

seth
williams
DISTRICT ATTORNEY

1500 Sansom Street, 4th Floor | Philadelphia, PA 19102 | 1-888-Seth4DA

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:

March 27, 2009

CONTACT:

Dan Fee
215-704-3160 (cell)

**STATEMENT ON JUDGE TERESHKO'S RULING REMOVING
SETH WILLIAMS FROM THE BALLOT**

PHILADELPHIA: The following is a statement from Dan Fee, campaign manager for Seth Williams, on Common Pleas Judge Allan Tereshko's rulings today removing Seth from the ballot and keeping Mike Turner on it.

"We are very disappointed by these decisions by Judge Tereshko because the judge appears to have broken new legal ground to remove Seth from the ballot and keep Mike Turner on it.

In the decision to remove Seth from the ballot, Judge Tereshko ruled that reimbursements must be listed as income. In addition, in the face of Supreme Court precedent in Seth's favor, the judge refused to consider his promptly amended disclosure form.

However, reimbursements are not considered income by the Internal Revenue Service, the Pennsylvania Department of Revenue or the Pennsylvania Ethics Commission. [US Code Title 26; 61 PA CODE SECTION 101.1; PA State Ethics Commission, Chapter 11]

Moreover, the reimbursements to Seth and his family for expenditures he made on behalf of his campaign were fully disclosed in the statement he filed with the state – a public document. [Williams Candidate Statement]

Finally, it is deeply troubling that the standard being applied to us by the Judge is one that Danny McCaffery, who challenged Seth's Statement of Financial Disclosure, cannot himself meet. According to the 2008 filing of the PA Good Government Fund, Mr. McCaffery received reimbursements totaling \$3,759 – an amount not reported on his financial disclosures. [McCaffery 2008 campaign finance filings, PA Good Government 2008 Filings]

We will be appealing the Judge's decision removing Seth from the ballot.

In a second decision keeping Mike Turner on the ballot, Judge Tereshko allowed the submission of petitions notarized by a New Jersey notary and the signatures of individuals that were

not registered to vote at the address they listed. Without those signatures, we believe Mr. Turner would have fallen short of the 1,000 needed to qualify for the ballot.

We will be reviewing our options and may challenge this second flawed decision.

###