

CITY OF AUSTIN ETHICS REVIEW COMMISSION

ROBERT MARK LITTLEFIELD,

Complainant

v.

UNCONVENTIONAL AUSTIN SPAC,

Respondent

§
§
§
§
§
§
§

Complaint No. 20191018

ORDER ON FINAL HEARING

I. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On October 18, 2019, Robert Mark Littlefield (“Complainant”) submitted to the Austin City Clerk (“City Clerk”) a Sworn Complaint (“the Complaint”) against Unconventional Austin SPAC (“Respondent”). On October 18, 2019, the City Clerk’s Office sent a copy of the Complaint and a notice of filing to the City Attorney, the Chair of the Ethics Review Commission (“the Commission”), Complainant, and Respondent.

The Complaint alleged that Respondent violated City Code Section 2-2-32 (Reporting of Direct Campaign Expenditures) of Chapter 2-2 (Campaign Finance).

On October 30, 2019, a notice of Preliminary Hearing was issued, setting the hearing for December 11, 2019. On December 11th, the Commission conducted a preliminary hearing and determined that reasonable grounds exist to believe a violation within the Commission’s jurisdiction had occurred.

On January 14, 2020, a Notice of Final Hearing was issued, which set the final hearing regarding this complaint for the Commission’s February 12, 2020 meeting. The notice advised Complainant and Respondent of the procedures for the final hearing.

The agenda for the February 12, 2020 meeting of the Commission and Final Hearing in this matter was timely posted on February 7, 2020.

Complainant Littlefield appeared at the final hearing. Respondent, Unconventional Austin SPAC, appeared at the hearing through its attorney of record, Fred Lewis. The parties were each afforded an opportunity to present evidence and argument.

II. CONCLUSIONS OF LAW


1. Under City Code Section 2-7-26, the Commission has jurisdiction over complaints alleging violations of Chapter 2-2 of the City Code (Campaign Finance).
2. The Complaint was filed with the City Clerk, was sworn to by Complainant, and identifies the section of the City Code alleged to have been violated, as required by Section 2-7-41 of the City Code.

IV. DETERMINATION OF THE ETHICS REVIEW COMMISSION

At the conclusion of the final hearing, a motion was made and seconded to dismiss the complaint against Respondent. The motion passed by a vote of 7-2. (Two members were absent from the hearing, and Chair Kahle recused herself from discussion and any action related to this complaint.)

The Commission orders that the complaint be dismissed.

ORDERED as of the 12th day of February, 2020.



Luis Soberon
Presiding Officer and Vice Chair
Ethics Review Commission