An elected or appointed member of the corporation commission, a county board of supervisors, a city or town governing body or a school district governing board shall not accept an expenditure or single expenditure for entertainment from a person who for compensation attempts to influence the procurement of materials, services or construction by an agency as defined in § 41-1001, including the office of the governor, or the passage or defeat of legislation, ordinances, rules, regulations, nominations and other matters that are pending or proposed or that are subject to formal approval by the corporation commission, a county board of supervisors, a city or town governing body or a school district governing board.

C. This section shall not apply to:

1. Entertainment in connection with a special event properly reported pursuant to this article.
2. Entertainment that is incidental to a speaking engagement.
3. The following persons while attending or participating in any sporting or cultural event or activity, sponsored by the board, district or institution, in a facility that is owned or operated by the board, district or institution:
 - (a) Employees of a school district governing board.

(b) Employees of a community college district governing board.

(c) Employees of any institution under the jurisdiction of the Arizona board of regents.

D. The provisions of this article that define special events for legislators apply to special events for members of the Arizona board of regents.

Credits

Added as § 41-1232.07 by [Laws 2000, Ch. 364, § 4](#), eff. Jan. 1, 2001. Renumbered as 41-1232.08. Amended by [Laws 2002, Ch. 282, § 1](#); [Laws 2013, Ch. 190, § 6](#).

A. R. S. § 41-1232.08, AZ ST § 41-1232.08

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

End of Document

© 2017 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 41. State Government (Refs & Annos)
Chapter 7. Legislature (Refs & Annos)
Article 8.1. Registration and Regulation of Lobbyists (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 41-1233

§ 41-1233. Prohibited acts

Effective: September 13, 2013

[Currentness](#)

No person shall:

1. Retain or employ another person to promote or oppose legislation for compensation contingent in whole or in part on the passage or defeat of any legislation, or the approval or veto of any legislation by the governor, and no person shall accept employment or render service for compensation on a contingent basis.
2. Lobby the legislature for compensation within one year after the person ceases to be a member of the senate or house of representatives.
3. In any manner improperly seek to influence the vote of any member of the legislature through communication with that member's employer.
4. Lobby the public body that employed the person in a capacity having a significant procurement role as defined in § 41-741 in the procurement of materials, services or construction within one year after the person ceases to be employed by the public body.

Credits

Added by Laws 1974, Ch. 198, § 1. Amended by [Laws 1994, Ch. 380, § 9](#); [Laws 2013, Ch. 190, § 7](#).

A. R. S. § 41-1233, AZ ST § 41-1233

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 41. State Government (Refs & Annos)
Chapter 7. Legislature (Refs & Annos)
Article 8.1. Registration and Regulation of Lobbyists (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 41-1233.01

§ 41-1233.01. Disclosure

Effective: July 24, 2014

[Currentness](#)

A person who is registered pursuant to this article or who is a designated lobbyist, lobbyist for compensation, authorized lobbyist, designated public lobbyist or authorized public lobbyist shall disclose that fact to:

1. Any legislator the person is lobbying for the first time or on any subsequent request of a legislator.
2. Any public official or employee of a public body each time that the person is lobbying for the procurement of materials, services or construction. The person also shall disclose the name of that person's client.

Credits

Added by Laws 1994, Ch. 380, § 11. Amended by Laws 2013, Ch. 190, § 8; Laws 2014, Ch. 145, § 4.

A. R. S. § 41-1233.01, AZ ST § 41-1233.01

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 41. State Government (Refs & Annos)
Chapter 7. Legislature (Refs & Annos)
Article 8.1. Registration and Regulation of Lobbyists (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 41-1234

§ 41-1234. Publicly funded contract lobbyists; prohibition; definition

Effective: August 9, 2017

[Currentness](#)

A. Notwithstanding any other law, a state agency, office, department, board or commission and any person acting on behalf of a state agency, office, department, board or commission shall not:

1. Enter into a contract or other agreement with a person or entity for lobbying services.
2. Spend monies for any person or entity to lobby on behalf of that agency, office, department, board or commission unless that person is a state employee.

B. This section does not apply to any state agency, office, department, board or commission that is either:

1. Headed by one or more elected officials.
2. Exempt from title 41, chapter 23¹ for the purposes of contracts for professional lobbyists.

C. This section does not apply to the employment relationship of a lobbyist who is a state employee directly employed by a state governmental unit for whom the employee acts as a lobbyist or lobbying is part of the employee's job description.

D. For the purposes of this section, "state employee" has the same meaning prescribed in [§ 41-1231](#).

Credits

Added by [Laws 2017, Ch. 145, § 1](#).

Footnotes

¹ Section 41-2501 et seq.

A. R. S. § 41-1234, AZ ST § 41-1234

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 41. State Government (Refs & Annos)
Chapter 7. Legislature (Refs & Annos)
Article 8.1. Registration and Regulation of Lobbyists (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 41-1234.01

§ 41-1234.01. Contributions prohibited during session; exceptions

Effective: July 3, 2015

[Currentness](#)

A. While registered under this article, a principal, public body, lobbyist, designated public lobbyist or authorized public lobbyist shall not make or promise to make a campaign contribution to or solicit or promise to solicit campaign contributions for:

1. A member of the legislature when the legislature is in regular session.

2. The governor when the legislature is in regular session or when regular session legislation is pending executive approval or veto.

B. Subsection A of this section only prohibits campaign contributions by principals, lobbyists, designated public lobbyists or authorized public lobbyists and the solicitation of campaign contributions by principals or lobbyists during any time that the legislature is in regular session but does not prohibit principals or lobbyists from raising monies for any other purpose during the regular session of the legislature.

C. A member of the legislature or the governor may accept a campaign contribution that is received by a member of the legislature or the governor within three calendar days after the first day of the regular session of the legislature if the campaign contribution was mailed and postmarked before the first day of the regular legislative session.

Credits

Added by Laws 1991, 3rd S.S., Ch. 2, § 6, eff. June 1, 1992. Amended by Laws 1992, Ch. 106, § 8, eff. Sept. 30, 1992, retroactively effective to June 1, 1992; Laws 2015, Ch. 286, § 6.

A. R. S. § 41-1234.01, AZ ST § 41-1234.01

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 41. State Government (Refs & Annos)
Chapter 7. Legislature (Refs & Annos)
Article 8.1. Registration and Regulation of Lobbyists (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 41-1235

§ 41-1235. Spurious communications; classification

[Currentness](#)

Whoever shall transmit, utter or publish to the legislature, or to any member or members of the legislature, or any committee, officer or employee of either house of the legislature, or to any state officer, agency, board, commission or council any communication materially related to any matter within the jurisdiction of the legislature, or be a party to the preparation thereof, knowing such communication or signature thereto is false, forged, counterfeit or fictitious shall be guilty of a class 2 misdemeanor.

Credits

Added by Laws 1974, Ch. 198, § 1. Amended by Laws 1978, Ch. 201, § 731, eff. Oct. 1, 1978.

A. R. S. § 41-1235, AZ ST § 41-1235

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 41. State Government (Refs & Annos)
Chapter 7. Legislature (Refs & Annos)
Article 8.1. Registration and Regulation of Lobbyists (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 41-1236

§ 41-1236. Reports and statements under oath

[Currentness](#)

All reports and statements required under this article shall be made under oath, before an officer authorized by law to administer oaths.

Credits

Added by Laws 1974, Ch. 198, § 1.

A. R. S. § 41-1236, AZ ST § 41-1236

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 41. State Government (Refs & Annos)
Chapter 7. Legislature (Refs & Annos)
Article 8.1. Registration and Regulation of Lobbyists (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 41-1237

§ 41-1237. Violation; classification

[Currentness](#)

A. Any person who knowingly violates any of the provisions of this article and any person who knowingly files any document provided for in this article that contains any materially false statement or material omission or any person who knowingly fails to comply with any material requirement of this article is guilty of a class 1 misdemeanor unless another classification is specifically prescribed in this article.

B. Any alleged violation of any provisions of this article may be investigated and prosecuted by the attorney general or by the county attorney of the county in which the alleged offense was committed.

Credits

Added by Laws 1974, Ch. 198, § 1. Amended by Laws 1978, Ch. 201, § 732, eff. Oct. 1, 1978; Laws 1978, Ch. 214, § 3, eff. Oct. 1, 1978; Laws 1982, Ch. 37, § 37.

A. R. S. § 41-1237, AZ ST § 41-1237

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
 Title 41. State Government (Refs & Annos)
 Chapter 7. Legislature (Refs & Annos)
 Article 8.1. Registration and Regulation of Lobbyists (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 41-1237.01

§ 41-1237.01. Compliance orders; injunctive relief; civil penalties

Currentness

A. If the secretary of state has reasonable cause to believe that a person is violating any provision of this article, the secretary of state shall notify the attorney general and the attorney general may serve on the person an order requiring compliance with that provision. The order shall state with reasonable particularity the nature of the violation and shall require compliance within twenty days from the date of issuance of the order . The alleged violator has twenty days from the date of issuance of the order to request a hearing pursuant to chapter 6, article 10 of this title.¹

B. If a person does not request a hearing and fails to take corrective action within the time specified in the compliance order issued pursuant to subsection A of this section or if, after the hearing, the person fails to take corrective action in compliance with an order issued after the hearing within the time specified in the order, the attorney general shall issue an order assessing a civil penalty of not more than one thousand dollars. The person alleged to have violated the compliance order has thirty days from the date of issuance of the order assessing the civil penalty to request a hearing pursuant to chapter 6, article 10 of this title .

C. Except as provided in § 41-1092.08, subsection H, any party aggrieved by a final order or decision of the attorney general may appeal to the superior court pursuant to title 12, chapter 7, article 6.

Credits

Added by Laws 1991, 3rd S.S., Ch. 2, § 7, eff. June 1, 1992. Amended by Laws 1997, Ch. 221, § 192; Laws 2000, Ch. 113, § 172.

Footnotes

¹ Section 41-1092 et seq.

A. R. S. § 41-1237.01, AZ ST § 41-1237.01

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 41. State Government (Refs & Annos)
Chapter 7. Legislature (Refs & Annos)
Article 8.1. Registration and Regulation of Lobbyists (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 41-1238

§ 41-1238. Limitations

[Currentness](#)

No provision of this article shall be construed, interpreted or enforced so as to limit, impair, abridge or destroy any person's right of freedom of expression and participation in government processes, or freedom of the press.

Credits

Added by Laws 1974, Ch. 198, § 1.

A. R. S. § 41-1238, AZ ST § 41-1238

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

End of Document

© 2017 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.

Arizona Revised Statutes Annotated
Title 41. State Government (Refs & Annos)
Chapter 7. Legislature (Refs & Annos)
Article 8.1. Registration and Regulation of Lobbyists (Refs & Annos)

A.R.S. § 41-1239

§ 41-1239. Duties of secretary of state

Currentness

A. The secretary of state shall:

1. Prescribe and publish the registration and registration amendment forms and the annual and quarterly expenditure forms, handbooks and rules necessary to carry out the provisions of this article.
2. Refer to the attorney general or county attorney for investigation any matter which the secretary of state has reason to believe constitutes a violation of any of the provisions of this article.
3. Provide for the cross-referencing of the registration required by §§ 41-1232 and 41-1232.01 so that each lobbyist authorized by a principal pursuant to § 41-1232, subsection A and each public lobbyist authorized by a public body pursuant to § 41-1232.01, subsection A shall be identified with such principal.
4. Advise incumbents and nonincumbent candidates regarding campaign finance laws and public officer reporting and disclosure laws. At the request of the person asking for advice, the secretary of state shall log the request and the response.
5. Compile and issue an annual report of all expenditures reported by principals, public bodies, lobbyists and public lobbyists. The annual report shall accurately summarize all expenditures for lobbying but shall not double report expenditures by a lobbyist that were reimbursed and reported by a principal or public body. The report shall list the name of each principal or public body along with the name of each lobbyist or public lobbyist that is listed on the principal's registration statement.

B. The secretary of state may adopt rules regarding initiative, referendum and recall. Rules adopted pursuant to this subsection apply to statewide and county initiatives, referenda and recalls.

Credits

Added by Laws 1978, Ch. 214, § 4, eff. Jan. 1, 1979. Amended by Laws 1991, Ch. 241, § 7, eff. June 12, 1991; Laws 1991, 3rd S.S., Ch. 1, § 36, eff. Nov. 4, 1992; Laws 1991, 3rd S.S., Ch. 2, § 8, eff. June 1, 1992; Laws 1992, Ch. 319, § 37, eff. Nov. 4, 1992; Laws 1994, Ch. 380, § 12; Laws 2000, Ch. 364, § 5, eff. Jan. 1, 2001.

A. R. S. § 41-1239, AZ ST § 41-1239

Current through the First Regular Session of the Fifty-Third Legislature (2017)

End of Document

© 2017 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.

SECOND REGULAR SESSION—1992

Ch. 134

C. Pursuant to the provisions of section 41-1279.04, Arizona Revised Statutes, the auditor general may examine all records necessary to conduct the study required by this section. In addition, the university physicians, inc., shall provide the auditor general with the following by a date specified by the auditor general:

1. The annual audit reports, including information and supporting documents used to prepare the audit reports, provided to the board of regents for the medical services plan contract of 1985 for the period of time covering the fiscal years ending June 30, 1990 and June 30, 1991.

2. The complete audit reports, including information and supporting documents used to prepare the audit reports, for the medical services plan contract of 1985 for the period of time covering the fiscal years ending June 30, 1990 and June 30, 1991.

3. Any other information, documents, or property deemed appropriate by the auditor general in order to conduct the study as provided in this section.

Sec. 2. Appropriation; purpose

The sum of nine thousand dollars is appropriated from the state general fund to the office of the auditor general to allow the auditor general to conduct the study prescribed by this act.

Sec. 3. Emergency

This act is an emergency measure that is necessary to preserve the public peace, health or safety and is operative immediately as provided by law.

Approved by the Governor, June 2, 1992.

Filed in the Office of the Secretary of State, June 2, 1992.

PUBLIC EMPLOYEES—ETHICS

CHAPTER 134

S.B. 1437

AN ACT AMENDING TITLE 38, ARIZONA REVISED STATUTES, BY ADDING CHAPTER 3.2; AMENDING SECTION 41-192, ARIZONA REVISED STATUTES; RELATING TO ETHICS.

Be it enacted by the Legislature of the State of Arizona:

Section 1. Declaration of public policy

It is the public policy of this state that all public officers and employees of this state shall discharge their public duties in full compliance with applicable laws concerning ethical conduct. To ensure that state public officers and employees know the standards of conduct against which their actions will be measured, information shall be provided to state departments, agencies, boards, commissions and councils on compliance with laws on ethics including those relating to bribery, conflicts of interest, contracting with the government, disclosure of confidential information, discrimination, nepotism, financial disclosure, gifts and extra compensation, incompatible employment, political activity by public employees, public access to records, open meeting laws, conduct after leaving one's position with the government and misuse of public resources for personal gain.

Sec. 2. Title 38, Arizona Revised Statutes, is amended by adding chapter 3.2, to read:

Additions are indicated by underline; deletions by ~~strikeout~~

499
APP-247

Ch. 134

40th LEGISLATURE

CHAPTER 3.2

PUBLIC SERVICE ORIENTATION PROGRAMS

ARTICLE 1. GENERAL PROVISIONS

§ 38-551. Definitions

In this chapter, unless the context otherwise requires:

1. "Public service orientation programs" means educational training about laws relating to the proper conduct of public business, including laws relating to bribery, conflicts of interest, contracting with the government, disclosure of confidential information, discrimination, nepotism, financial disclosure, gifts and extra compensation, incompatible employment, misuse of public resources for personal gain, political activity by public employees, public access to records, open meeting laws and conduct after leaving one's position with the government.

2. "State officer" means all individuals elected or appointed to the legislature, a statewide elective position, or a state agency, department, board, commission, committee or council.

§ 38-552. Public service orientation programs; implementation

A. The state shall conduct public service orientation programs so that all state officers and employees receive such training at least once every two years.

B. Public service orientation programs shall be administered as follows:

1. The attorney general shall implement the public service orientation program for all individuals elected or appointed to a statewide elective position and appointed to head a state agency or department.

2. Each house of the legislature shall implement the public service orientation program for members of its respective house and its employees.

3. The department of administration shall implement the public service orientation program for appointees and volunteers to all state agencies, departments, boards, commissions, committees and councils and for all other state employees.

Sec. 3. Section 41-192, Arizona Revised Statutes, is amended to read:

§ 41-192. Powers and duties of attorney general; restrictions on state agencies as to legal counsel; exceptions

A. The attorney general shall have charge of and direct the department of law and shall serve as chief legal officer of the state. The attorney general shall:

1. Be the legal advisor of the departments of this state and render such legal services as the departments require.

2. Establish administrative and operational policies and procedures within his department.

3. Approve long-range plans for developing departmental programs therein, and coordinate the legal services required by other departments of this state or other state agencies.

4. Represent school districts and governing boards of school districts in any lawsuit involving a conflict of interest with other county offices.

5. Represent political subdivisions, school districts and municipalities in suits to enforce state or federal statutes pertaining to antitrust, restraint of trade or price-fixing activities or conspiracies, provided that the attorney general shall notify in writing such political subdivision, school districts and municipalities of his intention to bring any such action on its behalf. At any time within thirty

SECOND REGULAR SESSION—1992

Ch. 134

days after such notification, such political subdivision, school districts and municipalities may, by formal resolution of its governing body, withdraw the authority of the attorney general to bring the intended action on its behalf.

6. In any action brought by the attorney general pursuant to state or federal statutes pertaining to antitrust, restraint of trade, or price-fixing activities or conspiracies for the recovery of damages by this state or any of its political subdivisions, school districts or municipalities, in addition to his other powers and authority, the attorney general on behalf of this state may enter into contracts relating to the investigation and prosecution of such action with any other party plaintiff who has brought a similar action for the recovery of damages and with whom the attorney general finds it advantageous to act jointly or to share common expenses or to cooperate in any manner relative to such action. In any such action, notwithstanding any other laws to the contrary, the attorney general may undertake, among other things, to render legal services as special counsel, or to obtain the legal services of special counsel from any department or agency of the United States, of this state, or any other state, or any department or agency thereof, any county, city, public corporation or public district in this state or in any other state, that has brought or intends to bring a similar action for the recovery of damages, or their duly authorized legal representatives in such action.

7. Organize the civil rights division within the department of law and administer such division pursuant to the powers and duties provided in chapter 9 of this title.

8. Compile, publish and distribute to all state agencies, departments, boards, commissions and councils, and to other persons and government entities on request, at least every ten years, the Arizona agency handbook that sets forth and explains the major state laws that govern state agencies, including information on the laws relating to bribery, conflicts of interest, contracting with the government, disclosure of public information, discrimination, nepotism, financial disclosure, gifts and extra compensation, incompatible employment, political activity by employees, public access and misuse of public resources for personal gain. A supplement to the handbook reflecting revisions to the information contained in the handbook shall be compiled and distributed by the attorney general as deemed necessary.

B. Except as otherwise provided by law, the attorney general may:

1. Organize the department into such bureaus, subdivisions or units as he deems most efficient and economical, and consolidate or abolish them.

2. Adopt rules for the orderly conduct of the business of the department.

3. Employ and assign assistant attorneys general and other employees necessary to perform the functions of the department. Not later than October 31, 1984, the attorney general shall submit to the joint legislative budget committee a comprehensive performance pay plan for all assistant attorneys general. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 38-611, all monies appropriated for salary adjustments for assistant attorneys general to become effective on or after January 1, 1985 shall be allocated in accordance with the performance pay plan as approved by the joint legislative budget committee. If the joint legislative budget committee does not approve a performance pay plan by December 31, 1984, assistant attorneys general shall receive salary adjustments pursuant to section 38-611.

4. Compromise or settle any action or claim by or against this state or any department, board or agency thereof. Where such compromise or settlement involves a particular department, board or agency of this state, the compromise or settlement shall be first approved by such department, board or agency.

Additions are indicated by underline; deletions by ~~strikeout~~

501
APP-249

Ch. 134**40th LEGISLATURE**

Where no department or agency is named or otherwise materially involved, the approval of the governor shall be first obtained.

5. Charge reasonable fees for distributing official publications, including attorney general legal opinions and the Arizona agency handbook. The fees received shall be deposited in a separate account and are available for expenditure by the attorney general solely for the production of official publications.

C. Assistants and employees in any legal division subject to a merit system prior to March 6, 1953 shall remain subject thereto.

D. The powers and duties of a bureau, subdivision or unit shall be limited to those assigned by law to the department.

E. Notwithstanding any law to the contrary, except as provided in subsections F and G of this section, no state agency other than the attorney general shall employ legal counsel or make an expenditure or incur an indebtedness for legal services, but the following are exempt from this section:

1. The director of water resources.
2. The residential utility consumer office.
3. The industrial commission.
4. The Arizona board of regents.
5. The auditor general.
6. The corporation commissioners and the corporation commission other than the securities division.

F. If the attorney general determines that he is disqualified from providing judicial or quasi-judicial legal representation or legal services on behalf of any state agency in relation to any matter, the attorney general shall give written notification to the state agency affected. If the agency has received written notification from the attorney general that he is disqualified from providing judicial or quasi-judicial legal representation or legal services in relation to any particular matter, the state agency is authorized to make expenditures and incur indebtedness to employ attorneys to provide the representation or services.

G. If the attorney general and the director of the department of agriculture cannot agree on the final disposition of a pesticide complaint under section 3-368 or if the attorney general and the director determine that a conflict of interest exists as to any matter or if the attorney general and the director determine that the attorney general does not have the expertise or attorneys available to handle a matter, the director is authorized to make expenditures and incur indebtedness to employ attorneys to provide representation or services to the department with regard to that matter.

H. Any department or agency of this state authorized by law to maintain a legal division or incur expenses for legal services from funds derived from sources other than the general revenue of the state, or from any special or trust fund, shall pay from such source of revenue or special or trust fund into the general fund of the state, to the extent such funds are available and upon a reimbursable basis for warrants drawn upon the state treasurer, the amount actually expended by the department of law within legislative appropriations for such legal division or legal services.

I. Appropriations made pursuant to subsection H of this section shall not be subject to lapsing provisions otherwise provided by law. Services for departments or agencies to which this subsection and subsection G of this section are applicable shall be performed by special or regular assistants to the attorney general.

J. Monies in the special fund authorized under subsection B, paragraph 5 of this section that at any time are in excess of fifteen thousand dollars shall

SECOND REGULAR SESSION—1992

Ch. 135

immediately revert to the state general fund. Monies in such fund of fifteen thousand dollars or less are exempt from the lapsing provision of section 35-190, except that monies in such fund at the close of the fiscal year in excess of five thousand dollars shall revert to the state general fund.

Approved by the Governor, June 2, 1992.

Filed in the Office of the Secretary of State, June 2, 1992.

**TAXATION—TRANSACTION PRIVILEGE,
EXCISE AND USE TAXES**

CHAPTER 135

S.B. 1442

AN ACT AMENDING SECTIONS 42-1310.01, 42-1310.11, 42-1310.13 AND 42-1409,
ARIZONA REVISED STATUTES; RELATING TO TRANSACTION PRIVILEGE,
AFFILIATED EXCISE AND USE TAXES.

Be it enacted by the Legislature of the State of Arizona:

Section 1. Section 42-1310.01, Arizona Revised Statutes, is amended to read:

§ 42-1310.01. Retail classification; definitions

A. The retail classification is comprised of the business of selling tangible personal property at retail. The tax base for the retail classification is the gross proceeds of sales or gross income derived from the business. The tax imposed on the retail classification pursuant to this section does not apply to the gross proceeds of sales or gross income from:

1. Professional or personal service occupations or businesses which involve sales or transfers of tangible personal property only as inconsequential elements.
2. Services rendered in addition to selling tangible personal property at retail.
3. Sales of warranty or service contracts. The storage, use or consumption of tangible personal property provided under the conditions of such contracts is subject to tax under section 42-1408.01.
4. Sales of tangible personal property by any nonprofit organization organized and operated exclusively for charitable purposes and recognized by the department and the United States internal revenue service as such a nonprofit organization for charitable purposes.
5. Sales to persons engaged in business classified under the restaurant classification of articles used by human beings for food, drink or condiment, whether simple, mixed or compounded.
6. Business activity by a person which is properly included in any other business classification by that person which is taxable under this article.
7. The sale of stocks and bonds.
8. Drugs and medical oxygen on the prescription of a member of the medical, dental or veterinarian profession who is licensed by law to administer such substances.
9. Prosthetic appliances as defined in section 23-501 prescribed or recommended by a ~~physician, dentist or other~~ health professional licensed pursuant to title 32, chapter 7, 8, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, or 17 or 29.

Additions are indicated by underline; deletions by ~~strikeout~~

APP-251 503

Arizona Administrative Code

Title 2. Administration

Chapter 5. Department of Administration -- State Personnel System

Subchapter A. Covered and Uncovered Employees

Article 5. Conditions of Employment

A.A.C. R2-5A-501

R2-5A-501. Standards of Conduct

Currentness

A. Required conduct. A state employee shall at all times:

1. Comply with federal and state laws and rules, statewide policies and employee handbook, and agency policies and directives;
2. Maintain high standards of honesty, integrity, and impartiality, free from personal considerations, or favoritism;
3. Be courteous, considerate, and prompt in interactions with and serving the public and other employees; and
4. Conduct himself or herself in a manner that will not bring discredit or embarrassment to the state.

B. Prohibited conduct. A state employee shall not:

1. Use his or her official position for personal gain, or attempt to use, or use, confidential information for personal advantage;
2. Permit himself or herself to be placed under any kind of personal obligation that could lead a person to expect official favors;
3. Perform an act in a private capacity that may be construed to be an official act;
4. Accept or solicit, directly or indirectly, anything of economic value as a gift, gratuity, favor, entertainment, or loan that is, or may appear to be, designed to influence the employee's official conduct. This provision shall not prohibit acceptance by an employee of food, refreshments, or unsolicited advertising or promotional material of nominal value;
5. Directly or indirectly use or allow the use of state equipment or property of any kind, including equipment and property leased to the state, for other than official activities unless authorized by written agency policy or as otherwise allowed by these rules;

6. Inhibit a state employee from joining or refraining from joining an employee organization; or

7. Take disciplinary or punitive action against another employee that impedes or interferes with that employee's exercise of any right granted under the law or these rules.

C. Consequences of non-compliance. An employee who violates the standards of conduct requirements listed in subsection (A) or (B) may be disciplined or separated from state employment. Any such actions involving a covered employee shall be in accordance with the rules in Subchapter B, Article 3.

Credits

Section made by exempt rulemaking at 18 A.A.R. 2782, effective September 29, 2012 (Supp. 12-4). Amended by exempt rulemaking at 19 A.A.R. 717 effective April 13, 2013 (Supp. 13-1).

Current through rules published in Arizona Administrative Register Volume 23, Issue 43, October 27, 2017.

A.A.C. R2-5A-501, AZ ADC R2-5A-501

Arizona Administrative Code

Title 14. Public Service Corporations; Corporations and Associations; Securities Regulation

Chapter 3. Corporation Commission - Rules of Practice and Procedure

Article 1. Rules of Practice and Procedure Before the Corporation Commission (Refs & Annos)

A.A.C. R14-3-103

R14-3-103. Parties

Currentness

A. Classification of parties. Parties to any proceeding before the Commission shall consist of and shall be designated "Applicant", "Complainant", "Respondent", "Intervenor", or "Protestant" according to the nature of the proceedings and the relationship of the party thereto.

B. Applicant. Any person requesting a certificate, permit, other authority or any affirmative relief other than a complainant shall be designated "Applicant".

C. Complainant. Any person complaining pursuant to any statute or any rule or order of the Commission shall be designated "Complainant".

D. Respondent. Any person against whom a complaint or petition is filed or any person who may be subject to having any schedule, rate or tariff forfeited or revoked by the Commission, shall be designated as "Respondent".

E. Intervenor. Any person permitted to intervene in any proceeding shall be designated "Intervenor".

F. Protestant. Any person permitted to protest in any proceeding shall be designated "Protestant".

G. Two or more complainants. Two or more complainants may join in one complaint if their respective complaints are against the same respondent or respondents and involve substantially the same matter or thing and a like state of facts.

H. Multiple respondents. If complaint be made of tariffs, rates, fares, charges, regulations or practices involving more than one public service corporation, all such public service corporations shall be made respondents.

I. Receivers and trustees. The receiver or trustee of any person subject to the orders of this Commission shall be a party in any proceeding affecting such person and shall be designated as herein provided.

Credits

Former Section R14-3-103 repealed, new Section R14-3-103 adopted effective December 17, 1975 (Supp. 75-2).

Current through rules published in Arizona Administrative Register Volume 23, Issue 52, December 29, 2017.

Arizona Administrative Code

Title 14. Public Service Corporations; Corporations and Associations; Securities Regulation

Chapter 3. Corporation Commission - Rules of Practice and Procedure

Article 1. Rules of Practice and Procedure Before the Corporation Commission (Refs & Annos)

A.A.C. R14-3-113

Ariz. Admin. Code R14-3-113

R14-3-113. Unauthorized communications

Currentness

A. Purpose. It is the purpose of this rule to assist the members of the Arizona Corporation Commission and its employees in avoiding the possibility of prejudice, real or apparent, to the public interest in proceedings before the Commission and hearings before the Arizona Power Plant and Transmission Line Siting Committee.

B. Application. The provisions of this rule apply from the time a contested matter is set for public hearing before the Commission and from the time a notice of siting hearing is published pursuant to R14-3-208(A). The provisions of this rule do not apply to rulemaking proceedings.

C. Prohibitions.

1. No person shall make or cause to be made an oral or written communication, not on the public record, concerning the substantive merits of a contested proceeding or siting hearing to a commissioner or commission employee involved in the decision-making process for that proceeding or siting hearing.

2. No commissioner or commission employee involved in the decision-making process of a contested proceeding or siting hearing shall request, entertain, or consider an unauthorized communication concerning the merits of the proceeding or siting hearing.

3. The provisions of this rule shall not prohibit:

- a. Communications regarding procedural matters;
- b. Communications regarding any other proceedings;
- c. Intra-agency or non-party communications regarding purely technical and legal matters;
- d. Comments from the general public;
- e. Communications among hearing officers, non-party staff and commissioners.

D. Remedy.

1. A commissioner or commission employee who receives an oral or written offer of any communication prohibited by this rule must decline to receive such communication and will explain that the matter is pending for determination and that all communication regarding it must be made on the public record. If unsuccessful in preventing such communications, the recipient will advise the communicator that the communication will not be considered, a brief signed statement setting forth the substance of the communication and the circumstances under which it was made, will be prepared, and the statement will be filed in the public record of the case or proceeding.

2. Any person affected by an unauthorized communication will have an opportunity to rebut on the record any facts or contentions contained in the communication.

3. If a party to a contested proceeding or siting hearing makes an unauthorized communication, the party may be required to show cause why its claim or interest in the proceeding or siting hearing should not be dismissed, denied, disregarded, or otherwise adversely affected on account of such violation.

Credits

Adopted effective January 3, 1986 (Supp. 86-1). Amended by final rulemaking at 12 A.A.R. 4181, effective December 25, 2006 (Supp. 06-4).

Current through rules published in Arizona Administrative Register Volume 23, Issue 43, October 27, 2017.

A.A.C. R14-3-113, AZ ADC R14-3-113

**CODE OF ETHICS FOR MEMBERS OF THE
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
REGULATORY UTILITY COMMISSIONERS**

CANON I

A Commissioner Should Uphold the Integrity of the Commission:

An honorable Commissioner of high integrity is indispensable to justice in discharging the responsibilities of the Commission. A Commissioner should participate in establishing, maintaining and enforcing, and should observe high standards of conduct so that the integrity and honor of the Commission may be preserved. The provisions of this Code of Ethics should be construed and applied to further that objective.

CANON II

A Commissioner Should Avoid Impropriety and the Appearance of Impropriety in All Activities:

A Commissioner should respect and comply with the law and should conduct himself or herself at all times in a manner that promotes public confidence in the integrity and impartiality of the Commission. A Commissioner should not own any stock or securities or other financial interest in any company regulated by the Commission.

A Commissioner should not allow family, social or other relationships to influence his or her official conduct or judgment. A Commissioner should not lend the prestige of office to advance the private interests of others nor should he or she convey or permit others to convey the impression that they are in a special position to influence him or her.

CANON III

A Commissioner Should Perform the Duties of Office Impartially and Diligently:

The official duties of a Commissioner take precedence over all other activities. A Commissioner's duties include all the duties of office prescribed by law. In the performance of these duties, the following standards apply:

- (1) A Commissioner should be faithful to and constantly strive to improve his or her competence in regulatory principles. He or she should be unswayed by partisan interests, public clamor, or fear of criticism.
- (2) A Commissioner should maintain order and decorum in the proceedings before him or her.
- (3) A Commissioner should be patient, dignified and courteous to litigants, witnesses, lawyers, and others with whom the Commission deals in an official capacity, and should require similar conduct of lawyers, staff, and others subject to the Commissioner's direction and control.
- (4) A Commissioner should afford to every person who is legally interested in a proceeding, or his or her lawyer, full right to be heard according to law.
- (5) A Commissioner should diligently discharge his or her administrative responsibilities, maintain professional confidence in Commission administration, and facilitate the

performance of the administrative responsibilities of other Commissioners and staff officials.

(6) A Commissioner should disqualify himself or herself in a proceeding in which his or her impartiality might reasonably be questioned, including, but not limited to, instances where:

- (a) The Commissioner has a personal bias or prejudice concerning a party;
- (b) The Commissioner has served as a lawyer or representative in the matter in controversy, or a lawyer with whom he or she previously practiced law served during such association as a lawyer or representative concerning the matter;
- (c) The Commissioner knows that he or she individually or as a fiduciary, or his or her spouse or minor child residing in his or her household, has a financial interest in the subject matter in controversy, or is a party to the proceeding, or any other interest that could be substantially affected by the outcome of the proceeding.

(7) For purposes of this section:

- (a) "Fiduciary" includes such relationships as executor, administrator, trustee and guardian;
- (b) "Financial interest" means ownership of a legal or equitable interest, however small, or a relationship as director, advisor, or other active participant in the affairs of a party, except that:
 - (i) Ownership in a mutual or common investment fund that holds securities is not a "financial interest" in such securities unless the Commissioner participates in the management of the fund;
 - (ii) An office in an educational, religious, charitable, fraternal, or civic organization is not a "financial interest" in securities held by that organization;
 - (iii) The proprietary interest of a policy holder in a mutual insurance company, of a depositor in a mutual savings association, or a similar proprietary interest, is a "financial interest" in the organization only if the outcome of the proceeding could substantially affect the value of the interest.

CANON IV

A Commissioner May Engage in Activities to Improve Regulation and Administration:

A Commissioner, subject to the proper performance of his or her duties, may engage in the following activities, and in doing so, he or she does not cast doubt on his or her capacity to decide impartially any issue that may come before the Commission:

- (1) The Commissioner may speak, write, lecture, teach, and participate in other activities concerning regulation and the administration of Commission business.
- (2) The Commissioner may appear at a public hearing before an executive or legislative body or official.

CANON V

A Commissioner Should Regulate His or Her Outside Activities to Minimize the Risk of Conflict:

By way of illustration, but not to be construed as excluding matters not covered:

(1) A Commissioner may write, lecture, teach, and speak on non-utility subjects and engage in arts, sports, and other social and recreational activities;

(2) A Commissioner may participate in civic and charitable activities that do not reflect adversely upon his or her impartiality or interfere with the performance of his or her official duties.

A Commissioner should refrain from financial and business dealing that tend to reflect adversely on his or her impartiality, interfere with the proper performance of his or her official duties, exploit his or her position, or involve him or her in frequent transactions with persons likely to come before the Commission.

Neither a Commissioner nor a member of his or her family residing in his or her household should accept a gift, bequest, favor, or loan from anyone except as follows:

(1) Instances in which the interests of the public are served by participation of the Commissioner such as widely attended luncheon meetings, dinner meetings, or similar gatherings sponsored by industrial, technical, and professional associations for the discussion of matters of mutual interest of the Commission and in the performance of his or her duties;

(2) A loan from a lending institution in its regular course of business on the same terms generally available to persons who are not Commissioners;

(3) A Commissioner or a member of his or her family residing in his or her household may accept any other gift, bequest, favor or loan if the donor is not a party or other person whose special interest may come or are likely to ever come before the Commissioner.

Adopted by the 89th NARUC Annual Convention on November 17, 1977 (**Convention Proceedings**, pages 315-318)

ARIZONA CODE OF JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Arizona Supreme Court
Rule 81, Rules of the Supreme Court,

Amended November 24, 2009

[This page is intentionally left blank]

**ARIZONA CODE OF JUDICIAL CONDUCT
CONTENTS**

Preliminary Sections

	Preamble	[1]
	Scope	[2]
	Terminology	[3]
	Application	[5]
Canon 1.	A judge shall uphold and promote the independence, integrity, and impartiality of the judiciary and shall avoid impropriety and the appearance of impropriety.	[9]
Rule 1.1.	Compliance with the Law	[9]
Rule 1.2.	Promoting Confidence in the Judiciary	[9]
Rule 1.3.	Avoiding Abuse of the Prestige of Judicial Office	[10]
Canon 2.	A judge shall perform the duties of judicial office impartially, competently, and diligently.	[11]
Rule 2.1.	Giving Precedence to Judicial Duties	[11]
Rule 2.2.	Impartiality and Fairness	[11]
Rule 2.3.	Bias, Prejudice, and Harassment	[11]
Rule 2.4.	External Influences on Judicial Conduct	[12]
Rule 2.5.	Competence, Diligence, and Cooperation	[12]
Rule 2.6.	Ensuring the Right to be Heard	[13]
Rule 2.7.	Responsibility to Decide	[14]
Rule 2.8.	Decorum, Demeanor, and Communication with Jurors	[14]
Rule 2.9.	Ex parte Communications	[15]
Rule 2.10.	Judicial Statements on Pending and Impending Cases	[17]
Rule 2.11.	Disqualification	[17]
Rule 2.12.	Supervisory Duties	[20]
Rule 2.13.	Administrative Appointments	[20]
Rule 2.14.	Disability and Impairment	[21]
Rule 2.15.	Responding to Judicial and Lawyer Misconduct	[21]
Rule 2.16.	Cooperation with Disciplinary Authorities	[22]
Canon 3.	A judge shall conduct the judge's extrajudicial activities so as to minimize the risk of conflict with the obligations of judicial office.	[23]

Rule 3.1.	Extrajudicial Activities in General	[23]
Rule 3.2.	Appearances Before Governmental Bodies and Consultation with Governmental Officials	[24]
Rule 3.3.	Acting as a Character Witness	[24]
Rule 3.4.	Appointments to Governmental Positions	[25]
Rule 3.5.	Use of Nonpublic Information	[25]
Rule 3.6.	Affiliation with Discriminatory Organizations	[25]
Rule 3.7.	Participation in Educational, Religious, Charitable, Fraternal, or Civic Organizations and Activities	[26]
Rule 3.8.	Appointments to Fiduciary Positions	[28]
Rule 3.9.	Service as an Arbitrator or Mediator	[29]
Rule 3.10.	Practice of Law	[29]
Rule 3.11.	Financial, Business, or Remunerative Activities	[29]
Rule 3.12.	Compensation for Extrajudicial Activities	[30]
Rule 3.13.	Acceptance and Reporting of Gifts, Loans, Bequests, Benefit or Other Things of Value	[31]
Rule 3.14.	Reimbursement of Expenses and Waivers of Fees or Charges	[33]
Rule 3.15.	Financial Reporting Requirements	[34]
Rule 3.16.	Conducting Weddings	[34]
Canon 4.	A judge or candidate for judicial office shall not engage in political or campaign activity that is inconsistent with the independence, integrity, or impartiality of the judiciary.	[35]
Rule 4.1.	Political and Campaign Activities of Judges and Judicial Candidates in General	[35]
Rule 4.2.	Political and Campaign Activities of Judicial Candidates	[38]
Rule 4.3.	Campaign Standards and Communications	[38]
Rule 4.4.	Campaign Committees	[40]
Rule 4.5.	Activities of Judges Who Become Candidates for Nonjudicial Office	[40]
Index		[43]

[The index and page numbers are not part of the official version of the code.]

PREAMBLE

An independent, fair, and impartial judiciary is indispensable to our system of justice. The United States legal system is based upon the principle that an independent, impartial, and competent judiciary, composed of men and women of integrity, will interpret and apply the law that governs our society. Thus, the judiciary plays a central role in preserving the principles of justice and the rule of law. Inherent in all the rules contained in this code are the precepts that judges, individually and collectively, must respect and honor the judicial office as a public trust and strive to maintain and enhance confidence in the legal system.

Judges should maintain the dignity of judicial office at all times, and avoid both impropriety and the appearance of impropriety in their professional and personal lives. They should aspire at all times to conduct that ensures the greatest possible public confidence in their independence, impartiality, integrity, and competence.

This code establishes standards for the ethical conduct of judges and judicial candidates. It is not intended as an exhaustive guide for the conduct of judges and judicial candidates, who are governed in their judicial and personal conduct by general ethical standards as well as by the code. The code is intended, however, to provide guidance and assist judges in maintaining the highest standards of judicial and personal conduct, and to provide a basis for regulating their conduct through disciplinary agencies.

SCOPE

This code consists of four canons, numbered rules under each canon, and comments that generally follow and explain each rule. Scope and terminology sections provide additional guidance in interpreting and applying the code. An application section establishes when the various rules apply to a judge or judicial candidate.

The canons state overarching principles of judicial ethics that all judges must observe. Although a judge may be disciplined only for violating a rule, the canons provide important guidance in interpreting the rules. Where a rule contains a permissive term, such as “may” or “should,” the conduct being addressed is committed to the personal and professional discretion of the judge or candidate in question, and no disciplinary action should be taken for action or inaction within the bounds of such discretion.

The comments that accompany the rules serve two functions. First, they provide guidance regarding the purpose, meaning, and proper application of the rules. They contain explanatory material and, in some instances, provide examples of permitted or prohibited conduct. Second, the comments identify aspirational goals for judges. To implement fully the principles of this code as articulated in the canons, judges should strive to exceed the standards of conduct established by the rules, holding themselves to the highest ethical standards and seeking to achieve those aspirational goals, thereby enhancing the dignity of the judicial office.

The rules in the code are rules of reason that should be applied consistent with constitutional requirements, statutes, other court rules, and decisional law, and with due regard for all relevant circumstances. The rules should not be interpreted to impinge upon the essential independence of judges in making judicial decisions.

The black letter of the rules is binding and enforceable. It is not intended, however, that every transgression will result in the imposition of discipline. Whether discipline should be imposed should be determined through a reasonable and reasoned application of the rules and should depend upon factors such as the seriousness of the transgression, the facts and circumstances that existed at the time of the transgression, the extent of any pattern of improper activity, whether there have been previous violations, and the effect of the improper activity upon the judicial system or others.

The code is not designed or intended as a basis for civil or criminal liability. Neither is it intended to be the basis for litigants to seek collateral remedies against each other or to obtain tactical advantages in proceedings before a court.

TERMINOLOGY

“Appropriate authority” means the authority having responsibility for initiation of disciplinary process in connection with the violation to be reported.

“Contribution” means both financial and in-kind contributions, such as goods, professional or volunteer services, advertising, and other types of assistance, which, if obtained by the recipient otherwise, would require a financial expenditure.

“De minimis,” in the context of interests pertaining to disqualification of a judge, means an insignificant interest that could not raise a reasonable question regarding the judge’s impartiality.

“Domestic partner” means a person with whom another person maintains a household and an intimate relationship, other than a person to whom he or she is legally married.

“Economic interest” means ownership of more than a de minimis legal or equitable interest and is further defined, for purposes of compliance with state law, in A.R.S. § 38-502(11). Except for situations in which the judge participates in the management of such a legal or equitable interest, or the interest could be substantially affected by the outcome of a proceeding before a judge, it does not include:

- (1) an interest in the individual holdings within a mutual or common investment fund;
- (2) an interest in securities held by an educational, religious, charitable, fraternal, or civic organization in which the judge or the judge’s spouse, domestic partner, parent, or child serves as a director, an officer, an advisor, or other participant;
- (3) deposit in a financial institution or deposits or proprietary interests the judge may maintain as a member of a mutual savings association or credit union, or similar proprietary interests; or
- (4) an interest in the issuer of government securities held by the judge.

“Fiduciary” includes relationships such as executor, administrator, trustee, or guardian.

“Impartial,” “impartiality,” and **“impartially”** mean absence of bias or prejudice in favor of, or against, particular parties or classes of parties, as well as maintenance of an open mind in considering issues that may come before a judge.

“Impending matter” is a matter that is imminent or expected to occur in the near future.

“Impropropriety” includes conduct that violates the law, court rules, or provisions of this Code, and conduct that undermines a judge’s independence, integrity, or impartiality.

“Independence” means a judge’s freedom from influence or controls other than those established by law.

“Integrity” means probity, fairness, honesty, uprightness, and soundness of character.

“Judge” means any person who is authorized to perform judicial functions within the Arizona judiciary, including a justice or judge of a court of record, a justice of the peace, magistrate, court commissioner, special master, hearing officer, referee, or pro tempore judge.

“Judicial candidate” means any person, including a sitting judge, who is seeking selection for or retention in judicial office by election or appointment. A person becomes a candidate for judicial office as soon as he or she makes a public announcement of candidacy, declares or files as a candidate with the election or appointment authority, authorizes or, where permitted, engages in solicitation or acceptance of contributions or support, or is nominated for election or appointment to office.

“Knowingly,” “knowledge,” “known,” and “knows” means actual knowledge of the fact in question. A person’s knowledge may be inferred from circumstances.

“Law” encompasses court rules as well as ordinances, regulations, statutes, constitutional provisions, and decisional law.

“Member of the judge’s family” means a spouse, domestic partner, child, grandchild, parent, grandparent, or other relative or person with whom the judge maintains a close familial relationship.

“Member of a judge’s family residing in the judge’s household” means any relative of a judge by blood or marriage, or a person treated by a judge as a member of the judge’s family, who resides in the judge’s household.

“Nonpublic information” means information that is not available to the public. Nonpublic information may include, but is not limited to, information that is sealed by statute or court order or impounded or communicated in camera, and information offered in dependency cases or psychiatric reports.

“Pending matter” is a matter that has commenced. A matter continues to be pending through any appellate process until final disposition.

“Personally solicit” means a direct request made by a judge or a judicial candidate for financial support or in-kind services, whether made by letter, telephone, or any other means of communication.

“Political organization” means a political party or other group sponsored by or affiliated with a political party or candidate, the principal purpose of which is to further the election or appointment of candidates for political office. For purposes of this code, the term does not include a judicial candidate’s campaign committee created as authorized by Rule 4.3.

“Public election” includes primary and general elections, partisan elections, nonpartisan elections, recall elections, and retention elections.

“Third degree of relationship” includes the following persons: great-grandparent, grandparent, parent, uncle, aunt, brother, sister, child, grandchild, great-grandchild, nephew, and niece.

APPLICATION

The Application section establishes when the various rules apply to a judge or judicial candidate.

PART A. Applicability of this Code.

- (1) The provisions of the code apply to all judges. Parts B through D of this section identify exemptions that apply to part-time judges.
- (2) The provisions of Canon 4 apply to judicial candidates.

Comment

1. The rules in this code have been formulated to address the ethical obligations of any person who serves a judicial function within the Arizona judicial branch, and are premised upon the supposition that a uniform system of ethical principles should apply to all those authorized to perform judicial functions. The code does not apply to administrative law judges or administrative hearing officers in this state unless expressly made applicable by statute or by agency rules. Such officers are generally affiliated with the executive branch of government rather than the judicial branch and each agency should consider the unique characteristics of particular positions in adopting and adapting the code for administrative law judges or administrative hearing officers. See Arizona Judicial Ethics Advisory Committee, Opinion 92-03 (January 31, 1992).

2. The determination of which category of judicial service and, accordingly, which specific rules apply to an individual judicial officer, depends upon the nature of the particular judicial service.

3. Arizona has what are often called “problem-solving” courts, in which judges are authorized by court rules to act in nontraditional ways. For example, judges presiding in drug courts and monitoring the progress of participants in those courts’ programs may be authorized and even encouraged to communicate directly with social workers, probation officers, and others outside the context of their usual judicial role as independent decision makers on issues of fact and law. When local rules governing problem-solving courts, or protocols for problem-solving courts known and consented to by the participants, specifically authorize conduct not otherwise permitted under these rules, they take precedence over the provisions set forth in the code. Nevertheless, judges serving on “problem-solving” courts shall comply with this code except to the extent local rules or protocols provide and permit otherwise. See Rule 2.9, Comment 4.

PART B. Retired Judge Available for Assignment.

A retired judge available for assignment to judicial service need not comply with Rules 3.2 (appearances before governmental bodies and consultation with government officials), 3.3 (acting as a character witness), 3.4 (appointments to governmental positions), 3.7 (participation in educational, religious, charitable, fraternal, or civic organizations and activities), 3.8 (appointments to fiduciary positions), 3.9 (service as arbitrator or mediator), 3.10 (practice of law), 3.11 (financial, business or remunerative activities), 3.12 (compensation for extrajudicial activities),

3.13 (acceptance and reporting of gifts, loans, bequests, benefits, or other things of value), 3.14 (reimbursement of expenses and waivers of fees or charges), 3.15 (reporting requirements), and 4.1(A) (political and campaign activities of judges and judicial candidates in general).

PART C. Continuing or Periodic Part-Time Judge.

A judge who serves part-time on a continuing or periodic basis, but is permitted to devote time to another profession or occupation and whose compensation is less than that of a full-time judge, is not required to comply:

- (1) except while serving as a judge with Rules 2.10(A) and (B) (judicial statements on pending and impending cases); or
- (2) at any time with Rules 3.4 (appointments to governmental positions), 3.8 (appointments to fiduciary positions), 3.9 (service as arbitrator or mediator), 3.10 (practice of law), 3.11 (financial, business, or remunerative activities), 3.14 (reimbursement of expenses and waivers of fees or charges), 3.15 (reporting requirements), 4.1 (political and campaign activities of judges and judicial candidates in general), 4.2 (political and campaign activities of judicial candidates in public elections), 4.3 (activities of candidates for appointive judicial office), 4.4 (campaign committees), and 4.5 (activities of judges who become candidates for nonjudicial office).

Additionally, such a judge shall not practice law in the specific court on which the judge serves or in any court subject to the appellate jurisdiction of the specific court on which the judge serves, and shall not act as a lawyer in a proceeding in which the judge has served as a judge or in any other proceeding related thereto.

Comment

When a person who has been a continuing part-time judge is no longer a continuing part-time judge, that person may act as a lawyer in a proceeding in which he or she has served as a judge or in any other proceeding related thereto only with the informed consent of all parties, and pursuant to any applicable Rules of Professional Conduct.

PART D. Pro Tempore Part-Time Judge.

A pro tempore part-time judge is a person appointed pursuant to Article 6, § 31 of the Arizona Constitution, or municipal charter or ordinance, who serves or expects to serve repeatedly on a less than full-time basis, but under a separate appointment by a presiding judge for each limited period of service or for each matter.

- (1) A pro tempore part-time judge is not required to comply:
 - (a) except while serving as a judge with Rules 1.2 (promoting confidence in the judiciary), 2.4 (external influences on judicial conduct), 2.10 (judicial statements on pending and impending cases), 3.2 (appearance before governmental bodies and consultation with government officials), 3.3 (acting as a character witness); or

- (b) at any time with Rules 3.4 (appointments to governmental positions), 3.7 (participation in educational, religious, charitable, fraternal, or civic organizations and activities), 3.8 appointments to fiduciary positions), 3.9 (service as arbitrator or mediator, 3.10 (practice of law), 3.11 (financial, business, or remunerative activities), 3.13 (acceptance and reporting of gifts, loans, bequests, benefits, or other things of value), 3.15 (reporting requirements), 4.1 (political and campaign activities of judges and judicial candidates in general), and 4.5 (activities of judges who become candidates for nonjudicial office).
- (2) A person who has been a pro tempore part-time judge shall not act as a lawyer in a proceeding in which the judge has served as a judge or in any other proceeding related thereto except as otherwise permitted by Rule 1.12(a) of the Arizona Rules of Professional Conduct.
- (3) A pro tempore part-time judge who serves once or only sporadically in a specialized division of a court or in a court without specialized divisions may appear as a lawyer in such specialized division or court during such service.
- (4) A pro tempore part-time judge who serves repeatedly on a continuing scheduled basis in a specialized division of a court or in a court without specialized divisions shall not appear as a lawyer in such specialized division or court during such service.
- (5) A part-time pro tempore judge who is appointed to perform judicial functions of a nonappealable nature on a continuing scheduled basis shall not appear as a lawyer in other proceedings involving the function of the court in which the service was performed, but may appear as a lawyer in all other areas of practice before the court.

Comment

1. The restrictions of Part D apply to the members of a pro tempore part-time judge's law firm.

2. The purpose of Part D is to allow the greatest possible use of part-time pro tempore judges to augment judicial resources in order to reduce case backlogs and the time necessary to process cases to disposition while minimizing any potential for the appearance of impropriety.

3. The language of Part D is intended to allow, at a minimum, the following current practices:

- (a) A lawyer sits as a part-time pro tempore judge for one family law trial and during this time appears in the family law divisions as a lawyer in other matters.
- (b) A lawyer sits as a part-time pro tempore juvenile judge two or more half days a week on a continuing scheduled basis and during this time appears in court as a lawyer in all types of proceedings except for juvenile matters.
- (c) A lawyer sits as a part-time pro tempore criminal judge in the after-hours and weekend initial appearance program and thereafter appears as a lawyer in the

criminal divisions except that the lawyer does not appear in the initial appearance program on behalf of clients.

- (d) A lawyer sits on a continuing scheduled basis as a part-time pro tempore judge in a satellite court in one community and otherwise appears in the main court located in a different community on all variety of matters, but does not appear in any proceeding in the satellite court.
- (e) A lawyer sits on a continuing scheduled basis as a pro tempore part-time justice of the peace in one precinct and appears as a lawyer in a justice court in another precinct.
- (f) A lawyer sits once or only sporadically as a pro tempore part-time magistrate in a municipal court and otherwise appears as a lawyer in the same court on all variety of matters.
- (g) These comments replace Advisory Opinion 92-16 (issued December 8, 1992, and reissued March 8, 1993) dealing with ethical constraints on lawyers serving as pro tempore judges.

PART E. Time for Compliance by New Judges.

A person to whom this code becomes applicable shall comply immediately with its provisions, except that those judges to whom Rules 3.8 (appointments to fiduciary positions) and 3.11 (financial, business, or remunerative activities) apply shall comply with those rules as soon as reasonably possible, but in no event later than one year after the code becomes applicable to the judge.

Comment

If serving as a fiduciary when selected as judge, a new judge may, notwithstanding the prohibitions in Rule 3.8, continue to serve as fiduciary, but only for that period of time necessary to avoid serious adverse consequences to the beneficiaries of the fiduciary relationship and in no event longer than one year. Similarly, if engaged at the time of judicial selection in a business activity, a new judge may, notwithstanding the prohibitions in Rule 3.11, continue in that activity for a reasonable period but in no event longer than one year.

CANON 1**A JUDGE SHALL UPHOLD AND PROMOTE THE INDEPENDENCE,
INTEGRITY, AND IMPARTIALITY OF THE JUDICIARY,
AND SHALL AVOID IMPROPRIETY AND THE
APPEARANCE OF IMPROPRIETY.****RULE 1.1. Compliance with the Law**

A judge shall comply with the law, including the Code of Judicial Conduct.

Comment

For a discussion of the judge's obligation when applying and interpreting the law, see Rule 2.2 and the related comment.

RULE 1.2. Promoting Confidence in the Judiciary

A judge shall act at all times in a manner that promotes public confidence in the independence, integrity, and impartiality of the judiciary, and shall avoid impropriety and the appearance of impropriety.

Comment

1. Public confidence in the judiciary is eroded by improper conduct and conduct that creates the appearance of impropriety. This principle applies to both the professional and personal conduct of a judge.

2. A judge should expect to be the subject of public scrutiny that might be viewed as burdensome if applied to other citizens, and must accept the restrictions imposed by the code.

3. Conduct that compromises or appears to compromise the independence, integrity, and impartiality of a judge undermines public confidence in the judiciary. Because it is not practicable to list all such conduct, the rule is necessarily cast in general terms.

4. Judges should participate in activities that promote ethical conduct among judges and lawyers, support professionalism within the judiciary and the legal profession, and promote access to justice for all.

5. Actual improprieties include violations of law, court rules, or provisions of this code. The test for appearance of impropriety is whether the conduct would create in reasonable minds a perception that the judge violated this code or engaged in other conduct that reflects adversely on the judge's honesty, impartiality, temperament, or fitness to serve as a judge. An appearance of impropriety does not exist merely because a judge has previously rendered a decision on a similar issue, has a general opinion about a legal matter that relates to the case before him or her, or may have personal views that are not in harmony with the views or objectives of either party. A judge's personal and family circumstances are generally not appropriate considerations on which to presume an appearance of impropriety.

6. A judge should initiate and participate in activities for the purpose of promoting public understanding of and confidence in the administration of justice. In conducting such activities, the judge must act in a manner consistent with this code.

RULE 1.3. Avoiding Abuse of the Prestige of Judicial Office

A judge shall not abuse the prestige of judicial office to advance the personal or economic interests of the judge or others, or allow others to do so.

Comment

1. It is improper for a judge to use or attempt to use his or her position to gain personal advantage or deferential treatment of any kind. For example, it would be improper for a judge to allude to his or her judicial status to gain favorable treatment in encounters with traffic officials. Similarly, a judge must not use judicial letterhead to gain an advantage in conducting his or her personal business.

2. A judge may provide a reference or recommendation for an individual based upon the judge's personal knowledge. The judge may use judicial letterhead if there is no likelihood that the use of the letterhead would reasonably be perceived as an attempt to exert pressure by reason of the judicial office.

3. Judges may participate in the process of judicial selection by cooperating with appointing authorities and screening committees, by recommending qualified candidates for judicial office, and by responding to inquiries from and volunteering information to such entities concerning the professional qualifications of a person being considered for judicial office.

4. A judge who writes or contributes to publications of for-profit entities should not permit anyone associated with the publication of such materials to exploit the judge's office in a manner that violates this rule or other applicable law. In contracts for publication of a judge's writing, the judge should retain sufficient control over the advertising to avoid such exploitation.

CANON 2**A JUDGE SHALL PERFORM THE DUTIES OF JUDICIAL OFFICE
IMPARTIALLY, COMPETENTLY, AND DILIGENTLY****RULE 2.1. Giving Precedence to Judicial Duties**

The judicial duties of a judge take precedence over all of a judge's other activities.

Comment

1. To ensure that judges are available to fulfill their judicial duties, judges must conduct their personal and extrajudicial activities to minimize the risk of conflicts that would result in frequent disqualification. See Canon 3.

2. Judicial duties are those prescribed by law. In addition, judges are encouraged to participate in activities that promote public understanding of and confidence in the justice system.

RULE 2.2. Impartiality and Fairness

A judge shall uphold and apply the law, and shall perform all duties of judicial office fairly and impartially.

Comment

1. To ensure impartiality and fairness to all parties, a judge must be objective and open-minded.

2. Although each judge comes to the bench with a unique background and personal philosophy, a judge must interpret and apply the law without regard to whether the judge approves or disapproves of the law in question.

3. A good faith error of fact or law does not violate this rule. However, a pattern of legal error or an intentional disregard of the law may constitute misconduct.

4. It is not a violation of this rule for a judge to make reasonable accommodations to ensure self-represented litigants the opportunity to have their matters fairly heard.

RULE 2.3. Bias, Prejudice, and Harassment

(A) A judge shall perform the duties of judicial office, including administrative duties, without bias or prejudice.

(B) A judge shall not, in the performance of judicial duties, by words or conduct manifest bias or prejudice, or engage in harassment, including but not limited to bias, prejudice, or harassment based upon race, sex, gender, religion, national origin, ethnicity, disability, age, sexual orientation, marital status, socioeconomic status, or political affiliation, and shall not permit court staff, court officials, or others subject to the judge's direction and control to do so.

(C) A judge shall require lawyers in proceedings before the court to refrain from manifesting bias or prejudice, or engaging in harassment, based upon attributes including but

not limited to race, sex, gender, religion, national origin, ethnicity, disability, age, sexual orientation, marital status, socioeconomic status, or political affiliation, against parties, witnesses, lawyers, or others.

(D) The restrictions of paragraphs (B) and (C) do not preclude judges or lawyers from making legitimate reference to the listed factors, or similar factors, when they are relevant to an issue in a proceeding.

Comment

1. A judge who manifests bias or prejudice in a proceeding impairs the fairness of the proceeding and brings the judiciary into disrepute.

2. Examples of manifestations of bias or prejudice include but are not limited to epithets; slurs; demeaning nicknames; negative stereotyping; attempted humor based upon stereotypes; threatening, intimidating, or hostile acts; suggestions of connections between race, ethnicity, or nationality and crime; and irrelevant references to personal characteristics. Facial expressions and body language may convey to parties and lawyers in the proceeding, jurors, the media, and others an appearance of bias or prejudice. A judge must avoid conduct that may reasonably be perceived as prejudiced or biased.

3. Harassment, as referred to in paragraphs (B) and (C), is verbal or physical conduct that denigrates or shows hostility or aversion toward a person on bases such as race, sex, gender, religion, national origin, ethnicity, disability, age, sexual orientation, marital status, socioeconomic status, or political affiliation.

4. Sexual harassment includes but is not limited to sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature that is unwelcome. See Arizona Supreme Court Administrative Order 92-33 (Oct. 19, 1992), for the judiciary's sexual harassment policy.

RULE 2.4. External Influences on Judicial Conduct

(A) A judge shall not be swayed by partisan interests, public clamor, or fear of criticism.

(B) A judge shall not permit family, social, political, financial, or other interests or relationships to influence the judge's judicial conduct or judgment.

(C) A judge shall not convey or permit others to convey the impression that any person or organization is in a position to influence the judge.

Comment

An independent judiciary requires that judges decide cases according to the law and facts, without regard to whether particular laws or litigants are popular or unpopular with the public, the media, government officials, or the judge's friends or family. Confidence in the judiciary is eroded if judicial decision making is perceived to be subject to inappropriate outside influences.

RULE 2.5. Competence, Diligence, and Cooperation

(A) A judge shall perform judicial and administrative duties competently, diligently, and promptly.

(B) A judge shall reasonably cooperate with other judges and court officials in the administration of court business.

(C) A judge shall participate actively in judicial education programs and shall complete mandatory judicial education requirements.

Comment

1. Competence in the performance of judicial duties requires the legal knowledge, skill, thoroughness, and preparation reasonably necessary to perform a judge's responsibilities of judicial office.

2. A judge should seek the necessary docket time, court staff, expertise, and resources to discharge all adjudicative and administrative responsibilities.

3. Prompt disposition of the court's business requires a judge to devote adequate time to judicial duties, to be punctual in attending court and expeditious in determining matters under submission, and to take reasonable measures to ensure that court officials, litigants, and their lawyers cooperate with the judge to that end.

4. In disposing of matters promptly and efficiently, a judge must demonstrate due regard for the rights of parties to be heard and to have issues resolved without unnecessary cost or delay. A judge should monitor and supervise cases in ways that reduce or eliminate dilatory practices, avoidable delays, and unnecessary costs.

5. Article 2, § 11 of the Arizona Constitution requires that "Justice in all cases shall be administered openly, and without unnecessary delay." Article 6, Section 21 provides that "Every matter submitted to a judge of the superior court for his decision shall be decided within sixty days from the submission thereof. The supreme court shall by rule provide for the speedy disposition of all matters not decided within such period." See Rule 91(e), Rules of the Supreme Court; A.R.S. § 12-128.01. In addition, A.R.S. § 11-424.02(A) prohibits a justice of the peace from receiving compensation if a cause "remains pending and undetermined for sixty days after it has been submitted for decision." These and other time requirements are discussed in depth in Arizona Judicial Ethics Advisory Committee, Advisory Opinion 06-02 (April 25, 2006).

RULE 2.6. Ensuring the Right to Be Heard

(A) A judge shall accord to every person who has a legal interest in a proceeding, or that person's lawyer, the right to be heard according to law.

(B) A judge may encourage parties to a proceeding and their lawyers to settle matters in dispute, but shall not coerce any party into settlement.

Comment

1. The right to be heard is an essential component of a fair and impartial system of justice. Substantive rights of litigants can be protected only if procedures protecting the right to be heard are observed.

2. The judge plays an important role in overseeing the settlement of disputes, but should be careful that efforts to further settlement do not undermine any party's right to be heard according to law. The judge should keep in mind the effect that the judge's participation in settlement discussions may have, not only on the judge's own views of the case, but also on the perceptions of the lawyers and the parties if the case remains with the judge after settlement efforts are unsuccessful. Among the factors that a judge should consider when deciding upon an appropriate settlement practice for a case are (1) whether the parties have requested or voluntarily consented to a certain level of participation by the judge in settlement discussions, (2) whether the parties and their counsel are relatively sophisticated in legal matters, (3) whether the case will be tried by the judge or a jury, or is on appellate review, (4) whether the parties participate with their counsel in settlement discussions, (5) whether any parties are unrepresented by counsel, (6) whether the matter is civil or criminal, and (7) whether the judge involved in the settlement discussions will also be involved in the decision on the merits.

3. Judges must be mindful of the effect settlement discussions can have, not only on their objectivity and impartiality, but also on the appearance of their objectivity and impartiality. Despite a judge's best efforts, there may be instances when information obtained during settlement discussions could influence a judge's decision-making during trial or on appeal and, in such instances, the judge should consider whether disqualification may be appropriate. See Rule 2.11(A)(1).

RULE 2.7. Responsibility to Decide

A judge shall hear and decide matters assigned to the judge, except when disqualification is required by Rule 2.11 or other law.

Comment

1. Although there are times when disqualification is necessary to protect the rights of litigants and preserve public confidence in the independence, integrity, and impartiality of the judiciary, judges must be available to decide matters that come before the courts. Unwarranted disqualification may bring public disfavor to the court and to the judge personally. The dignity of the court, the judge's respect for fulfillment of judicial duties, and a proper concern for the burdens that may be imposed upon the judge's colleagues require that a judge not use disqualification to avoid cases that present difficult, controversial, or unpopular issues.

2. A judge is not ethically obligated to automatically recuse himself or herself from a case in which one of the litigants has filed a complaint against the judge with the Commission on Judicial Conduct. See Advisory Opinion 98-02.

RULE 2.8. Decorum, Demeanor, and Communication with Jurors

(A) A judge shall require order and decorum in proceedings before the court.

(B) A judge shall be patient, dignified, and courteous to litigants, jurors, witnesses, lawyers, court staff, court officials, and others with whom the judge deals in an official capacity, and shall require similar conduct of lawyers, court staff, court officials, and others subject to the judge's direction and control.

(C) A judge shall not commend or criticize jurors for their verdict other than in a court order or opinion in a proceeding, but may express appreciation to jurors for their service to the judicial system and the community.

Comment

1. The duty to hear all proceedings with patience and courtesy is not inconsistent with the duty imposed in Rule 2.5 to dispose promptly of the business of the court. Judges can be efficient and businesslike while being patient and deliberate.

2. Commending or criticizing jurors for their verdict may imply a judicial expectation in future cases and may impair a juror's ability to be fair and impartial in a subsequent case. There are several exceptions to this general rule, however, and with certain qualifications judges may speak to a discharged jury following the return of a verdict. See Arizona Judicial Ethics Advisory Committee Opinion 01-01 (reissued January 22, 2003). This rule does not preclude a judge from communicating with jurors personally, in writing, or through court personnel to obtain information for the purpose of improving the administration of justice.

RULE 2.9. Ex Parte Communication

(A) A judge shall not initiate, permit, or consider ex parte communications, or consider other communications made to the judge outside the presence of the parties or their lawyers, concerning a pending or impending matter, except as follows:

- (1) When circumstances require it, ex parte communication for scheduling, administrative, or emergency purposes, which does not address substantive matters, is permitted, provided:
 - (a) the judge reasonably believes that no party will gain a procedural, substantive, or tactical advantage as a result of the ex parte communication; and
 - (b) the judge makes provision to promptly notify all other parties of the substance of the ex parte communication, and gives the parties an opportunity to respond.
- (2) A judge may obtain the advice of a disinterested expert on the law applicable to a proceeding.
- (3) A judge may consult with other judges, or with court personnel whose functions are to aid the judge in carrying out the judge's adjudicative responsibilities. If in doing so the judge acquires factual information that is not part of the record, the judge shall make provision promptly to notify the parties of the substance of the information and provide the parties with an opportunity to respond. The judge may not abrogate the responsibility personally to decide the matter.
- (4) A judge may, with the consent of the parties, confer separately with the parties and their lawyers in an effort to settle matters pending before the judge.
- (5) A judge may initiate, permit, or consider any ex parte communication when expressly authorized by law to do so.

(6) A judge may engage in ex parte communications when serving on problem-solving courts, if such communications are authorized by protocols known and consented to by the parties or by local rules.

(B) If a judge inadvertently receives an unauthorized ex parte communication bearing upon the substance of a matter, the judge shall make provision to promptly notify the parties of the substance of the communication and provide the parties with an opportunity to respond.

(C) Except as otherwise provided by law, a judge shall not investigate facts in a matter independently, and shall consider only the evidence presented and any facts that may properly be judicially noticed.

(D) A judge shall make reasonable efforts, including providing appropriate supervision, to ensure that this rule is not violated by court staff, court officials, and others subject to the judge's direction and control.

Comment

1. To the extent reasonably possible, all parties or their lawyers shall be included in communications with a judge. A judge may also direct judicial staff, without invoking the notice and disclosure provisions of this rule, to screen written ex parte communications and to take appropriate action consistent with this rule.

2. Whenever the presence of a party or notice to a party is required by this rule, it is the party's lawyer, or if the party is unrepresented, the party, who is to be present or to whom notice is to be given.

3. The proscription against communications concerning a proceeding includes communications with persons who are not participants in the proceeding, except to the limited extent permitted by this rule.

4. When serving on problem-solving courts, such as mental health courts or drug courts, judges may assume a more interactive role with parties, treatment providers, probation officers, social workers, and others. See Application, Part A, Comment 3.

5. A judge may consult with other judges on pending matters, but must avoid ex parte discussions of a case with judges who have previously been disqualified from hearing the matter, and with judges who have appellate jurisdiction over the matter.

6. The prohibition against a judge independently investigating the facts in a matter extends to information available in all mediums, including electronic.

7. A judge may consult ethics advisory committees, outside counsel, or legal experts concerning the judge's compliance with this code.

8. An appropriate and often desirable procedure for a court to obtain the advice of a disinterested expert on legal issues is to invite the expert to file a brief *amicus curiae*.

9. A judge may request a party to submit proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law, so long as the other parties are apprised of the request and are given an opportunity to respond to the proposed findings and conclusions.

10. If communication between the trial judge and the appellate court with respect to a proceeding is permitted, a copy of any written communication or the substance of any oral communication should be provided to all parties.

RULE 2.10. Judicial Statements on Pending and Impending Cases

(A) A judge shall not make any public statement that might reasonably be expected to affect the outcome or impair the fairness of a matter pending or impending in any court, or make any nonpublic statement that might substantially interfere with a fair trial or hearing.

(B) A judge shall not, in connection with cases, controversies, or issues that are likely to come before the court, make pledges, promises, or commitments that are inconsistent with the impartial performance of the adjudicative duties of judicial office.

(C) A judge shall require court staff, court officials, and others subject to the judge's direction and control to refrain from making statements that the judge would be prohibited from making by paragraphs (A) and (B).

(D) Notwithstanding the restrictions in paragraph (A), a judge may make public statements in the course of official duties, may explain court procedures, and may comment on any proceeding in which the judge is a litigant in a personal capacity.

(E) Subject to the requirements of paragraph (A), a judge may respond directly or through a third party to allegations in the media or elsewhere concerning the judge's conduct in a matter.

Comment

1. This rule's restrictions on judicial speech are essential to the maintenance of the independence, integrity, and impartiality of the judiciary.

2. This rule does not prohibit a judge from commenting on proceedings in which the judge is a litigant in a personal capacity. In cases in which the judge is a litigant in an administrative capacity, the judge may comment publicly on the merits of the case. In cases in which the judge is a litigant in a nominal capacity, such as a special action, the judge must not comment publicly except as otherwise specifically permitted by this rule.

3. Depending upon the circumstances, the judge should consider whether it may be preferable for a third party, rather than the judge, to respond or issue statements in connection with allegations concerning the judge's conduct in a matter.

RULE 2.11. Disqualification

(A) A judge shall disqualify himself or herself in any proceeding in which the judge's impartiality might reasonably be questioned, including but not limited to the following circumstances:

- (1) The judge has a personal bias or prejudice concerning a party or a party's lawyer, or personal knowledge of facts that are in dispute in the proceeding.
- (2) The judge knows that the judge, the judge's spouse or domestic partner, or a person within the third degree of relationship to either of them, or the spouse or domestic partner of such a person is:

- (a) a party to the proceeding, or an officer, director, general partner, managing member, or trustee of a party;
 - (b) acting as a lawyer in the proceeding;
 - (c) a person who has more than a de minimis interest that could be substantially affected by the proceeding; or
 - (d) likely to be a material witness in the proceeding.
- (3) The judge knows that he or she, individually or as a fiduciary, or the judge's spouse, domestic partner, parent, or child, or any other member of the judge's family residing in the judge's household, has an economic interest, as defined by this code or Arizona law, in the subject matter in controversy or in a party to the proceeding.
- (4) The judge knows or learns by means of a timely motion that a party, a party's lawyer, or the law firm of a party's lawyer has within the previous four years made aggregate contributions to the judge's campaign in an amount that is greater than the amounts permitted pursuant to A.R.S. § 16-905.
- (5) The judge, while a judge or a judicial candidate, has made a public statement, other than in a court proceeding, judicial decision, or opinion, that commits or appears to commit the judge to reach a particular result or rule in a particular way in the proceeding or controversy.
- (6) The judge:
- (a) served as a lawyer in the matter in controversy, or was associated with a lawyer in the preceding four years who participated substantially as a lawyer in the matter during such association;
 - (b) served in governmental employment, and in such capacity participated personally and substantially as a lawyer or public official concerning the proceeding, or has publicly expressed in such capacity an opinion concerning the merits of the particular matter in controversy;
 - (c) was a material witness concerning the matter; or
 - (d) previously presided as a judge over the matter in another court.

(B) A judge shall keep reasonably informed about the judge's personal and fiduciary economic interests, and make a reasonable effort to keep informed about the personal economic interests of the judge's spouse or domestic partner and minor children residing in the judge's household.

(C) A judge subject to disqualification under this rule, other than for bias or prejudice under paragraph (A)(1), may disclose on the record the basis of the judge's disqualification and may ask the parties and their lawyers to consider, outside the presence of the judge and court personnel, whether to waive disqualification. If, following the disclosure, the parties and lawyers agree, without participation by the judge or court personnel, that the judge should not

be disqualified, the judge may participate in the proceeding. The agreement shall be incorporated into the record of the proceeding.

(D) Official communications received in the course of performing judicial functions as well as information gained through training programs and from experience do not in themselves create a basis for disqualification.

Comment

1. Under this rule, a judge is disqualified whenever the judge's impartiality might reasonably be questioned, regardless of whether any of the specific provisions of paragraphs (A)(1) through (5) apply.

2. A judge's obligation not to hear or decide matters in which disqualification is required applies regardless of whether a motion to disqualify is filed.

3. The rule of necessity may override the rule of disqualification. For example, a judge might be required to participate in judicial review of a judicial salary statute or might be the only judge available in a matter requiring immediate judicial action, such as a hearing on probable cause or a temporary restraining order. In matters that require immediate action, the judge must disclose on the record the basis for possible disqualification and make reasonable efforts to transfer the matter to another judge as soon as practicable.

4. The fact that a lawyer in a proceeding is affiliated with a law firm with which a member of the judge's family is affiliated does not itself disqualify the judge. If, however, the judge's impartiality might reasonably be questioned under paragraph (A), or a member of the judge's family is known by the judge to have an interest in the law firm that could be substantially affected by the proceeding under paragraph (A)(2)(c), the judge's disqualification is required.

5. A judge should disclose on the record information that the judge believes the parties or their lawyers might reasonably consider relevant to a possible motion for disqualification, even if the judge believes there is no basis for disqualification.

6. "Economic interest," as set forth in the Terminology section, means ownership of more than a de minimis legal or equitable interest and is further defined, for purposes of compliance with state law, in A.R.S. § 38-502(11). Except for situations in which a judge participates in the management of such a legal or equitable interest, or the interest could be substantially affected by the outcome of a proceeding before a judge, it does not include:

- (a) an interest in the individual holdings within a mutual or common investment fund;
- (b) an interest in securities held by an educational, religious, charitable, fraternal, or civic organization in which the judge or the judge's spouse, domestic partner, parent, or child serves as a director, officer, advisor, or other participant;
- (c) a deposit in a financial institution or deposits or proprietary interests the judge may maintain as a member of a mutual savings association or credit union, or similar proprietary interests; or
- (d) an interest in the issuer of government securities held by the judge.

7. A lawyer in a government agency does not ordinarily have an association with other lawyers employed by that agency within the meaning of Rule 2.11(A)(6)(a); a judge formerly employed by a government agency, however, should disqualify himself or herself in a proceeding if the judge's impartiality might reasonably be questioned because of such association.

Rule 2.12. Supervisory Duties

(A) A judge shall require court staff, court officials, and others subject to the judge's direction and control to act in a manner consistent with the judge's obligations under this code.

(B) A judge with supervisory authority for the performance of other judges shall take reasonable measures to ensure that those judges properly discharge their judicial responsibilities, including the prompt disposition of matters before them.

(C) A judge shall require staff, court officials, and others subject to the judge's direction and control to comply with the provisions of the Code of Conduct for Judicial Employees adopted by the supreme court.

Comment

1. A judge is responsible for his or her own conduct and for the conduct of others, such as staff, when those persons are acting at the judge's direction or control. A judge may not direct court personnel to engage in conduct on the judge's behalf or as the judge's representative when such conduct would violate the code if undertaken by the judge.

2. Public confidence in the judicial system depends upon timely justice. To promote the efficient administration of justice, a judge with supervisory authority must take the steps needed to ensure that judges under his or her supervision administer their workloads promptly.

Rule 2.13. Administrative Appointments

(A) In making administrative appointments, a judge:

- (1) shall exercise the power of appointment impartially and on the basis of merit; and
- (2) shall avoid nepotism, favoritism, and unnecessary appointments.

(B) A judge shall not approve compensation of appointees beyond the fair value of services rendered.

Comment

1. Appointees of a judge include assigned counsel, officials such as referees, commissioners, special masters, receivers, and guardians, and personnel such as clerks, secretaries, and bailiffs. Consent by the parties to an appointment or an award of compensation does not relieve the judge of the obligation prescribed by paragraph (A).

2. Unless otherwise defined by law, nepotism is the appointment or hiring of any relative within the third degree of relationship of either the judge or the judge's spouse or domestic partner, or the spouse or domestic partner of such relative. Arizona's anti-nepotism statute, which applies to judicial officers, is found in A.R.S. § 38-481.

RULE 2.14. Disability and Impairment

A judge having a reasonable belief that the performance of a lawyer or another judge is impaired by drugs or alcohol, or by a mental, emotional, or physical condition, shall take appropriate action, which may include a confidential referral to a lawyer or judicial assistance program.

Comment

1. "Appropriate action" means action intended and reasonably likely to help the judge or lawyer in question address the problem and prevent harm to the justice system. Depending upon the circumstances, appropriate action may include but is not limited to speaking directly to the impaired person, notifying an individual with supervisory responsibility over the impaired person, or making a referral to an assistance program.

2. Taking or initiating corrective action by way of referral to an assistance program may satisfy a judge's responsibility under this rule. Assistance programs have many approaches for offering help to impaired judges and lawyers, such as intervention, counseling, or referral to appropriate health care professionals. Depending upon the gravity of the conduct that has come to the judge's attention, however, the judge may be required to take other action, such as reporting the impaired judge or lawyer to the appropriate authority, agency, or body. See Rule 2.15.

RULE 2.15. Responding to Judicial and Lawyer Misconduct

(A) A judge having knowledge that another judge has committed a violation of this code that raises a substantial question regarding the judge's honesty, trustworthiness, or fitness as a judge in other respects shall inform the appropriate authority.

(B) A judge having knowledge that a lawyer has committed a violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct that raises a substantial question regarding the lawyer's honesty, trustworthiness, or fitness as a lawyer in other respects shall inform the appropriate authority.

(C) A judge who receives information indicating a substantial likelihood that another judge has committed a violation of this code shall take appropriate action.

(D) A judge who receives information indicating a substantial likelihood that a lawyer has committed a violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct shall take appropriate action.

(E) Acts of a judge in the discharge of disciplinary responsibilities required or permitted by Rule 2.15 are part of a judge's judicial duties and shall be absolutely privileged, and no civil action predicated thereon may be instituted against the judge.

Comment

1. Taking action to address known misconduct is a judge's obligation. Paragraphs (A) and (B) impose an obligation on the judge to report to the appropriate disciplinary authority the known misconduct of another judge or a lawyer that raises a substantial question regarding the honesty, trustworthiness, or fitness of that judge or lawyer. Ignoring or denying known misconduct among one's judicial colleagues or members of the legal profession undermines a judge's responsibility to participate in efforts to ensure public respect for the justice system. This

rule limits the reporting obligation to those offenses that an independent judiciary must vigorously endeavor to prevent.

2. A judge who does not have actual knowledge that another judge or a lawyer may have committed misconduct, but receives information indicating a substantial likelihood of such misconduct, is required to take appropriate action under paragraphs (C) and (D). Appropriate action may include, but is not limited to, communicating directly with the judge who may have violated this code, communicating with a supervising judge, or reporting the suspected violation to the appropriate authority or other agency or body. Similarly, actions to be taken in response to information indicating that a lawyer has committed a violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct may include but are not limited to communicating directly with the lawyer who may have committed the violation, or reporting the suspected violation to the appropriate authority or other agency or body.

RULE 2.16. Cooperation with Disciplinary Authorities

(A) A judge shall cooperate and be candid and honest with judicial and lawyer disciplinary agencies.

(B) A judge shall not retaliate, directly or indirectly, against a person known or suspected to have assisted or cooperated with an investigation of a judge or a lawyer.

Comment

1. Cooperation with investigations and proceedings of judicial and lawyer discipline agencies, as required in paragraph (A), instills confidence in judges' commitment to the integrity of the judicial system and the protection of the public.

2. Judicial employees have a right to cooperate or communicate with the Commission on Judicial Conduct at any time, without fear of reprisal, for the purpose of discussing potential or actual judicial misconduct.

CANON 3

A JUDGE SHALL CONDUCT THE JUDGE'S EXTRAJUDICIAL ACTIVITIES TO MINIMIZE THE RISK OF CONFLICT WITH THE OBLIGATIONS OF JUDICIAL OFFICE

RULE 3.1. Extrajudicial Activities in General

A judge may engage in extrajudicial activities, except as prohibited by law or this code. However, when engaging in extrajudicial activities, a judge shall not:

(A) participate in activities that will interfere with the proper performance of the judge's judicial duties;

(B) participate in activities that will lead to frequent disqualification of the judge;

(C) participate in activities that would appear to a reasonable person to undermine the judge's independence, integrity, or impartiality or demean the judicial office;

(D) engage in conduct that would appear to a reasonable person to be coercive; or

(E) make use of court premises, staff, stationery, equipment, or other resources, except for activities that concern the law, the legal system, or the administration of justice, or unless such additional use is permitted by law.

Comment

1. To the extent that time permits, and judicial independence and impartiality are not compromised, judges are encouraged to engage in appropriate extrajudicial activities. Judges are uniquely qualified to engage in extrajudicial activities that concern the law, the legal system, and the administration of justice, such as by speaking, writing, teaching, or participating in scholarly research projects. In addition, judges are permitted and encouraged to engage in educational, religious, charitable, fraternal, or civic extrajudicial activities not conducted for profit, even when the activities do not involve the law. See Rule 3.7.

2. Participation in both law-related and other extrajudicial activities helps integrate judges into their communities and furthers public understanding of and respect for courts and the judicial system.

3. Discriminatory actions and expressions of bias or prejudice by a judge, even outside the judge's official or judicial actions, are likely to appear to a reasonable person to call into question the judge's integrity and impartiality. Examples include jokes or other remarks that demean individuals based upon their race, sex, gender, religion, national origin, ethnicity, disability, age, sexual orientation, marital status, political affiliation, or socioeconomic status. For the same reason, a judge's extrajudicial activities must not be conducted in connection or affiliation with an organization that practices invidious discrimination. See Rule 3.6.

4. While engaged in permitted extrajudicial activities, judges must not coerce others or take action that would reasonably be perceived as coercive. For example, depending upon the circumstances, a judge's solicitation of contributions or memberships for an organization, even as permitted by Rule 3.7(A), might create the risk that the person solicited would feel obligated to respond favorably or would do so to curry favor with the judge.

5. The telecommunications policy of the Arizona judiciary, which defines the permissible uses of electronic equipment, is set forth in Part 1, Chapter 5, § 1-503 of the Arizona Code of Judicial Administration.

RULE 3.2. Appearances Before Governmental Bodies and Consultation with Government Officials.

A judge shall not appear voluntarily at a public hearing before, or otherwise consult with, an executive or a legislative body or official, except:

(A) in connection with matters concerning the law, the legal system, or the administration of justice;

(B) in connection with matters about which the judge acquired knowledge or expertise in the course of the judge's judicial duties; or

(C) when the judge is acting in a matter involving the judge's interests or when the judge is acting in a fiduciary capacity.

Comment

1. Judges possess special expertise in matters of law, the legal system, and the administration of justice, and may properly share that expertise with governmental bodies and executive or legislative branch officials.

2. In appearing before governmental bodies or consulting with government officials, judges must be mindful that they remain subject to other provisions of this code, such as Rule 1.3, prohibiting judges from using the prestige of office to advance their own or others' interests, Rule 2.10, governing public comment on pending and impending matters, and Rule 3.1(C), prohibiting judges from engaging in extrajudicial activities that would appear to a reasonable person to undermine the judge's independence, integrity, or impartiality.

3. In general, it would be an unnecessary and unfair burden to prohibit judges from appearing before governmental bodies or consulting with government officials on matters that are likely to affect them as private citizens, such as zoning proposals affecting their real property. In engaging in such activities, however, judges must not refer to their judicial positions and must otherwise exercise caution to avoid using the prestige of judicial office.

RULE 3.3. Acting as a Character Witness

A judge shall not testify as a character witness in a judicial, administrative, or other adjudicatory proceeding or otherwise vouch for the character of a person in a legal proceeding, except when duly summoned.

Comment

A judge who, without being subpoenaed, testifies as a character witness abuses the prestige of judicial office to advance the interests of another. See Rule 1.3. Except in unusual circumstances where the demands of justice require, a judge should discourage a party from requiring the judge to testify as a character witness.

RULE 3.4. Appointments to Governmental Positions

A judge shall not accept appointment to a governmental committee, board, commission, or other governmental position, unless it is one that concerns the law, the legal system, or the administration of justice.

Comment

1. Rule 3.4 implicitly acknowledges the value of judges accepting appointments to entities that concern the law, the legal system, or the administration of justice. Even in such instances, however, a judge should assess the appropriateness of accepting an appointment, paying particular attention to the subject matter of the appointment and the availability and allocation of judicial resources, including the judge's time commitments, and giving due regard to the requirements of the independence and impartiality of the judiciary.

2. A judge may represent his or her country, state, or locality on ceremonial occasions or in connection with historical, educational, or cultural activities. Such representation does not constitute acceptance of a government position.

RULE 3.5. Use of Nonpublic Information

A judge shall not intentionally disclose or use nonpublic information acquired in a judicial capacity for any purpose unrelated to the judge's judicial duties.

Comment

1. In the course of performing judicial duties a judge may acquire information of commercial or other value that is unavailable to the public. The judge must not reveal or use such information for personal gain or for any purpose unrelated to his or her judicial duties.

2. This rule is not intended to affect a judge's ability to act on information as necessary to protect the health or safety of any individual if consistent with other provisions of this code.

Rule 3.6. Affiliation with Discriminatory Organizations

(A) A judge shall not hold membership in any organization that practices invidious discrimination on the basis of race, sex, gender, religion, national origin, ethnicity, or sexual orientation.

(B) A judge shall not use the benefits or facilities of an organization if the judge knows or should know that the organization practices invidious discrimination on one or more of the bases identified in paragraph (A). A judge's attendance at an event in a facility of an organization that the judge is not permitted to join is not a violation of this Rule when the judge's attendance is an isolated event that could not reasonably be perceived as an endorsement of the organization's practices.

(C) A judge's membership or participation in a religious organization as a lawful exercise of the freedom of religion, or a judge's membership or participation in an organization that engages in expressive activity from which the judge cannot be excluded consistent with the judge's lawful exercise of his or her freedom of expression or association, is not a violation of this rule.

Comment

1. A judge's public manifestation of approval of invidious discrimination on any basis gives rise to the appearance of impropriety and diminishes public confidence in the integrity and impartiality of the judiciary. A judge's membership in an organization that practices invidious discrimination creates the perception that the judge's impartiality is impaired.

2. An organization is generally said to discriminate invidiously if it arbitrarily excludes from membership on the basis of race, sex, gender, religion, national origin, ethnicity, or sexual orientation persons who would otherwise be eligible for admission. Whether an organization practices invidious discrimination is a complex question to which judges should be attentive. The answer cannot be determined from a mere examination of an organization's current membership rolls, but rather, depends upon how the organization selects members, as well as other relevant factors, such as whether the organization stigmatizes excluded persons as inferior and odious, whether it perpetuates and celebrates cultures, historical events, and ethnic or religious beliefs, identities, or traditions, or whether it is an intimate, purely private organization whose membership limitations could not constitutionally be prohibited.

3. When a judge learns that an organization to which the judge belongs engages in invidious discrimination, the judge must resign immediately from the organization.

4. This rule does not prohibit a judge's national or state military service.

RULE 3.7. Participation in Educational, Religious, Charitable, Fraternal, or Civic Organizations and Activities

(A) A judge may not directly solicit funds for an organization. However, subject to the requirements of Rule 3.1, a judge may participate in activities sponsored by organizations or governmental entities concerned with the law, the legal system, or the administration of justice, and those sponsored by or on behalf of educational, religious, charitable, fraternal, or civic organizations not conducted for profit, including but not limited to the following activities:

- (1) assisting such an organization or entity in planning related to fund-raising, volunteering services or goods at fund-raising events, and participating in the management and investment of the organization's or entity's funds;
- (2) soliciting contributions for such an organization or entity, but only from members of the judge's family or from judges over whom the judge does not exercise supervisory or appellate authority;
- (3) soliciting membership for such an organization or entity, even though the membership dues or fees generated may be used to support the objectives of the organization or entity, but only if the organization or entity is concerned with the law, the legal system, or the administration of justice;
- (4) appearing or speaking at, receiving an award or other recognition at, being featured on the program of, and permitting his or her title to be used in connection with an event of such an organization or entity, but if the event serves a fund-raising purpose, the judge may do so only if the event concerns the law, the legal system, or the administration of justice.

- (5) making or soliciting recommendations to such a public or private fund-granting organization or entity in connection with its fund-granting programs and activities, but only if the organization or entity is concerned with the law, the legal system, or the administration of justice; and
 - (6) serving as an officer, director, trustee, or nonlegal advisor of such an organization or entity, unless it is likely that the organization or entity:
 - (a) will be engaged in proceedings that would ordinarily come before the judge; or
 - (b) will frequently be engaged in adversary proceedings in the court of which the judge is a member, or in any court subject to the appellate jurisdiction of the court of which the judge is a member.
- (B) A judge may encourage lawyers to provide pro bono legal services.
- (C) Subject to the preceding requirements, a judge may:
- (1) Provide leadership in identifying and addressing issues involving equal access to the justice system; develop public education programs; engage in activities to promote the fair administration of justice; and convene or participate or assist in advisory committees and community collaborations devoted to the improvement of the law, the legal system, the provision of services, or the administration of justice.
 - (2) Endorse projects and programs directly related to the law, the legal system, the administration of justice, and the provision of services to those coming before the courts, and may actively support the need for funding of such projects and programs.
 - (3) Participate in programs concerning the law or which promote the administration of justice.

Comment

1. The activities permitted by paragraph (A) generally include those sponsored by or undertaken on behalf of public or private not-for-profit educational institutions, and other not-for-profit organizations, including law-related, charitable, and other organizations. An organization concerned with the law, the legal system, and the administration of justice may include an accredited institution of legal education, whether for-profit or not-for-profit.

2. Even for law-related organizations, a judge should consider whether the membership and purposes of the organization, or the nature of the judge's participation in or association with the organization, would conflict with the judge's obligation to refrain from activities that reflect adversely upon a judge's independence, integrity, and impartiality.

3. Mere attendance at an event, whether or not the event serves a fund-raising purpose, does not constitute participation in violation of paragraph (A)(4). It is also generally permissible for a judge to serve as an usher or a food server or preparer, or to perform similar functions, at fund-raising events sponsored by educational, religious, charitable, fraternal, or civic organizations. Such activities are not solicitation and do not present an element of coercion or abuse the prestige of judicial office.

4. Identification of a judge's position in educational, religious, charitable, fraternal, or civic organizations on letterhead used for fund-raising or membership solicitation does not violate this Rule. The letterhead may list the judge's title or judicial office if comparable designations are used for other persons.

5. In addition to appointing lawyers to serve as counsel for indigent parties in individual cases, a judge may promote broader access to justice by encouraging lawyers to participate in pro bono legal services, if in doing so the judge does not employ coercion or abuse the prestige of judicial office. Such encouragement may take many forms, including providing lists of available programs, training lawyers to do pro bono legal work, and participating in events recognizing lawyers who have done pro bono work.

6. A judge may be an announced speaker at a fund-raising event benefitting indigent representation, scholarships for law students, or accredited institutions of legal education.

RULE 3.8. Appointments to Fiduciary Positions

(A) A judge shall not accept appointment to serve in a fiduciary position, such as executor, administrator, trustee, guardian, attorney in fact, or other personal representative, except for the estate, trust, or person of a member of the judge's family, and then only if such service will not interfere with the proper performance of judicial duties.

(B) A judge shall not serve in a fiduciary position if the judge as fiduciary will likely be engaged in proceedings that would ordinarily come before the judge, or if the estate, trust, or ward becomes involved in adversary proceedings in the court on which the judge serves, or one under its appellate jurisdiction.

(C) A judge acting in a fiduciary capacity shall be subject to the same restrictions on engaging in financial activities that apply to a judge personally.

(D) If a person who is serving in a fiduciary position becomes a judge, he or she must comply with this rule as soon as reasonably practicable, but in no event later than one year after becoming a judge.

Comment

A judge should recognize that other restrictions imposed by this code may conflict with a judge's obligations as a fiduciary; in such circumstances, a judge should resign as fiduciary. For example, serving as a fiduciary might require frequent disqualification of a judge under Rule 2.11 because a judge is deemed to have an economic interest in shares of stock held by a trust if the amount of stock held is more than de minimis.

RULE 3.9. Service as Arbitrator or Mediator

A judge shall not act as an arbitrator or a mediator or perform other judicial functions apart from the judge's official duties unless expressly authorized by law.

Comment

1. This rule does not prohibit a judge from participating in arbitration, mediation, or settlement conferences performed as part of assigned judicial duties. Rendering dispute

resolution services apart from those duties, whether or not for economic gain, is prohibited unless it is expressly authorized by law.

2. Retired, part-time, or pro tempore judges may be exempt from this section. See Application, Parts B, C(2) and D(2).

RULE 3.10. Practice of Law

A judge shall not practice law. A judge may represent himself or herself and may, without compensation, give legal advice to and draft or review documents for a member of the judge's family, but is prohibited from serving as the family member's lawyer in any forum.

Comment

1. A judge may act as his or her own attorney in all legal matters, including matters involving litigation and matters involving appearances before or other dealings with governmental bodies. A judge must not use the prestige of office to advance the judge's personal or family interests. See Rule 1.3.

2. Retired, part-time, or pro tempore judges may be exempt from this section. See Application, Parts B, C(1)(b) and D(1)(b).

3. Judges who are actively practicing law at the time of their election or appointment to the bench are encouraged to become familiar with ethical considerations immediately affecting the transition from lawyer to judge. Arizona Judicial Ethics Advisory Committee Opinion 00-07 (December 20, 2000).

4. This rule does not prohibit the practice of law pursuant to military service.

RULE 3.11. Financial, Business, or Remunerative Activities

(A) A judge may hold and manage investments of the judge and members of the judge's family.

(B) A judge shall not serve as an officer, director, manager, general partner, advisor, or employee of any business entity except that a judge may manage or participate in:

- (1) a business closely held by the judge or members of the judge's family; or
- (2) a business entity primarily engaged in investment of the financial resources of the judge or members of the judge's family.

(C) A judge shall not engage in financial activities permitted under paragraphs (A) and (B) if they will:

- (1) interfere with the proper performance of judicial duties;
- (2) lead to frequent disqualification of the judge;
- (3) involve the judge in frequent transactions or continuing business relationships with lawyers or other persons likely to come before the court on which the judge serves; or
- (4) result in violation of other provisions of this code.

Comment

1. Judges are generally permitted to engage in financial activities, including managing real estate and other investments for themselves or for members of their families. Participation in these activities, like participation in other extrajudicial activities, is subject to the requirements of this code. For example, it would be improper for a judge to spend so much time on business activities that it interferes with the performance of judicial duties. See Rule 2.1. Similarly, it would be improper for a judge to use his or her official title or appear in judicial robes in business advertising, or to conduct his or her business or financial affairs in such a way that disqualification is frequently required. See Rules 1.3 and 2.11.

2. As soon as practicable without serious financial detriment, the judge must divest himself or herself of investments and other financial interests that might require frequent disqualification or otherwise violate this rule.

3. A judge's uncompensated participation as an officer, director, or advisor of an organization concerned with the law, the legal system, or the administration of justice is not prohibited by this rule. See Rule 3.7, Comment 1.

4. To the extent permitted by Rule 1.3, a judge's participation as a teacher at an educational institution is not prohibited by this rule. See Rule 3.12, Comment 1.

RULE 3.12. Compensation for Extrajudicial Activities

A judge may accept reasonable compensation for extrajudicial activities permitted by this code or other law unless such acceptance would appear to a reasonable person to undermine the judge's independence, integrity, or impartiality.

Comment

1. A judge is permitted to accept honoraria, stipends, fees, wages, salaries, royalties, or other compensation for speaking, teaching, writing, and other extrajudicial activities, provided the compensation is reasonable and commensurate with the task performed. The judge should be mindful, however, that judicial duties must take precedence over other activities. See Rule 2.1.

2. Compensation derived from extrajudicial activities may be subject to public reporting. See Rule 3.15.

RULE 3.13. Acceptance and Reporting of Gifts, Loans, Bequests, Benefits, or Other Things of Value

(A) A judge shall not accept any gifts, loans, bequests, benefits, or other things of value, if acceptance is prohibited by law or would appear to a reasonable person to undermine the judge's independence, integrity, or impartiality.

(B) Unless otherwise prohibited by law or by paragraph (A), a judge may accept the following:

- (1) items with little intrinsic value, such as plaques, certificates, trophies, and greeting cards;
- (2) gifts, loans, bequests, benefits, or other things of value from friends, relatives, or other persons, including lawyers, whose appearance or interest in a proceeding

pending or impending before the judge would in any event require disqualification of the judge under Rule 2.11;

- (3) ordinary social hospitality;
- (4) commercial or financial opportunities and benefits, including special pricing and discounts, and loans from lending institutions in their regular course of business, if the same opportunities and benefits or loans are made available on the same terms to similarly situated persons who are not judges;
- (5) rewards and prizes given to competitors or participants in random drawings, contests, or other events that are open to persons who are not judges;
- (6) scholarships, fellowships, and similar benefits or awards granted on the same terms and based on the same criteria applied to other applicants;
- (7) books, magazines, journals, audiovisual materials, and other resource materials supplied by publishers on a complimentary basis for official use;
- (8) gifts, awards, or benefits associated with the business, profession, or other separate activity of a spouse, a domestic partner, or other family member of a judge residing in the judge's household, but that incidentally benefit the judge;
- (9) gifts incident to a public testimonial;
- (10) invitations to the judge and the judge's spouse, domestic partner, or guest to attend without charge:
 - (a) an event associated with a bar-related function or other activity relating to the law, the legal system, or the administration of justice; or
 - (b) an event associated with any of the judge's educational, religious, charitable, fraternal, or civic activities permitted by this code, if the same invitation is offered to nonjudges who are engaged in similar ways in the activity as is the judge.

(C) A judge shall report the acceptance of any gift, loan, bequest, or other thing of value as required by Rule 3.15.

Comment

1. Whenever a judge accepts a gift or other thing of value without paying fair market value, there is a risk that the benefit might be viewed as intended to influence the judge's decision in a case. Rule 3.13 prohibits the acceptance of such benefits except in circumstances where the risk of improper influence is low and subject to applicable financial disclosure requirements. See Rule 3.15.

2. Gift-giving between friends and relatives is a common occurrence and ordinarily does not create an appearance of impropriety or cause reasonable persons to believe that the judge's independence, integrity, or impartiality has been compromised. In addition, when the appearance of friends or relatives in a case would require the judge's disqualification under Rule 2.11, there would be no opportunity for a gift to influence the judge's decision making.

Paragraph (B)(2) places no restrictions upon the ability of a judge to accept gifts or other things of value from friends or relatives under these circumstances but may require public reporting.

3. The receipt of ordinary social hospitality, commensurate with the occasion, is not likely to undermine the integrity of the judiciary. However, the receipt of other gifts and things of value from an attorney or party who has or is likely to come before the judge will be appropriate only in the rarest of circumstances.

4. Businesses and financial institutions frequently make available special pricing, discounts, and other benefits, either in connection with a temporary promotion or for preferred customers, based upon longevity of the relationship, volume of business transacted, and other factors. A judge may freely accept such benefits if they are available to the general public, or if the judge qualifies for the special price or discount according to the same criteria as are applied to persons who are not judges. As an example, loans provided at generally prevailing interest rates are not gifts, but a judge could not accept a loan from a financial institution at below-market interest rates unless the same rate was being made available to the general public for a certain period of time or only to borrowers with specified qualifications that the judge also possesses.

5. If a gift or other benefit is given to the judge's spouse, domestic partner, or member of the judge's family residing in the judge's household, it may be viewed as an attempt to influence the judge indirectly. A judge should remind family and household members of the reporting requirements imposed upon judges by Rule 3.15 and urge them to take these restrictions into account when making decisions about accepting such gifts or benefits.

6. Rule 3.13 does not apply to contributions to a judge's campaign for judicial office. Such contributions are governed by other rules of this code, including Rules 4.2 and 4.3.

RULE 3.14. Reimbursement of Expenses and Waivers of Fees or Charges

(A) Unless otherwise prohibited by Rules 3.1 and 3.13(A) or other law, a judge may accept reimbursement of necessary and reasonable expenses for travel, food, lodging, or other incidental expenses, or a waiver or partial waiver of fees or charges for registration, tuition, and similar items, from sources other than the judge's employing entity, if the expenses or charges are associated with the judge's participation in extrajudicial activities permitted by this code.

(B) Reimbursement of expenses for necessary travel, food, lodging, or other incidental expenses shall be limited to the actual costs reasonably incurred by the judge and, when appropriate to the occasion, by the judge's spouse, domestic partner, or guest.

(C) A judge who accepts reimbursement of expenses or waivers or partial waivers of fees or charges on behalf of the judge or the judge's spouse, domestic partner, or guest shall publicly report such acceptance as required by Rule 3.15.

Comment

1. Educational, civic, religious, fraternal, and charitable organizations often sponsor meetings, seminars, symposia, dinners, awards ceremonies, and similar events. Judges are encouraged to attend educational programs, as both teachers and participants, in law-related

and academic disciplines, in furtherance of their duty to remain competent in the law. Participation in a variety of other extrajudicial activity is also permitted and encouraged by this code.

2. Not infrequently, sponsoring organizations invite certain judges to attend seminars or other events on a fee-waived or partial-fee-waived basis, and sometimes include reimbursement for necessary travel, food, lodging, or other incidental expenses. A judge's decision whether to accept reimbursement of expenses or a waiver or partial waiver of fees or charges in connection with these or other extrajudicial activities must be based upon an assessment of all the circumstances. The judge must undertake a reasonable inquiry to obtain the information necessary to make an informed judgment about whether acceptance would be consistent with the requirements of this code.

3. A judge must determine whether acceptance of reimbursement or fee waivers would not appear to a reasonable person to undermine the judge's independence, integrity, or impartiality. The factors that a judge should consider when deciding whether to accept reimbursement or a fee waiver for attendance at a particular activity include:

- (a) whether the sponsor is an accredited educational institution or bar association rather than a trade association or a for-profit entity.
- (b) whether the funding comes largely from numerous contributors rather than from a single entity and is earmarked for programs with specific content;
- (c) whether the content is related or unrelated to the subject matter of litigation pending or impending before the judge, or to matters that are likely to come before the judge;
- (d) whether the activity is primarily educational rather than recreational, and whether the costs of the event are reasonable and comparable to those associated with similar events sponsored by the judiciary, bar associations, or similar groups;
- (e) whether information concerning the activity and its funding sources is available upon inquiry;
- (f) whether the sponsor or source of funding is generally associated with particular parties or interests currently appearing or likely to appear in the judge's court, thus possibly requiring disqualification of the judge under Rule 2.11;
- (g) whether differing viewpoints are presented; and
- (h) whether a broad range of judicial and nonjudicial participants are invited, whether a large number of participants are invited, and whether the program is designed specifically for judges.

RULE 3.15. Financial Reporting Requirements

(A) A judge shall file annually the financial disclosure statement required by A.R.S. § 38-542 or other applicable law. The completion and filing of the annual financial disclosure statement fulfills the reporting requirements set forth in this code.

(B) Reports made in compliance with this rule shall be filed as public documents in the office designated by law.

Comment

1. The information required to be reported by Rules 3.12, 3.13, and 3.14 is a portion of the information that must be included on the annual financial disclosure statement mandated by A.R.S. § 38-542 or other applicable law. A judge is obligated to disclose fully and accurately all information requested on the annual disclosure statement and does not fulfill the statutory obligation by reporting only the information required by Rules 3.12, 3.13, and 3.14. Applicable law requires sufficient disclosure of the financial interests of and gifts to a judge and members of his or her household to promote judicial accountability and integrity.

2. To avoid needless repetition of disclosure requirements, the Arizona judiciary deems compliance with the substantive legal requirement as sufficient to meet the ethical obligations of a judge and thus incorporates them in this code.

3. Reimbursement of expenses from a judge's employer need not be reported under Rule 3.14(C) or Rule 3.15.

RULE 3.16. Conducting Weddings

(A) The performance of wedding ceremonies by a judge is a discretionary function rather than a mandatory function of the court.

(B) A judge shall not interrupt or delay any regularly scheduled or pending court proceeding in order to perform a wedding ceremony.

(C) A judge shall not advertise his or her availability for performing wedding ceremonies.

(D) A judge shall not charge or accept a fee, honorarium, gratuity, or contribution for performing a wedding ceremony during court hours.

(E) A judge may charge a reasonable fee or honorarium to perform a wedding ceremony during non-court hours, whether the ceremony is performed in the court or away from the court.

CANON 4

**A JUDGE OR CANDIDATE FOR JUDICIAL OFFICE SHALL NOT
ENGAGE IN POLITICAL OR CAMPAIGN ACTIVITY THAT IS
INCONSISTENT WITH THE INDEPENDENCE, INTEGRITY,
OR IMPARTIALITY OF THE JUDICIARY**

**RULE 4.1. Political and Campaign Activities of Judges and Judicial Candidates in
General**

(A) A judge or a judicial candidate shall not do any of the following:

- (1) act as a leader in, or hold an office in, a political organization;
- (2) make speeches on behalf of a political organization or another candidate for public office;
- (3) publicly endorse or oppose another candidate for any public office;
- (4) solicit funds for or pay an assessment to a political organization or candidate, make contributions to any candidate or political organization in excess of the amounts permitted by law, or make total contributions in excess of fifty percent of the cumulative total permitted by law. See, e.g., A.R.S. § 16-905.
- (5) actively take part in any political campaign other than his or her own campaign for election, reelection or retention in office;
- (6) personally solicit or accept campaign contributions other than through a campaign committee authorized by Rule 4.4;
- (7) use or permit the use of campaign contributions for the private benefit of the judge, the candidate, or others, except as provided by law;
- (8) use court staff, facilities, or other court resources in a campaign for judicial office;
- (9) make any statement that would reasonably be expected to affect the outcome or impair the fairness of a matter pending or impending in any court; or
- (10) in connection with cases, controversies, or issues that are likely to come before the court, make pledges, promises, or commitments that are inconsistent with the impartial performance of the adjudicative duties of judicial office.

(B) A judge or judicial candidate shall take reasonable measures to ensure that other persons do not undertake, on behalf of the judge or judicial candidate, any activities prohibited under paragraph (A).

(C) Except as prohibited by this code, a judge may:

- (1) engage in activities, including political activities, to improve the law, the legal system and the administration of justice; and
- (2) purchase tickets for political dinners or other similar functions, but attendance at any such functions shall be restricted so as not to constitute a public endorsement of a candidate or cause otherwise prohibited by these rules.

Comment

General Considerations

1. Even when subject to public election, a judge plays a role different from that of a legislator or executive branch official. Rather than making decisions based upon the expressed views or preferences of the electorate, a judge makes decisions based upon the law and the facts of every case. Therefore, in furtherance of this interest, judges and judicial candidates must, to the greatest extent possible, be free and appear to be free from political influence and political pressure.

2. When a person becomes a judicial candidate, this canon becomes applicable to his or her conduct. A successful judicial candidate is subject to discipline under the code for violation of any of the rules set forth in Canon 4, even if the candidate was not a judge during the period of candidacy. An unsuccessful judicial candidate who is a lawyer and violates this code may be subject to discipline under applicable court rules governing lawyers.

Participation in Political Activities

3. Public confidence in the independence and impartiality of the judiciary is eroded if judges or judicial candidates are perceived to be subject to political influence. Although judges and judicial candidates may register to vote as members of a political party, they are prohibited by paragraph (A)(1) from assuming leadership roles in political organizations. Examples of such leadership roles include precinct committeemen and delegates or alternates to political conventions. Such positions would be inconsistent with an independent and impartial judiciary.

4. Paragraphs (A)(2) and (A)(3) prohibit judges and judicial candidates from making speeches on behalf of political organizations or publicly endorsing or opposing candidates for public office, respectively, to prevent them from abusing the prestige of judicial office to advance the interests of others. Paragraph (A)(3) does not prohibit a judge or judicial candidate from making recommendations in complying with Rule 1.3 and the related comments. These rules do not prohibit candidates from campaigning on their own behalf or opposing candidates for the same judicial office for which they are running.

5. Paragraph (A)(3) does not prohibit a judge or judicial candidate from privately expressing his or her views on judicial candidates or other candidates for public office.

6. A candidate does not publicly endorse another candidate for public office by having that candidate's name on the same ticket.

7. Although members of the families of judges and judicial candidates are free to engage in their own political activity, including running for public office, there is no “family exception” to the prohibition in paragraph (A)(3) against a judge or candidate publicly endorsing candidates for public office. A judge or judicial candidate must not become involved in, or publicly associated with, a family member’s political activity or campaign for public office. To avoid public misunderstanding, judges and judicial candidates should take and should urge members of their families to take reasonable steps to avoid any implication that the judge or judicial candidate endorses any family member’s candidacy or other political activity.

8. Judges and judicial candidates retain the right to participate in the political process as voters in all elections. For purposes of this canon, participation in a caucus-type election procedure does not constitute public support for or endorsement of a political organization or candidate and is not prohibited by paragraphs (A)(2) or (A)(3).

Statements and Comments Made During a Campaign for Judicial Office

9. Subject to paragraph (A)(9), a judicial candidate is permitted to respond directly to false, misleading, or unfair allegations made against him or her during a campaign, although it is permissible for someone else, including another judge, to respond if the allegations relate to a pending case.

10. Paragraph (A)(9) prohibits judicial candidates from making comments that might impair the fairness of pending or impending judicial proceedings. This provision does not restrict arguments or statements to the court or jury by a lawyer who is a judicial candidate, or rulings, statements, or instructions by a judge that may appropriately affect the outcome of a matter.

11. Paragraph (A)(9) must be read in conjunction with Rule 2.10, which allows judges to make public statements in the course of their official duties.

Pledges, Promises, or Commitments Inconsistent with Impartial Performance of the Adjudicative Duties of Judicial Office

12. The role of a judge is different from that of a legislator or executive branch official, even when the judge is subject to public election. Campaigns for judicial office must be conducted differently from campaigns for other offices. The narrowly drafted restrictions upon political and campaign activities of judicial candidates provided in Canon 4 allow candidates to conduct campaigns that provide voters with sufficient information to permit them to distinguish between candidates and make informed electoral choices.

13. Paragraph (A)(10) makes applicable to both judges and judicial candidates the prohibition that applies to judges in Rule 2.10(B), relating to pledges, promises, or commitments that are inconsistent with the impartial performance of the adjudicative duties of judicial office.

14. The making of a pledge, promise, or commitment is not dependent upon, or limited to, the use of any specific words or phrases; instead, the totality of the statement must be examined to determine if a reasonable person would believe that the candidate for judicial office has specifically undertaken to reach a particular result. Pledges, promises, or commitments must be contrasted with statements or announcements of personal views on legal, political, or other

issues, which are not prohibited. When making such statements, a judge should acknowledge the overarching judicial obligation to apply and uphold the law, without regard to his or her personal views.

15. A judicial candidate may make campaign promises related to judicial organization, administration, and court management, such as a promise to dispose of a backlog of cases, start court sessions on time, or avoid favoritism in appointments and hiring. A candidate may also pledge to take action outside the courtroom, such as working toward an improved jury selection system or advocating for more funds to improve the physical plant and amenities of the courthouse.

16. Judicial candidates may receive questionnaires or requests for interviews from the media and from issue advocacy or other community organizations that seek to learn their views on disputed or controversial legal or political issues. Paragraph (A)(10) does not specifically address judicial responses to such inquiries. Depending upon the wording and format of such questionnaires, candidates' responses might be viewed as pledges, promises, or commitments to perform the adjudicative duties of office other than in an impartial way. To avoid violating paragraph (A)(10), therefore, candidates who respond to media and other inquiries should also give assurances that they will keep an open mind and will carry out their adjudicative duties faithfully and impartially if elected. Candidates who do not respond may state their reasons for not responding, such as the danger that answering might be perceived by a reasonable person as undermining a successful candidate's independence or impartiality, or that it might lead to frequent disqualification. See Rule 2.11.

RULE 4.2. Political and Campaign Activities of Judicial Candidates

(A) A judicial candidate shall:

- (1) act at all times in a manner consistent with the independence, integrity, and impartiality of the judiciary;
- (2) comply with all applicable election, election campaign, and election campaign fund-raising laws and regulations;
- (3) review and approve the content of all campaign statements and materials produced by the candidate or his or her campaign committee, as authorized by Rule 4.4, before their dissemination; and
- (4) take reasonable measures to ensure that other persons do not undertake on behalf of the candidate activities other than those described in Rule 4.4 that the candidate is prohibited from doing by Rule 4.1.

Rule 4.3. Campaign Standards and Communications

During the course of any campaign for nomination or election to judicial office, a judicial candidate, by means of campaign materials, including sample ballots, advertisements in the media, electronic communications, or a speech, press release, or any other public communication, shall not knowingly or with reckless disregard do any of the following:

(A) Post, publish, broadcast, transmit, circulate, or distribute information concerning the judicial candidate or an opponent that would be deceiving or misleading to a reasonable person;

(B) Manifest bias or prejudice toward an opponent that would be prohibited in the performance of judicial duties under Rule 2.3(B), which prohibition does not preclude a judicial candidate from making legitimate reference to the listed factors when they are relevant to the qualifications for judicial office;

(C) Use the title of an office not currently held by a judicial candidate in a manner that implies that the judicial candidate currently holds that office;

(D) Use the term “judge” when the judicial candidate is not a judge unless that term appears after or below the name of the judicial candidate and is accompanied by the words “elect” or “vote,” in prominent lettering, before the judicial candidate’s name or the word “for,” in prominent lettering, between the name of the judicial candidate and the term “judge”;

(E) Use the term “re-elect” when the judicial candidate has never been elected at a general or special election to the office for which he or she is a judicial candidate;

(F) Misrepresent the identity, qualifications, present position, or any other fact about the judicial candidate or an opponent;

(G) Make a false or misleading statement concerning the formal education or training completed or attempted by a judicial candidate; a degree, diploma, certificate, scholarship, grant, award, prize, or honor received, earned, or held by a judicial candidate; or the period of time during which a judicial candidate attended any school, technical program, college, or other educational institution;

(H) Make a false or misleading statement concerning the professional, occupational, or vocational licenses held by a judicial candidate, or the candidate’s employment history and descriptions of work-related titles or positions;

(I) Make a false or misleading statement about an opponent’s personal background or history;

(J) Falsely identify the source of a statement, issue statements under the name of another person without authorization, or falsely state the endorsement of or opposition to a judicial candidate by a person, organization, political party, or publication.

Comment

1. A judicial candidate must be scrupulously accurate, fair, and honest in all statements made by the candidate and his or her campaign committee. This rule obligates the candidate and the committee to refrain from making statements that are false or misleading or that omit facts necessary to avoid misleading voters.

2. A sitting judge, who is a judicial candidate for an office other than the court on which he or she currently serves, violates Rule 4.3(C) if he or she used the title “judge” without identifying the court on which the judge currently serves.

3. Judicial candidates are sometimes the subject of false, misleading, or unfair allegations made by opposing candidates, third parties, or the media. For example, false or misleading statements might be made regarding the identity, present position, experience, qualifications, or judicial rulings of a candidate. In other situations, false or misleading allegations may be made that bear upon a candidate's integrity or fitness for judicial office. As long as the candidate does not violate this rule, the candidate may make a factually accurate public response. In addition, when an independent third party has made unwarranted attacks on a candidate's opponent, the candidate may disavow the attacks and request the third party to cease and desist.

RULE 4.4. Campaign Committees

(A) A judicial candidate subject to public election may establish a campaign committee to manage and conduct a campaign for the candidate, subject to the provisions of this code. The candidate is responsible for ensuring that his or her campaign committee complies with applicable provisions of this code and other applicable law. See generally A.R.S. § 16-901 *et seq.*

(B) A judicial candidate subject to public election shall direct his or her campaign committee to solicit and accept only such campaign contributions as are permissible by law and to comply with all applicable statutory requirements for disclosure and divestiture of campaign contributions.

Comment

1. Judicial candidates are prohibited from personally soliciting campaign contributions or personally accepting campaign contributions. See Rule 4.1(A)(6). This rule recognizes that in many jurisdictions, judicial candidates must raise campaign funds to support their candidacies, and permits candidates, other than candidates for appointive judicial office, to establish campaign committees to solicit and accept lawful financial contributions or in-kind contributions.

2. Campaign committees may solicit and accept campaign contributions, manage the expenditure of campaign funds, and generally conduct campaigns. Candidates are responsible for compliance with the requirements of election law and other applicable law and for the activities of their campaign committees.

3. During the campaign, the candidate and his or her campaign committee should consider whether a contribution may affect the independence, integrity, and impartiality of the judge. The judicial candidate and his or her campaign committee should be aware that contributions could create grounds for disqualification if the candidate is elected to judicial office. See Rule 2.11.

Rule 4.5. Activities of Judges Who Become Candidates for Nonjudicial Office

(A) Upon becoming a candidate for a nonjudicial elective office other than as a candidate to a constitutional convention, a judge shall resign from judicial office.

(B) Upon becoming a candidate for a nonjudicial appointive office, a judge is not required to resign from judicial office, provided that the judge complies with the other provisions of this code.

Comment

1. In campaigns for nonjudicial elective public office, candidates may make pledges, promises, or commitments related to positions they would take and ways they would act if elected to office. Although appropriate in nonjudicial campaigns, this manner of campaigning is inconsistent with the role of a judge, who must remain fair and impartial to all who come before him or her. The potential for misuse of the judicial office, and the political promises that the judge would be compelled to make in the course of campaigning for nonjudicial elective office, together dictate that a judge who wishes to run for such an office must resign upon becoming a candidate.

2. The “resign to run” rule set forth in paragraph (A) ensures that a judge cannot use the judicial office to promote his or her candidacy and prevents post-campaign retaliation from the judge in the event the judge is defeated in the election. When a judge is seeking appointive nonjudicial office, however, the dangers are not sufficient to warrant imposing the “resign to run” rule.

NOTES

INDEX TO THE CODE OF JUDICIAL CONDUCT

(Revised May 3, 2010)

This index is not a part of the official version of the code adopted by the Arizona Supreme Court. No representations are being made as to its completeness and suggestions for subject classifications are welcome at any time.

A

Abuse of prestige of office	Rule 1.3
Access to justice	Rule 1.2, Comment 4
Adjudicative responsibilities	Rules 2.2, 2.4, 2.5(A), 2.7, 2.8 and 2.9(A)(3)
Administrative responsibilities	Rules 2.5, 2.12 and 2.13
Administrative law judges	Application, Part A, Comment 1
Advertising, control of	Rule 1.3, Comment 4
Aggravating factors	Scope, para. 5
Appearance before government bodies	Rule 3.2
Appearance of impropriety	Preamble, para. 2; Canon 1, Rule 1.2
Appearance of impropriety, test for	Rule 1.2, Comment 5
Appellate judges, communication with	Rule 2.9, Comment 5.
Applicability of code to all judges	Application, Part A(1)
Applicability to judicial candidates	Application, Part A(2)
Application section, purpose of	Scope, para. 1
Appointments, administrative	Rule 2.13
Appointments, fiduciary	Rule 3.8
Appointments, governmental	Rule 3.4
Appropriate action, defined	Rule 2.14, Comment 1
“Appropriate authority,” defined	Terminology
Appropriate authority, reporting to	Rules 2.14, 2.15
Arbitrator, service as	Rule 3.9
Aspirational goals	Scope, para. 3
Attorney in fact	Rule 3.8(A)
Awards, accepting	Rule 3.13(B)(6) and (8)

B

Bar activities, invitations to	Rule 3.13(B)(10)(a)
Benefits, accepting	Rule 3.13
Bequests, accepting	Rule 3.13
Bias or prejudice prohibited	Rule 2.3
Bias as basis for disqualification	Rule 2.11(A)(1), Rule 3.1, Comment 3
Bias, list of factors	Rule 2.3(B)
Board membership	Rule 3.7(A)(6)(charity); Rule 3.11(B)
Business activities	Rule 3.11

C

Campaign activities	Rules 4.1, 4.2, 4.3
---------------------	---------------------

Campaign committees	Rule 4.4
Campaign contributions	Rules 4.1, 4.4
Campaign for nonjudicial office	Rule 4.5
Campaign speeches	Rule 4.1(A)(2)
Campaign standards and communications	Rule 4.3
Candidate, defined	See "Judicial Candidate"
Canons as overarching principles	Scope, para. 2
Ceremonial occasions	Rule 3.4, Comment 2
Character witness, acting as	Rule 3.3
Charitable activities, in general	Rule 3.7
Charitable activities, invitations to	Rule 3.13(B)(10)(b)
Civic activities, invitations to	Rule 3.13(B)(10)(b)
Code as basis for regulation	Preamble, para. 3
Code not an exhaustive guide	Preamble, para. 3
Committees, governmental	Rule 3.4
Committees, campaign	Rule 4.4
Comments, purpose of	Scope, para. 3
Commitments, pending cases	Rule 2.10(B)
Commitments, controversies or issues	Rule 4.1(10), Comments 12 through 14
Communications	See Ex Parte Communications
Compensation, extrajudicial activities	Rule 3.12
Compensation, reporting	Rule 3.13
Competence	Preamble, para. 1; Rule 2.5(A)
Complaint, no automatic recusal	Rule 2.7, Comment 2
Compliance by new judges	Application, Part E
Compliance with the law and code	Rule 1.1
Conflict, duty to minimize risk of	Canon 3
"Contribution," defined	Terminology
Confidence in judiciary, promoting	Rule 1.2
Confidence in legal system	Preamble, para. 1
Consultation with government officials	Rule 3.2
Continuing part-time judge	Application, Part C
Contributions	See "soliciting contributions"
Cooperation with others	Rule 2.5(C)
Court personnel, supervisory duties over	2.12(A)
D	
Decisions, responsibility to decide	Rule 2.7
Delay	Rule 2.5
Demeanor with jurors	Rule 2.8
"De minimis" interest, defined	Terminology
De minimis interest, disqualification	Rule 2.11(A)(2)(c)
Dignity of judicial office	Preamble, para. 2

Diligence	Rule 2.5(A)
Director, serving as	Rules 3.7(A)(6), 3.11(B)
Disability, duty to take action	Rule 2.14
Disciplinary authorities, cooperation with	Rule 2.16
Disciplinary action for violating rule	Scope, para. 2
Disciplinary responsibilities	Rules 2.15, 2.16
Disclosure of campaign contributions	Rule 4.4(B)(3)
Discretion, professional	Scope, para. 2
Discrimination, invidious defined	Rule 3.6, Comment 2
Discrimination, organizations	Rule 3.6
Disqualification, unwarranted	Rule 2.7, Comment 1
Disqualification, in general	Rule 2.11
Disqualification not automatic	Rule 2.7, Comment 2
“Domestic partner,” defined	Terminology
E	
“Economic interest,” defined	Terminology
Economic interest, applied	Rule 2.11(B), Comment 6
Economic interest, as disqualification	Rule 2.11(A)(3)
Endorsing projects and programs	Rule 3.7(C)(2)
Education	See “judicial education”
Educational organizations and activities	Rule 3.7
Election or reelection	Rule 4.1(A)(5)
Endorsements, political	Rule 4.1(A)(3)
Endorsements, legal projects and programs	Rule 3.7(C)(2)
Enforceability of rules	Scope, para. 5
Errors of law, good faith	Rule 2.2, Comment 3
Executive or legislative body	Rule 3.2
Exemptions for part-time judges	Application, Parts B through D
Ex parte communications	Rule 2.9(A)
Experts, consulting	Rule 2.9(A)(2), Comment 7
External influences on conduct	Rule 2.4
Extrajudicial activities	Canon 3
Extrajudicial activities, in general	Rule 3.1
F	
Facts, independent investigation of	Rule 2.9(C)
Facts, personal knowledge of	Rule 2.11(A)(1)
Fairness	Preamble, para. 1; Rule 2.2
False or misleading statement, candidate	Rule 4.3(G), (H), and (I), Comment 3
Family business	Rule 3.11(A) and (B)
Family circumstances	Rule 1.2, Comment 5.
Family relationships	Rule 2.4(B)

Favoritism, in appointments	Rule 2.13(A)(2)
Fear of criticism	Rule 2.4(A)
Fiduciary, appointment as	Rule 3.8
“Fiduciary,” defined	Terminology
Fiduciary, serving when selected	Application, Part E, Comment 1
Financial activities, in general	Rule 3.11
Financial activities, time for compliance	Application, Part E
Financial reporting requirements	Rule 3.15
Fund-raising, for candidates	Rule 4.1(A)(4)
Fund-raising, in general	Rule 3.7(A)
G	
General ethical standards apply	Preamble, para. 3
Gifts, generally	Rule 3.13
Gifts, reporting requirements	Rule 3.15
Gifts to family members	Rule 3.13, Comment 5
Guardian, accepting appointment as	Rule 3.13
Guardians, appointment of	Rule 2.13, Comment 1
H	
Harassment prohibited	Rule 2.3; see also “sexual harassment”
Honoraria, accepting	Rule 3.12, Comment 1
I	
Impairment, duty to take action	See “disability”
Impartiality and fairness	Rule 2.2
“Impartiality,” defined	Terminology
Impartiality, disqualification	Rule 2.11(A)(1)
Impartially, performing duties	Canon 2
Impartiality, promoting	Preamble, para. 1; Rule 1.2, Rule 2.2
Impartiality, upholding	Canon 1
“Impending matter,” defined	Terminology
“Impropriety,” defined	Terminology
Improprieties, actual	Rule 1.2, Comment 5.
Independence	Preamble, para. 1; Rule 1.2
“Independence,” defined	Terminology
Independence, in general	Canon 1, Rule 1.2
Independence versus rules	Scope, para. 4
Influence, in general	Rule 2.4
Influence, political	Rule 4.1, Comment 1
Influences on judge	See “external influences”
Integrity	Preamble. para. 1; Rule 1.2
“Integrity,” defined	Terminology

Investments, managing and holding	Rule 3.11
Investigating facts independently	Rule 2.9(C)
Invidious discrimination	Rule 3.6(A), Comments 1 through 3
J	
“Judge,” defined	Terminology
Judge, use of title in campaigns	Rule 4.3(A) and (B)
Judicial duties, giving precedence to	Rule 2.1
Judicial candidate, code applies to	Preamble, para. 3; Application, Part A(2)
“Judicial candidate,” defined	Terminology
Judicial candidate, in general	Rules 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4
Judicial decisions, independence	Scope, para. 4
Judicial discretion	Scope, para. 2
Judicial duties or responsibilities	See “adjudicative,” “administrative,” “disciplinary”
Judicial education requirements	Rule 2.5(C)
Judicial employees	Rule 2.16, Comment 2
Judicial office as public trust	Preamble, para. 1
Judicial misconduct	See “misconduct”
Judicial selection, participation in	Rule 1.3, Comment 3
Jurors, comments to	Rule 2.8(C)
Jurors, demeanor with	Rule 2.8(A) and (B)
K	
“Knowingly,” defined	Terminology
Knowingly or knows, disqualification	Rule 2.11
Knowledge, judicial or lawyer misconduct	Rule 2.15(A) and (B)
L	
“Law,” defined	Terminology
Law practice prohibited	Rule 3.10
Lawyers, conduct towards	Rule 2.8(B)
Lawyers, disability and impairment	Rule 2.15(B)
Lawyers, financial activities with	Rule 3.11(C)(3)
Lawyers, gifts from	Rule 3.13(B)(2), Comment 3
Lawyer misconduct	See “misconduct”
Lawyers, ex parte communications with	Rule 2.9(A)
Leadership activities	Rule 3.7(C)(1)
Letterhead, use for personal business	Rule 1.3, Comments 1 and 2
Letterhead, listing name on organizational	Rule 3.7, Comment 4
Liability, rules not a basis for	Scope, para. 5
Litigant, conduct when dealing with	Rule 2.8(B)
Litigant, right to be heard	Rule 2.6(A)
Litigant, self-represented	Rule 2.2, Comment 4

Loans, accepting and reporting	Rule 3.13
M	
Mediator, service as	Rule 3.9
“Member of judge’s family,” defined	Terminology
“Member of judge’s family residing in judge’s household,” defined	Terminology
Membership, discriminatory organizations	Rule 3.6
Memberships, soliciting	Rule 3.7(A)(3)
Military service	Rule 3.16, Comment 4
Misconduct, responding to	Rule 2.15
Mitigating factors	Scope, para. 5
N	
Necessity, rule of	Rule 2.11. Comment 3
Nepotism	Rule 2.13(A)(2), Comment 2
Nonlegal advisor, serving as	Rule 3.7(A)(6)
New judges, compliance with code	Application, Part E
New judge serving as fiduciary	Application, Part E
“Nonpublic information,” defined	Terminology
Nonpublic information, use of	Rule 3.4
O	
Officer, serving as	Rule 2.11(A)(2)(a), Rule 3.7(A)(6), 3.11
Officiating in weddings	Rule 3.16
Organizations, discriminatory	Rule 3.6
Organizations, participation in	Rule 3.7
Organizations, political	Rule 4.1(A)
P	
Participation in outside activities	Rule 3.7
Partisan interests	See “external influence”
Part-time judges, examples of use	Application, Part D, Comments
“Pending matter,” defined	Terminology
Pending cases, statements on	Rule 2.10
Periodic part-time judge	Application, Part C
Permissive terms, use of	Scope, para. 2
Personal business, use of letterhead	Rule 1.3, Comment 1
Personal representative, serving as	Rule 3.8(A)
“Personally solicit,” defined	Terminology
Pledges, basis for disqualification	Rule 2.11(A)(5)
Pledges, promises and commitments	Rule 4.1(A)(10), Comments 12 through 16
Pledges, related to cases and issues	Rule 2.10(B)

Political activities, generally	Canon 4, Rule 4.1
Political influence	See “external influences”
“Political organization,” defined	Terminology
Political organization, membership in	Rule 4.1(A)
Practice of law, prohibited	Rule 3.10
Prejudice prohibited	Rule 2.3; see also “bias”
Prestige of office, avoiding abuse of	Rule 1.3
Prestige of office, testifying as witness	Rule 3.3, Comment
Problem-solving courts	Application, Part A, Comment 3
Probation officer, communicating with	Rule 2.9(A)(3)
Pro bono legal services	Rule 3.7(B), Comment 5
Professionalism, support of	Rule 1.2, Comment 4
Promises	See “pledges”
Prompt disposition of court business	Rule 2.5, Comments 3 and 4
Pro se litigant	See “litigant, self-represented”
Pro tempore part-time judge	Application, Part D
Public clamor	Rule 2.4(A)
Public confidence	Preamble, para. 2; Rule 1.2, Comment 3
“Public election,” defined	Terminology
Public hearing, appearing at	Rule 3.2
Public statement	Rule 2.11(A)(5)
Public statements on pending cases	Rule 2.10
Public testimonial, gifts incidental to	Rule 3.13(B)(9)
Public understanding, promoting	Rule 1.2, Comment 6; Rule 2.1, Comment 2
Publications, writing for	Rule 1.3, Comment 5
Q	
Questionnaires, responding to	Rule 4.1, Comment 15
R	
Real estate, managing	Rule 3.11(A), Comment 1
Reason, rules of	Scope, para. 5
Recommendations and references	Rule 1.3, Comment 2
Recommending judicial candidates	Rule 1.3, Comment 3
Reimbursement, in general	3.14
Religious organizations and activities	Rule 3.7
Remunerative activities	Rule 3.11
Retaliation prohibited	Rule 2.16(B)
Retired judge, application of rules	Application, Part B
Right to be heard, ensuring	Rule 2.6(A) and related comments.
Role of judiciary	Preamble, para. 1
Rules of Professional Conduct	Rule 2.15(B)
Rules of reason	Scope, para. 4

Rules, purpose of	Scope, para. 2
S	
Scholarships, accepting	Rule 3.13(B)(8)
Self-representation	See “litigant, self-represented”
Settlement, encouraging	Rule 2.6(B) and related comments.
Sexual harassment	Rule 2.3, Comment 4
Sixty-day rule, reference to	Rule 2.5, Comment 5
Social hospitality, accepting	Rule 3.13(B)(3)
Soliciting contributions, coercion	Rule 3.1, Comment 4
Soliciting contributions, in general	Rule 3.7(A)(2)
Soliciting contributions, political	Rule 4.1(A)(4)
Speaking at events, in general	Rule 3.7(A)(4)
Statements, campaign	See “campaign speeches”
Statements, false or misleading	Rule 4.3(G), (H), and (I), Comment 3
Supervisory authority and duties	Rule 2.12
T	
Teaching at educational institution	Rule 3.11, Comment 4
Telecommunications policy	Rule 3.1, Comment 5
Test for appearance of impropriety	Rule 1.2, Comment 5
“Third degree of relationship,” defined	Terminology
Time for compliance, new judges	Application, Part E
Travel	See “reimbursement of expenses”
Trustee, appointment as	Rule 3.8(A)
Trustee, disqualification	Rule 2.11(A)(2)
W	
Waiver of fees or charges	Rule 3.14
Weddings	Rule 3.16
Witness, conduct toward	Rule 2.8(B)
Witness, judge as material	Rule 2.11(A)(2)(d)
Witness, testifying as character	Rule 3.3

Black's Law Dictionary (10th ed. 2014), unethical

UNETHICAL

Bryan A. Garner, Editor in Chief

[Preface](#) | [Guide](#) | [Legal Abbreviations](#)

unethical *adj.* (1871) Not in conformity with moral norms or standards of professional conduct. See [LEGAL ETHICS](#).

Westlaw. © 2014 Thomson Reuters. No Claim to Orig. U.S. Govt. Works.

End of Document

© 2018 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.