



# The Anatomy Of Hillary Clinton's \$84 Million Money-Laundering Scheme

DAN BACKER 4:16 PM ET



In 2014, the Supreme Court ruled in favor of my client, Alabama engineer Shaun McCutcheon, in his challenge to the Federal Election Commission's (FEC) outdated "aggregate limits," which effectively limited how many candidates any one donor could support.

Anti-speech liberals railed against McCutcheon's win, arguing it would create supersized "Joint Fundraising Committees" (JFCs). In court, they claimed these JFCs would allow a single donor to cut a multimillion-dollar check, and the JFC would then route funds through dozens of participating state parties, who would then funnel it back to the final recipient.

Democracy 21 President Fred Wertheimer [claimed](#) the Supreme Court's McCutcheon v. FEC ruling would lead to "the system of legalized bribery recreated that existed prior to Watergate." The Supreme Court, in ruling for us, flatly stated such a scheme would [still be illegal](#).

The Democrats' response? Hold my beer.

The Committee to Defend the President has [filed an FEC complaint](#) against Hillary Clinton's campaign, Democratic National Committee (DNC), Democratic state parties and Democratic mega-donors.

[As Fox News reported](#), we documented the Democratic establishment "us[ing] state chapters as straw men to circumvent campaign donation limits and launder(ing) the money back to her campaign." The 101-page complaint focused on the Hillary Victory Fund (HVF) – the \$500 million joint fundraising committee between the Clinton campaign, DNC, and dozens of state parties – which did exactly that the Supreme Court declared would still be illegal.

HVF solicited six-figure [donations from major donors](#), including Calvin Klein and "Family Guy" creator Seth MacFarlane, and routed them through state parties en route to the