

March 13<sup>th</sup>, 2018



---

To the ACTION Party,

On behalf of the Student Body Supreme Court, we would like to thank you for expressing your concerns. We have received your email during spring break while the university was closed. Once classes resumed, we began the review of your letter on Monday, March 12<sup>th</sup>. We took the time to review your letter thoroughly, and we understand that there are three points needed to be addressed;

In regards to the campaigning in residential areas, we have reviewed previous minutes from past grievance hearings, that show candidates were disqualified for door-to-door campaigning, at no point were they disqualified for passing out platform cards.

In regards to advising, it is not the duty of the Student Government advisor to inform parties on campaign locations. Everything is expressed in the election code that was sent to you and should have been read and understood.

For the use of Student Government equipment for campaigning purposes, the sanction that was clearly given by the Supervisor of Elections was deemed appropriate by the Supreme Court. For the election results, there are votes that were cast by students that did not fill every office, which resulted in different percentages. We have reviewed the original results taken from EagleLink and compared it to the sheet handed out at the Election Results, and found that the results matched to sheet.

From our deliberations and findings, we will be dismissing this case. Thank you for expressing your concerns and reaching out to the Student Body Supreme Court.

Sincerely,

Ashley Sambrun, Chief Justice

Shane Broadstone, Associate Justice

Sophie Scarfo, Associate Justice