

**STATE OF MINNESOTA  
CAMPAIGN FINANCE AND PUBLIC DISCLOSURE BOARD**

**PRIMA FACIE  
DETERMINATION**

IN THE MATTER OF THE COMPLAINT OF TROY SCHEFFLER REGARDING REPRESENTATIVE JOSHUA HEINTZEMAN AND THE COMMITTEE TO ELECT JOSH HEINTZEMAN

On July 21, 2025, the Campaign Finance and Public Disclosure Board received a complaint submitted by Troy Scheffler regarding Representative Joshua Heintzeman, a candidate for Minnesota House of Representatives District 6B. The Committee to Elect Josh Heintzeman is the principal campaign committee of Representative Heintzeman.<sup>1</sup>

The complaint states “I reallege and reincorporate the 2/11/2025 Complaint” and includes a copy of that complaint.<sup>2</sup> The current complaint references and objects to a probable cause determination that the Board issued on April 8, 2025, regarding the complaint filed in February 2025.<sup>3</sup> The current complaint also references and objects to the decision to close a staff review prompted by the complaint filed in February 2025, which is documented within a memorandum issued by the Board’s executive director on May 9, 2025.<sup>4</sup> The complaint cites Minnesota Statutes sections 10A.18, 10A.20, 10A.34, and 211B.12, and Minnesota Rules 4503.0900.

The complaint expresses disagreement with the decision to close the staff review on the basis that an amended 2024 year-end report of receipts and expenditures that the Heintzeman committee filed with the Board on May 5, 2025, remedied any violation of Minnesota Rules 4503.0900, subpart 3. The complainant appears to believe that because the Heintzeman committee retained legal counsel to represent the committee and Representative Heintzeman, and defend against multiple complaints filed with the Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH) and the Board, the Heintzeman committee was required to include separate noncampaign disbursements for each matter within its campaign finance reports covering 2024.

The complaint argues that a \$10,000 noncampaign disbursement for legal services related to a First Amendment lawsuit involving Representative Heintzeman amounts to “fraud and extortion”. The complaint argues that the amount is too high, while simultaneously stating that Representative Heintzeman sought an award of \$18,532.50 in attorneys’ fees in that lawsuit.

The complaint notes that the amended 2024 year-end report that the Heintzeman committee filed with the Board on May 5, 2025, referenced the wrong case in explaining the purpose of an in-kind noncampaign disbursement resulting from an in-kind contribution made by a party unit, the HRCC. That error was corrected when the Heintzeman committee filed another amended 2024-year-end report on May 22, 2025.

---

<sup>1</sup> [cfb.mn.gov/reports-and-data/viewers/campaign-finance/candidates/17782/](https://cfb.mn.gov/reports-and-data/viewers/campaign-finance/candidates/17782/)

<sup>2</sup> [cfb.mn.gov/pdf/bdactions/1711\\_Complaint.pdf](https://cfb.mn.gov/pdf/bdactions/1711_Complaint.pdf)

<sup>3</sup> [cfb.mn.gov/pdf/bdactions/1711\\_Probable\\_Cause\\_Determination.pdf](https://cfb.mn.gov/pdf/bdactions/1711_Probable_Cause_Determination.pdf)

<sup>4</sup> [cfb.mn.gov/pdf/bdactions/1711\\_Closing\\_Memo.pdf](https://cfb.mn.gov/pdf/bdactions/1711_Closing_Memo.pdf)

The complaint also alleges that when the Heintzeman committee filed amended 2024 year-end reports, it referenced the wrong case in explaining the purpose of three noncampaign disbursements totaling \$445 paid to the district court in Crow Wing County. The complaint alleges that the fees were related to a defamation lawsuit captioned *Scheffler v. Franzen, et al.*, 18-CV-22-3881, rather than a First Amendment lawsuit captioned *Zinda v. Heintzeman*, 18-CV-24-2821. The complaint asserts that “This is no doubt a coverup to avoid Minn. Stat 211B.12 and 10A.34.”

The remainder of the complaint is largely comprised of *ad hominem* attacks, criticism of the Board and various other entities, and argument regarding issues over which the Board lacks jurisdiction.

## **Determination**

### Reporting, noncampaign disbursements, and false certification

Minnesota Statutes section 10A.20, subdivision 3, paragraph (m), requires campaign finance reports filed with the Board to include:

the name, address, and registration number if registered with the board of each individual or association to whom noncampaign disbursements have been made that aggregate in excess of \$200 within the year by or on behalf of the reporting entity and the amount, date, and purpose of each noncampaign disbursement, including an explanation of how the expenditure was used.

Minnesota Rules 4503.0900, subpart 3, provides that “Itemization of an expense which is classified as a noncampaign disbursement must include sufficient information to justify the classification.”

Minnesota Statutes section 10A.025, subdivision 2, provides that “An individual shall not sign and certify to be true a report or statement knowing it contains false information or knowing it omits required information.” Minnesota Statutes section 10A.025, subdivision 4, provides that “Material changes in information previously submitted and corrections to a report or statement must be reported in writing to the board within ten days following the date of the event prompting the change or the date upon which the person filing became aware of the inaccuracy.”

All but one of the reporting issues raised in the complaint have already been considered by the Board. The complaint asserts that the Heintzeman committee referenced the wrong case in explaining the purpose of three noncampaign disbursements totaling \$445 paid to the district court in Crow Wing County. As explained in more detail below, that assertion appears to be correct. Board staff will notify the Heintzeman committee, and if the assertion is correct, the Heintzeman committee will be required to file another amended 2024 year-end report to correct that error pursuant to Minnesota Statutes section 10A.025, subdivision 4.

The complaint does not provide a basis to believe that the Heintzeman committee's treasurer, Senator Keri Heintzeman, knowingly filed a false report. As stated within the probable cause determination issued on April 8, 2025, Senator Heintzeman signed a sworn affidavit on April 1, 2025, stating that "The court fees paid to Crow Wing County Court Administration were for case# 18-CV-22-38811." The affidavit was filed with the Board in response to the complaint Mr. Scheffler filed in February 2025. In this case, based on the context and evidence available, the filing of conflicting documents with the Board indicates an error, not malfeasance. Therefore, the complaint does not state a prima facie violation of Minnesota Statutes section 10A.025, subdivision 2.

Despite appearing to reference the wrong case with respect to \$445 in noncampaign disbursements, the Heintzeman committee's amended 2024 year-end report includes sufficient information to justify the classification of those disbursements as noncampaign disbursements, and accurately identifies the vendor that was paid and the general purpose of the disbursements, namely court fees. Therefore, the complaint does not state a prima facie violation of Minnesota Rules 4503.0900, subpart 3, or Minnesota Statutes section 10A.20, subdivision 3.

#### Use of money collected for political purposes and section 10A.34

The complaint argues that the alleged reference to the wrong case is "a coverup to avoid Minn. Stat 211B.12 and 10A.34." Minnesota Statutes section 10A.34 generally describes the legal remedies available when enforcing Minnesota Statutes Chapter 10A. It is not possible for the Heintzeman committee or Representative Heintzeman to violate that statute because it does not govern the conduct of any entities other than the Board, county attorneys, and the judiciary. The Board previously determined that the Heintzeman committee was permitted to use campaign funds to pay for legal services related to the defamation lawsuit captioned *Scheffler v. Franzen, et al.*, 18-CV-22-3881, and the First Amendment lawsuit captioned *Zinda v. Heintzeman*, 18-CV-24-2821, consistent with Minnesota Statutes sections 211B.12 and 10A.01, subdivision 26, paragraph (a), clause (1). Therefore, the complaint does not state a prima facie violation of Minnesota Statutes sections 10A.34 or 211B.12.

#### Previously dismissed allegations

To the extent that the complaint reasserts allegations that were dismissed within the prima facie determination issued on February 21, 2025,<sup>5</sup> including alleged violations of Minnesota Statutes sections 10A.18 and 211B.12, those allegations are again dismissed for the reasons stated therein. To the extent that the current complaint reasserts allegations that were dismissed within the probable cause determination issued on April 8, 2025, including alleged violations of Minnesota Statutes section 211B.12, those allegations are again dismissed for the reasons stated therein. To the extent that the current complaint alleges violations of Minnesota

---

<sup>5</sup> [cfb.mn.gov/pdf/bdactions/1711\\_Prima\\_Facie\\_Determination.pdf](https://cfb.mn.gov/pdf/bdactions/1711_Prima_Facie_Determination.pdf)

Rules 4503.0900, subpart 3, that were determined to have been remedied by the filing of an amended 2024 year-end report within the memorandum issued on May 9, 2025, those allegations are dismissed for the reasons stated therein.

### Conclusion

A person aggrieved by a decision of the Board regarding a complaint is generally entitled to judicial review under Minnesota Statutes section 14.63. The complainant has sought judicial review of decisions regarding the complaint filed with the Board in February 2025.<sup>6</sup> When a complainant disagrees with determinations made by the Board and has standing to seek judicial review, the proper forum for that review is the Minnesota Court of Appeals.

Pursuant to Minnesota Statutes section 10A.022, subdivision 3, this prima facie determination is made by a single Board member and not by any vote of the entire Board. The complaint is dismissed without prejudice.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'F. Rashid', is written over a horizontal line.

Faris Rashid, Chair  
Campaign Finance and Public Disclosure Board

Date: July 29, 2025

---

<sup>6</sup> The Court of Appeals case number is A25-0853.