



CITY OF HAMILTON

**DECISION of the
ELECTION COMPLIANCE AUDIT COMMITTEE**
established under Section 88.37(1) of the *Municipal Elections Act, 1996* (the “Act”)
**A CLERK’S REPORT RESPECTING A CONTRIBUTOR WHO APPEARS
TO HAVE EXCEEDED ANY OF THE CONTRIBUTION LIMITS UNDER
SECTION 88.9 OF THE ACT
ANTHONY PUDDU**

With respect to the meeting of the Election Compliance Audit Committee (the “Committee”) held on June 16, 2023, to consider the Clerk’s Report (FCS23067) concerning the contributions made by Anthony Puddu (the “Contributor”) to the 2022 Election Campaign (the “Campaign”) of Donna Puddu (the “Candidate”):

The Clerk’s Report indicates the Contributor’s total contributions as \$1,319.71, which appears to have contravened the maximum contribution to any one candidate, as per Section 88.9 (1) of the Act.

Both the Candidate and the Contributor were present at the meeting of the Committee.

The Contributor advised the Committee that he provided unpaid labour to the campaign of his mother, the Candidate, and that he was not paid for the video services he provided to the Candidate.

The Committee also received a written submission and supporting documentation from the Candidate. The written submission from the Candidate states that the Candidate misallocated funds in her financial statement by attributing the payment for a purchase of marketing materials from VistaPrint in the amount of \$319.71 to the Contributor when in fact the materials were paid for through the Candidate’s account. The written submission also indicated that an in-kind contribution valued at \$1,000 for video work was also attributed to the Contributor. The submission confirmed that no payment was made to the Contributor for the in-kind contribution, that no invoices were generated, and that the Contributor’s direct financial contribution to the Campaign was \$0.


The Committee accepts the explanation that the amount of \$319.71 for VistaPrint marketing materials was incorrectly reflected as a payment made by the Contributor.

Moreover, the Committee finds that the in-kind video work provided by the Contributor was not a contribution as paragraph 1 of Section 88.15 (4) of the Act states that the value of services provided by voluntary unpaid labour is not a contribution.

The Committee is satisfied that there are no reasonable grounds to believe that the Contributor has exceeded any of the contribution limits under Section 88.9 of the Act. As such, the Committee will not be commencing legal proceedings against the Contributor.

Dated at the City of Hamilton June 23, 2023.

Written and approved by the following Committee Members:



Jonathan van der Heiden

VIVIAN E. SANDERS

Vivian Sanders



Zachary Spicer