MEMORANDUM

TO: All Interested Parties

FROM: Compliance Review Commission (CRC)

DATE: August 14, 2019

RE: DECISION OF THE COMPLIANCE REVIEW COMMISSION RELATING TO A CHALLENGE FILED BY MS. RUTHEE GOLDKORN

INTRODUCTION:

On July 23, 2019, Ms. Ruthee Goldkorn filed a challenge to a Democratic Party Lunch Club meeting to be held on June 23, 2019 at the home of Mr. Stan Stossel. Ms. Goldkorn alleges that the home of Mr. Stossel is not ADA accessible and the invitation for the meeting was in violation of ADA standards. Ms. Goldkorn asserts the Riverside County Democratic Central Committee (RCDCC) Chair Tisa Rodriguez and the RCDCC is the party responsible for choosing the location. Through the urging of Ms. Goldkorn to Ms. Pelosi as the guest speaker, the location was changed to home of Eileen and Marv Stern.

Ms. Goldkorn addresses future possible challenges by alleging:

1. Mr. Stossel may have banned her from the IBEW union hall where the RCDCC has their monthly meeting, and
2. Her membership on the RCDCC as an associate member through the Democratic Club of Moreno Valley may be jeopardized.

DOCUMENTS INITIALLY RECEIVED AND REVIEWED:

Documents received and reviewed by the CRC associated with the challenge included the following:


TIMELINESS:

According to CDP Bylaws, Article XII, Section 4:

“All challenges must be commenced by the filing of a written challenge with the Secretary of This Committee, with copies served on the Chair of This Committee, as well as the appointing person, and the chair of the relevant organization, where applicable no later than seven (7) calendar days after the alleged violation occurred. Upon a showing of good cause, sustained by unanimous vote, the Compliance Review Commission may waive this requirement.”

(All By-Law references are to the California Democratic Party Bylaws, as amended through November 2018, unless otherwise indicated.)
The challenge by Ms. Goldkorn submitted on July 23, 2019 relating to an event which was scheduled to occur on June 23, 2019 is not within (7) seven days of the incident, thus the challenge is not timely. There was nothing provided that showed good cause why the CRC should waive this requirement.

STANDING:

According to Article XII, Section 3:

“All party to a challenge must be adversely affected to bring the challenge.”

Standing did not have to be reached because the challenge was not timely.

JURISDICTION

Article XII, Section 2a states:

“The Compliance Review Commission shall have initial jurisdiction over all challenges and/or appeals arising under these Bylaws.”

Jurisdiction did not have to be reached because the challenge was not timely.

ORDER:

Based upon the above facts and Bylaws of the CDP, the CRC makes the following Orders:

1) The challenge is denied due to timeliness. It should be noted that the event location was eventually changed which would make the initial basis for this challenge moot.
2) Any future allegations should be filed within seven (7) from the date of the incident to ensure timeliness.

Appeal of this order, if any, must be filed with the CDP Secretary, with copies to the Chair of the CDP State Central Committee, within twelve days of the date of this decision. (Article XII, section 6(a).) Thus, any appeal must be filed on or before August 26, 2019, with the Sacramento office of the California Democratic Party, and shall be an appeal to the next meeting of CDP Rules Committee upon conclusion of the response period.

Please note that per CDP Bylaws, Article XII, Section 7b, the filing of an appeal shall not stay any decision of the CRC. Parties may additionally respond in person, if so desired, provided there has been a timely filing of an appeal and notice of intent to testify is provided in writing to the Lead Chair of the Rules Committee by 5 PM on September 7, 2019, at the Sacramento office of the California Democratic Party. The Rules Committee may accept such additional testimony, written or oral, considering the nature and import thereof, as well as the time available for its proper consideration, as it deems appropriate, in its discretion.
Accordingly, this decision is so ordered, and is in effect, unless, and until, a successful appeal is made, decided, and contrary orders made whether by the CRC, or by the Rules Committee. CRC shall retain jurisdiction up until the time of an appeal, if any, is heard by the Rules Committee.

Respectfully submitted by a 6-0 vote of the members of the CRC,

Coby King, Co-Chair, Rules Committee
Lara Larramendi, Co-Lead Chair, Credentials Committee
Garry S. Shay, Lead Chair, Rules Committee
Keith Umemoto, Co-Chair, Credentials Committee
Michael Wagaman, Lead Chair, Credentials Committee
Laurence Zakson, Co-Chair, Rules Committee