

**UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA STUDENT GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION
SPRING 2022 GENERAL ELECTION REPORT**

Isaac Kabrick, SGA Election Commissioner

Election Commission Staff: Alexia Charlton, Jordan Murray, Cameron Decker (*acting*), Kyle Mershon (*acting*), Nathan Nguyen (*acting*), Abby Halsey-Kraus (*ex officio*)

Pursuant to SGACA Tit. VI Ch. 5 § 33, the following report details the results of the Spring 2022 SGA General Elections. Voting for these elections took place on March 29th and 30th, 2022.

The Election Commission received a total of 14 complaints:

- 6 were heard as formal petitions. The decisions in those cases are included in this report.
- 7 were received as unofficial notifications. The issues raised are summarized below.
 - 1 formal petition was withdrawn prior to being heard.

Projected winners of each race are bolded and indicated by an *

Campus Activities Council Chair:

2 candidates

*Francesca Losh	1177	55.52%
Aaron Reid	943	44.48%

Student Bar Association President:

3 candidates

*Gracie Pennington	62	51.24%
Jemma Cota	45	37.19%
Erick E. Morales Sartillo	14	11.57%

Undergraduate Student Congress Representative:

Architecture District: 1 open seat, 2 candidates

*Ben White	25
Alanna Rios	13

Atmospheric and Geographic Sciences District: 1 open seat, 1 candidate

Minimum votes needed: 8 (Fall 2020)

*Michael T. Reynolds	57
-----------------------------	-----------

Business District: 3 open seats, 1 candidate

Minimum votes needed: 108 (Fall 2021)

***Tyler Givens** **187**

Communication District: 2 open seats, 2 candidates

Minimum votes needed: 154 (Fall 2021)

Hudson Haskins 147

Rylee Houston 110

Engineering District: 2 open seats, 4 candidates

***Nathanael Reese** **95**

***Pranay Singh** **34**

Abdul Hadi Fawad 29

Daniel Jensen 29

Finance and Accounting District: 3 open seats, 1 candidate

Minimum votes needed: 122 (Fall 2021)

Arianna Jaquez 105

Humanities District: 3 open seats, 2 candidates

Minimum votes needed: 47 (Fall 2021)

***Megan Neaves** **54**

Emiliano Perez 20

Life Sciences District: 2 open seats, 1 candidate

Minimum votes needed: 58 (Fall 2021)

***Danielle Baca** **158**

Social Sciences District: 2 open seats, 3 candidates

*Ryan Barnett	117
*Razann Ghazal	103
Wacey Hopson	82

University College District: 5 open seats, 10 candidates

*Ethan Hedrick	301
*Shrey Kathuria	289
*Yara Ketaneh	266
*Colton Cable	222
*Will McCall	170
Caleb Hicks	168
Blake Hasselman	157
Daisy Barrett	141
Makenzie Toma	133
Shree Chetlur	90

Rulings on Infractions

Summary

SP22-001 An Anonymous Unofficial Notification

SP22-002 An Anonymous Unofficial Notification

SP22-003 An Anonymous Unofficial Notification

SP22-004 Director Easton Holloway v. Reid 4 CAC

0-2 in favor of Reid 4 CAC. No points assigned

SP22-005 An Unofficial Notification Filed by Director Easton Holloway

SP22-006 A Petition Filed by Candidate Francesca Losh

Withdrawn by the petitioner before consideration. No points assigned.

SP22-007 An Unofficial Notification Filed by Candidate Francesca Losh

SP22-008 An Unofficial Notification Filed by Candidate Francesca Losh

SP22-009 Francesca 4 CAC v. Reid 4 CAC

2-0 for Francesca 4 CAC. 1.0 point assigned to Reid 4 CAC.

SP22-010 Francesca 4 CAC v. Reid 4 CAC

2-0 for Francesca 4 CAC. 1.0 point assigned to Reid 4 CAC.

SP22-011 Francesca 4 CAC v. Reid 4 CAC

2-0 for Francesca 4 CAC. 0.5 points assigned to Reid 4 CAC.

SP22-012 Francesca 4 CAC v. Reid 4 CAC

2-0 for Francesca 4 CAC. 1.0 point assigned to Reid 4 CAC.

SP22-013A Petition by the Election Commissioner Regarding Campaign Finance Reports

2-0 in each case against the candidate. 1.0 or 1.5 points assigned as described below.

SP22-014 An Anonymous Unofficial Notification

Total Points Assigned

Aaron Reid (as Reid 4 CAC) received 3.5 points total.

Alanna Rios received 1.5 points total.

Abdul Hadi Fawad received 1.5 points total.

Pranay Singh received 1.5 points total.

Makenzie Toma received 1.5 points total.

Tyler Givens received 1.0 point total.

Blake Hasselman received 1.0 point total.

Ethan Hedrick received 1.0 point total.

Yara Ketaneh received 1.0 point total.

Will McCall received 1.0 point total.

Razann Ghazal received 1.0 point total.

No other candidate was assigned any points. No sanctions were applied. No votes were conducted to disqualify any candidate.

Reported Irregularities

The Commission received seven Unofficial Notifications detailing election irregularities.

SP22-001, **SP22-002**, and **SP22-003** were anonymously filed notifications concerning campaigning before the campaign time frame. The petitioner provided evidence that suggests that candidates were posting campaign materials on social media prior to the publication of the Information on Candidates Booklet. While this would seem to suggest candidates were campaigning outside of the time frame, the circumstances of this election necessitated that the time frame began prior to the publication of the Information on Candidates Booklet. *EC Opinion 2022-001*. Therefore, the evidence provided does not suggest wrongdoing on the part of the candidates in question.

SP22-005 and **SP22-007** alleged, independently, that a candidate had improperly used the Interlocking OU Logo in campaign materials shared via social media. The petitioners did not provide information regarding the date and time of the alleged infraction, so the notification could not be properly seen as an official petition. The Election Commissioner observed that the materials in question did not include the Interlocking OU Logo at the time the notifications were filed.

SP22-008 alleges an infraction substantially similar to the allegations in **SP22-004**. This unofficial notification was filed after the statutory deadline to be heard as a formal petition and could not be properly seen as such.

SP22-014 was an anonymously filed notification alleging improper campaigning in a GroupMe group. Because the petition was anonymously filed, it was not considered to be heard as an official petition. In any case, a review of the evidence suggests no wrongdoing on the part of the candidate in question, as the message seems to be compliant with election rules.

Decisions of the SGA Election Commission

The decisions of the Election Commission for the Spring 2022 SGA General Election are attached beginning on the next page.

SGA Election Commission
Director Easton Holloway v. Reid 4 CAC
SP22-004 24 Mar. 2022

Holding

2-0 for Reid 4 CAC

No points shall be assigned pursuant to this petition

Facts of the Petition

SP22-004 was submitted to the Student Government Association (hereinafter “SGA”) Election Commission (“the Commission”) on Tuesday, March 22, 2022, by Director Easton Holloway (hereinafter “the Petitioner”) via the “Unofficial Election Notification Form Spring 2022.” This form was established in accordance with the SGA Code Annotated (hereinafter “the Code”) to provide SGA members an electronic form for reporting election irregularities. *SGACA* Tit. VI Ch. 5 § 31. Upon review, the SGA Election Commissioner (hereinafter “the Commissioner”) determined that the form and content of the notification resembled an election complaint, and that the notification would more properly be considered as an election complaint. *Id.* The Commissioner determined that the Reid 4 CAC campaign (hereinafter “the Respondent”) was implicated in the complaint and informed the representatives of that campaign that the claim had been filed. The Respondent filed a written response on March 23, 2022, less than 24 hours after they had been informed of the complaint.

The complaint alleges that the Respondent committed a Class B infraction by campaigning outside of the campaign time frame. *Id.* Ch. 4 § 25(b)(i). For the Spring 2022 General Election, the campaign time frame opened at 12:00 PM on March 18, 2022. Specifically, the Petitioner alleges that the Respondent established an account on Instagram.com for the explicit purpose of promoting their campaign, including a hyperlink to the campaign’s Linktr.ee landing page which featured links to campaign materials and a campaign supporter GroupMe group message. As evidence, the Petitioner submitted an apparent screenshot of a screenshot as it appears in the camera roll of an iPhone. The image is timestamped, per the Photos application, as of “Thursday, 9:56 AM.” The image depicts an Instagram.com account page titled “CAC Chair Candidate” with candidate Aaron Reid’s likeness. No further evidence was submitted pursuant to this petition.

The Respondent admitted that the Instagram.com account was prepared before the campaign time frame, and argued that the actions taken represented campaign preparation, not campaigning. The 6 followers to the page, according to the Respondent, included the candidate, the designated agent, and four other people working closely with the campaign to prepare for campaigning. The Respondent also states that the account was set to “private” shortly after its creation.

Question Considered

- I. Do the actions of the Reid 4 CAC campaign constitute campaigning outside of the campaign time frame?

Short Answer

- I. No. The actions presented in this petition represent campaign preparation, not campaigning.

Discussion

Neither party to this case contests the basic facts that an Instagram.com account was created with the intent of promoting the Respondent's campaign, and that it was created before the campaign time frame outlined by the Code. The question before the Commission, then, is whether the creation of that account, and the inclusion of a hyperlink to other campaign material, constitutes illegal campaigning. The definition of campaigning found in the Code does little to shed light on this question. Certainly, the actions of the Respondent appear to be organized, and appear to be promoting a candidate, but a determination of what constitutes active promotion under the Code requires broader consideration. *Id.* Ch. 1 § 1(c).

The Code makes it clear that candidates are allowed to begin preparations for their campaign prior to the campaign time frame. "Candidates may register for [campaign] materials prior to the official campaign period." *Id.* Ch. 4 § 22. In order to register campaign materials, candidates must design those materials. There is no expectation that candidates will create these designs by themselves, or only with the help of their Designated Agent, as they are allowed to solicit the services of SGA members to work on their campaign. *Id.* Ch 1 § 1(a) and Ch. 4 § 25(c)(v). While there is a distinct lack of clarity as to the official status of these members working on the campaign under the Code, it is nevertheless reasonable to assume that at least some candidates will solicit some help in the preparation leading up to the campaign time frame. Absent any claim or evidence to the contrary, the Commission accepts the Respondent's claim that the six followers and five accounts followed by the Instagram.com account in question fall into this category of campaign members.

Just as candidates are allowed to seek approval for campaign designs, print campaign materials, and coordinate campaign events prior to the campaign time frame, they are allowed to prepare campaign websites and social media accounts. These actions do not constitute campaigning, as they lack the essential "active" component that is achieved when candidates begin to post those posters, attend those events, and use their social media accounts to solicit support from the general public. *Id.* Ch. 1 § 1(c). It is clear from the evidence that the Respondent engaged in campaign preparation, but it is unclear that he attempted to engage in active campaigning, and he has made claims to the contrary.

Some may want to point to the fact that the petitioner was able to find the Instagram.com account as evidence that the campaign did not make sufficient efforts to shield their preparations

from the public eye, and that their infraction is one of omission. While candidates likely have a responsibility to ensure their preparations are not overtly visible (though there is little in the Code to support this), there is a degree to which candidates cannot control what is visible to the electorate. It is the opinion of the commission that the Petitioner most likely sought out the Instagram.com account, or otherwise stumbled upon it by pure happenstance, similar to looking for a candidate's posters in their office or catching a glimpse of them at the copy store. In neither case can the candidate be said to have actively promoted their campaign.

Therefore, absent claims or evidence to the contrary, the Commission finds that the Reid 4 CAC campaign has not committed an infraction, and that no points shall be assessed in this case.

It is so ordered.

SGA Election Commission
Francesca 4 CAC v. Reid 4 CAC
SP22-009 27 Mar. 2022

Holding

2-0 for the Petitioner

The Reid 4 CAC campaign will be assigned 1.0 point.

Facts of the Petition

SP22-009 was submitted to the Student Government Association (hereinafter “SGA”) Election Commission (“the Commission”) on March 23, 2022, by Alyssa Hargis on behalf of the Francesca 4 CAC campaign (hereinafter “the Petitioner”) via the “Unofficial Election Notification Form Spring 2022.” This form was established in accordance with the SGA Code Annotated (hereinafter “the Code”) to provide SGA members an electronic form for reporting election irregularities. *SGACA* Tit. VI Ch. 5 § 31. Upon review, the SGA Election Commissioner (hereinafter “the Commissioner”) determined that the form and content of the notification resembled an election complaint, and that the notification would more properly be considered as an election complaint. *Id.* The Commissioner determined that the Reid 4 CAC campaign (hereinafter “the Respondent”) was implicated in the complaint and informed the representatives of that campaign that the claim had been filed. The Respondent requested an extension to file a response to this petition and three others, which was approved by the Commission. The Respondent filed a written response on March 26, 2022, before the approved deadline.

The complaint alleges that the Respondent committed a Class C infraction using a protected logo of the University of Oklahoma or an affiliate. *Id.* Ch. 4 § 25(c)(iv). Specifically, the complaint alleges that the Respondent posted an image to the Reid 4 CAC Instagram.com account depicting the Interlocking OU and provided evidence in the form of a screen capture image apparently depicting the same.

The Respondent makes no claim to the contrary in the written response. Quoting from the response: “The Reid 4 CAC Campaign admits that there was an Instagram post by the campaign Instagram account that included a small trademarked logo of the University.” The Respondent proceeds to speculate that the inclusion of the Interlocking OU logo likely had minimal impact on the campaign and request a proportional judgement.

This petition was heard at the same meeting as SP22-010, SP22-011, and SP22-012, which all allege similar actions.

Questions Considered

- I. Has the Reid 4 CAC campaign used a logo of the University of Oklahoma and committed a Class C infraction?
- II. If so, how many points shall be assigned in this matter?

Short Answers

- I. Yes, the appearance of the logo was either intentional or negligent, and in either case was prominent
- II. 1.0 point shall be assigned to the Reid 4 CAC campaign pursuant to this matter.

Discussion

There is no question in this matter whether a protected logo of the University of Oklahoma appeared in campaign materials. The evidence submitted makes clear, and the Respondent concurs, that the Interlocking OU logo, as it appears in the Instagram.com post, is licensed or otherwise legally controlled by the University of Oklahoma or its affiliates. While the respondent makes the case that the utility of such an inclusion is questionable, they fail to establish that it should not qualify as “use” under the Code. In any case, the Commission finds that inclusion in this case does constitute “use” by the campaign. The logo appears on the shirt of the individual pictured, is in plain view of anyone viewing the image, and readily identifies the person in the image as a member of the OU community. The Respondent was made aware of this rule at the Mandatory Candidates Meeting prior to the campaign time frame. In that meeting, particular emphasis was added to the importance and relatively high application of the infraction in question, and a thorough explanation of acceptable use was given.

In considering how many points to assign in this matter, the Commission considered the block of four petitions heard that evening, SP22-009, SP22-010, SP22-011, and SP22-012. Each of these petitions was filed by the present Petitioner against the present Respondent, and each alleges an infraction under the present conditions, with some differences throughout. In SP22-009, the Commission finds the Respondent acted negligently by failing to recognize the infraction and finds the inclusion of the full and easily recognized Interlocking OU logo to constitute a severe violation. In considering “the effect which the campaign rule violation may have had on the campaign, on other candidates, and to the campus as a whole”, the Commission accepts in part the reasoning of the Respondent that this infraction likely had a relatively small effect, and accordingly spare the Respondent the highest penalty available. *Id.* Ch. 5 § 28(b)(iv).

Accordingly, the Commission finds that a Class C infraction was committed in this case and assigns the Reid 4 CAC campaign 1.0 points. Following this judgement, the Reid 4 CAC campaign has 1.0 points total.

It is so ordered.

SGA Election Commission
Francesca 4 CAC v. Reid 4 CAC
SP22-010 27 Mar. 2022

Holding

2-0 for the Petitioner

The Reid 4 CAC campaign will be assigned 1.0 point.

Facts of the Petition

SP22-010 was submitted to the Student Government Association (hereinafter “SGA”) Election Commission (“the Commission”) regarding the Campus Activities Council (hereinafter “CAC”) Chair election, on March 23, 2022, by Alyssa Hargis on behalf of the Francesca 4 CAC campaign (hereinafter “the Petitioner”) via the “Unofficial Election Notification Form Spring 2022.” This form was established in accordance with the SGA Code Annotated (hereinafter “the Code”) to provide SGA members an electronic form for reporting election irregularities. *SGACA* Tit. VI Ch. 5 § 31. Upon review, the SGA Election Commissioner (hereinafter “the Commissioner”) determined that the form and content of the notification resembled an election complaint, and that the notification would more properly be considered as an election complaint. *Id.* The Commissioner determined that the Reid 4 CAC campaign (hereinafter “the Respondent”) was implicated in the complaint and informed the representatives of that campaign that the claim had been filed. The Respondent requested an extension to file a response to this petition and three others, which was approved by the Commission. The Respondent filed a written response on March 26, 2022, before the approved deadline.

The complaint alleges that the Respondent committed a Class C infraction using the logo of an event of the Programming Branch of SGA. *Id.* Ch. 4 § 25(c)(iv). Specifically, the complaint alleges that the Respondent posted an image to the Reid 4 CAC Instagram.com account depicting the logo of the University of Oklahoma Dance Marathon (hereinafter “OUDM”) and provides evidence in the form of a screen capture image apparently depicting the same.

The response in this case was filed by the Designated Agent for the Reid 4 CAC campaign, Jaden Smicklas. Smicklas also serves as the Executive Chair of OUDM. The Respondent agrees that the image attached to the complaint is an accurate depiction of a post by the Reid 4 CAC Instagram.com account. They proceed to make effectively four distinct arguments in this matter:

First, the Respondent states that this was not use of the logo of OUDM. Quoting from the response:

“...as the Executive Chair of OU Dance Marathon, I can attest that the letters seen in this photo do not stand as the official logo of OU Dance Marathon. The logo on the shirt is not used as OU

Dance Marathon's official branding, which can be found in the official OU Dance Marathon Branding packet which can be provided upon further request."

Second, the Respondent states that the petition was improperly filed by someone other than the "registered leadership" of OUDM. *Id.* The Respondent further notes that the use of the image was approved by OUDM leadership.

Third, the Respondent states that if CAC as a whole is considered to be the RSO with control over this mark, then the petition was still improperly filed by someone other than the registered leadership of CAC. *Id.*

Fourth and finally, the petitioner states that the effect of this alleged violation is minimal and asks that no points be assessed.

This petition was heard at the same meeting as SP22-009, SP22-011, and SP22-012, which all allege similar actions.

Questions Considered

- I. Does the logo that appears in the Instagram.com post constitute the logo of a program of the Programming Branch?
- II. Was this petition properly filed?
- III. Was an infraction committed in this matter?
- IV. If so, how many points shall be assessed?

Short Answers

- I. Yes, under precedent and careful review of the OUDM Branding Guidelines, the logo depicted constitutes the logo of a program of the Programming Branch.
- II. Yes, as any SGA Member may file a petition pursuant to this clause of the infraction in question.
- III. Yes, the inclusion of the logo in question constitutes an infraction.
- IV. 1.0 points shall be assigned to the Reid 4 CAC campaign pursuant to this matter.

Discussion

The Commission considered each of the Respondent's lines of reasoning in this matter. First, that the logo as it appears in the image is not an official logo. The image depicts an icon which appears to be the [Miracle Network Dance Marathon Candle logo](#) next to the letters "OUDM". The Respondent correctly notes that this specific configuration of logo and letters does not appear in the OUDM Branding Guidelines Packet. However, the Miracle Network Dance Marathon Candle logo does appear in the packet, and apparently may be used alone in branding for OUDM. Thus, the Commission finds the inclusion of the Candle logo, regardless of the lettering that follows, to constitute use of the logo of OUDM.

Notably, even if the Commission had not found that the Candle logo alone constitutes a violation, precedent dictates that the logo and letters configuration likely constitutes a violation in its own right. The SGA Superior Court has previously held that:

“[The section of the Code relating to the use of logos] does not require that the logo or symbol be ‘official’ or ‘registered’ with the University, rather the logo or symbol must ‘represent’ the University or University entities. Candidates must remember that symbolic representation is evaluated both subjectively and objectively. A candidate with organizational familiarity may recognize such depictions as ‘unofficial.’ However, it is perhaps more important to consider that an average student is not likely to make the distinction between ‘official’ and ‘unofficial’ logos.”
[SC 2020-001 Lee v. Election Board § II. \(A\)\(2\).](#)

Second and third, the Respondent claims that the Petitioner lacks standing to file petition in this matter, as they are the registered leadership of neither OUDM nor CAC more generally. Indeed, the third sentence of the section of the Code in question states, in part, that “[o]nly the registered leadership of RSOs [Registered Student Organizations] may file a grieves [sic.] for their logo...” *SGACA* Tit. VI Ch. 4 § 25(c)(iv). Notably, however, this sentence follows the sentence implicated in this petition, barring candidates from using any logo of the SGA any branch of the SGA, or any program of the Programing Branch. *Id.* The Commission interprets this separate consideration of SGA entities and non-SGA RSOs to mean that, while candidates may receive permission to use the logo or likeness of an RSO, they may not receive permission to do so for SGA entities. OUDM is an event of the CAC, which constitutes the Programming Branch of SGA, and so the use of OUDM logos is prohibited in campaign materials.

In considering how many points to assign in this matter, the Commission considered the block of four petitions heard that evening, SP22-009, SP22-010, SP22-011, and SP22-012. Each of these petitions was filed by the present Petitioner against the present Respondent, and each alleges an infraction under the present conditions, with some differences throughout. In SP22-010, the Commission finds the Respondent acted negligently by failing to recognize the infraction and finds the full and visible inclusion of the OUDM logo to constitute a severe violation. In considering “the effect which the campaign rule violation may have had on the campaign, on other candidates, and to the campus as a whole”, the Commission accepts in part the reasoning of the Respondent that this infraction likely had a relatively small effect, and accordingly spare the Respondent the highest penalty available. *Id.* Ch. 5 § 28(b)(iv).

Accordingly, the Commission finds that a Class C infraction was committed in this case and assigns the Reid 4 CAC campaign 1.0 points. Following this judgement, the Reid 4 CAC campaign has 2.0 points total. *SP22-009.*

It is so ordered.

SGA Election Commission
Francesca 4 CAC v. Reid 4 CAC
SP22-011 27 Mar. 2022

Holding

2-0 for the Petitioner

The Reid 4 CAC campaign will be assigned 0.5 points.

Facts of the Petition

SP22-011 was submitted to the Student Government Association (hereinafter “SGA”) Election Commission (“the Commission”) regarding the Campus Activities Council (hereinafter “CAC”) Chair election, on March 23, 2022, by Alyssa Hargis on behalf of the Francesca 4 CAC campaign (hereinafter “the Petitioner”) via the “Unofficial Election Notification Form Spring 2022.” This form was established in accordance with the SGA Code Annotated (hereinafter “the Code”) to provide SGA members an electronic form for reporting election irregularities. *SGACA* Tit. VI Ch. 5 § 31. Upon review, the SGA Election Commissioner (hereinafter “the Commissioner”) determined that the form and content of the notification resembled an election complaint, and that the notification would more properly be considered as an election complaint. *Id.* The Commissioner determined that the Reid 4 CAC campaign (hereinafter “the Respondent”) was implicated in the complaint and informed the representatives of that campaign that the claim had been filed. The Respondent requested an extension to file a response to this petition and three others, which was approved by the Commission. The Respondent filed a written response on March 26, 2022, before the approved deadline.

The complaint alleges that the Respondent committed a Class C infraction using a protected logo of the University of Oklahoma or an affiliate. *Id.* Ch. 4 § 25(c)(iv). Specifically, the complaint alleges that the Respondent posted an image to the Reid 4 CAC Instagram.com account depicting the Interlocking OU and provided evidence in the form of a screen capture image apparently depicting the same.

The Respondent makes no claim to the contrary in the written response. Quoting from the response: “The Reid 4 CAC Campaign admits that there was an Instagram post by the campaign Instagram account that included an extremely small and hard-to-notice trademarked logo of the University.” They note that the logo is difficult to see, covered by a partially transparent graphic element, and partially obscured by text. Further they note that the inclusion of the logo had very little utility for the campaign, and request no points be assigned.

This petition was heard at the same meeting as SP22-009, SP22-010, and SP22-012, which all allege similar actions.

Questions Considered

- I. Has the Reid 4 CAC campaign used a logo of the University of Oklahoma and committed a Class C infraction?
- II. If so, how many points shall be assigned in this matter?

Short Answers

- I. Yes, the inclusion of the Interlocking OU logo constitutes an infraction in this case.
- II. 0.5 points shall be assigned to the Reid 4 CAC campaign in this matter.

Discussion

Reviewing the written filings in this case may give the sense that the present petition is substantially identical to SP22-009. Both petitions allege the use of the Interlocking OU logo in an Instagram.com post, a Class C infraction. In SP22-009, the Commission found that the appearance of the Interlocking OU logo on the person pictured constituted use of that logo, and the Commission finds the same to be true in this case. Though the Respondent points out, and the Commission agrees, that the logo is difficult to see at first glance, it is nevertheless visible and identifiable in the post.

The degree to which the logo was obscured in the image lead the Commission to determine that this infraction was not severe enough to warrant similar punishment to that assigned in SP22-009.

Accordingly, the Commission finds that a Class C infraction was committed in this case and assigns the Reid 4 CAC campaign 0.5 points. Following this judgement, the Reid 4 CAC campaign has 2.5 points total. *SP22-010*.

It is so ordered.

SGA Election Commission
Francesca 4 CAC v. Reid 4 CAC
SP22-012 27 Mar. 2022

Holding

2-0 for the Petitioner

The Reid 4 CAC campaign will be assigned 1.0 point.

Facts of the Petition

SP22-012 was submitted to the Student Government Association (hereinafter “SGA”) Election Commission (“the Commission”) regarding the Campus Activities Council (hereinafter “CAC”) Chair election, on March 23, 2022, by Alyssa Hargis on behalf of the Francesca 4 CAC campaign (hereinafter “the Petitioner”) via the “Unofficial Election Notification Form Spring 2022.” This form was established in accordance with the SGA Code Annotated (hereinafter “the Code”) to provide SGA members an electronic form for reporting election irregularities. *SGACA* Tit. VI Ch. 5 § 31. Upon review, the SGA Election Commissioner (hereinafter “the Commissioner”) determined that the form and content of the notification resembled an election complaint, and that the notification would more properly be considered as an election complaint. *Id.* The Commissioner determined that the Reid 4 CAC campaign (hereinafter “the Respondent”) was implicated in the complaint and informed the representatives of that campaign that the claim had been filed. The Respondent requested an extension to file a response to this petition and three others, which was approved by the Commission. The Respondent filed a written response on March 26, 2022, before the approved deadline.

The filed petition and response are both substantially identical to the complaint and response filed in SP22-012, with the notable exception that this is related to a separate post on account in question.

This petition was heard at the same meeting as SP22-009, SP22-010, and SP22-011, which all allege similar actions.

Questions Considered

- I. Shall the holding in SP22-010 apply in this case?
- II. Shall the Respondent’s permission to chalk be enjoined?

Short Answers

- I. Yes, the facts and response in this case are substantially identical to those in SP22-010. The holding in that case shall apply.
- II. No, the Respondent shall maintain their permission to chalk, subject to other election policies.

Discussion

The allegations in this case are substantially identical to those found in SP22-010. In that case, the Election Commission found that a post by the Reid 4 CAC Instagram.com account improperly displayed the logo of a program of the Programming Branch in the form of the logo in question in this petition. The text of the petitions and responses in both cases are identical save for the name of the individual pictured in each case. With this in mind, the Election Commission has decided to rest on its opinion in SP22-010, and rule accordingly.

Accordingly, the Commission finds that a Class C infraction was committed in this case and assigns the Reid 4 CAC campaign 1.0 points. Following this judgement, the Reid 4 CAC campaign has 3.5 points total. *SP22-011*.

Because the Respondent has been assigned at least three points as a result of this order, the Commission considered the question of assigning sanctions. “Once a campaign has been assigned at least three (3) points, the Election Commission may temporarily or permanently prohibit a candidate from chalking within their designate [sic.] chalking zone.” *SGACA* Tit. VI Ch. 5 § 28(d)(ii). Considering that none of the points assigned have related to chalking, the Commission finds that sanctioning chalking activities would be an ineffective means of addressing the infractions committed. While the Commission wants for better and more relevant sanction and enjoining authority in the increasingly digital campaign space, it nevertheless declines to impose any sanctions on the Respondent pursuant to this matter.

It is so ordered.

SGA Election Commission
A Petition by the Election Commissioner Regarding Initial Campaign Finance Reports
SP22-013 27 Mar. 2022

Holding

2-0 in each case that all respondents committed an infraction

Points are assigned as follows:

1.0 point assigned to the following candidates/campaigns: Tyler Givens, Lacey Lewis, Blake Hasselman, Ethan Hedrick, Yara Ketaneh, Will McCall, and Razann Ghazal

1.5 points assigned to the following candidates: Alanna Rios, Abdul Hadi Fawad, Pranay Singh, and Makenzie Toma

Note: Grant Tumey was initially named as a Respondent in this case but has since withdrawn from the election. Accordingly, no points are assessed to his campaign.

Facts of the Petition

SP22-013 was submitted to the Student Government Association (hereinafter “SGA”) Election Commission (“the Commission”) on March 25, 2022, by the SGA Election Commissioner (hereinafter “the Commissioner”) via the “Election Formal Petition Form Spring 2022. This form was established in accordance with the SGA Code Annotated (hereinafter “the Code”) to provide SGA members an electronic form for reporting suspected campaign infractions. *SGACA* Tit. VI Ch. 5 § 28. The petition states prior findings by the Commission that several candidates for office in the Spring 2022 SGA General Elections failed to file initial financial reports that were correct and complete in form, in violation of the Code. *Id.* Ch. 4 § 25(b)(vi). Quoting from the petition:

The following candidates failed to provide the Election Commission with an initial financial report before 5:00 PM on March 21, 2022, and are therefore considered to have provided an incorrect/incomplete report (SGACA Tit. VI Ch. 4 § 25(b)(vi)):

- Tyler Givens submitted a financial report at 5:58 PM on March 21, 2022, which was otherwise correct and complete.*
- Lacey Lewis submitted a financial report at 5:38 PM on March 21, 2022, which was otherwise correct and complete.*
- Blake Hasselman submitted a financial report at 5:36 PM on March 21, 2022, which was otherwise correct and complete.*

- Ethan Hedrick submitted a financial report at 5:06 PM on March 21, 2022, which was otherwise correct and complete.*
- Yara Ketaneh submitted a financial report at 5:01 PM on March 21, 2022, which was otherwise correct and complete.*
- Will McCall submitted a financial report at 5:30 PM on March 21, 2022, which was otherwise correct and complete.*
- Alanna Rios failed to submit an initial campaign financial report.* •*Grant Tumey failed to submit an initial campaign financial report.*
- Abdul Hadi Fawad failed to submit an initial campaign financial report.*
 - Pranay Singh failed to submit an initial campaign financial report.*
 - Razann Ghazal failed to submit an initial campaign financial report.*
 - Makenzie Toma failed to submit an initial campaign financial report.*

Upon review, each of these candidates was named as a Respondent to this petition and informed that they had 24-hours to file a response or request an oral hearing. After 24-hours, no candidate had requested a hearing, and the Commission received only two written responses. The first response was received from Candidate Yara Ketaneh, who attributed her late submission to receiving her invoice late from the copy shop at which she printed her campaign materials. The second response was received from Candidate Razann Ghazal, who apologized for initially failing to submit a report, and, in the same response, submitted an initial financial report. The Commission considered the petition as a unit.

Questions Considered

- I. Were the implicated candidates campaign initial financial reports incorrect or incomplete by the deadline?
- II. Shall the precedent set in FA21-016 apply?

Short Answers

- I. Yes, none of the implicated parties had a financial report on file that was correct and complete by the deadline
- II. Yes, candidates who submitted a late report shall be assigned 1.0 point, and candidates who failed to submit an initial financial report shall be assigned 1.5 points.

Discussion

In reviewing the financial reports, the Commission found unanimously in each case that the alleged infractions occurred. Regarding Candidate Ketaneh's case, while the Commission is sympathetic to the confusion that led to the late submission, we find no cause to treat it differently from other late submissions, as to do so would render the deadline functionally

obsolete. Regarding Candidate Ghazal's case, the Commission chooses to accept the initial financial report attached to the response as a late initial financial report.

Per the precedent set in [FA21-016](#), the Commission assigns 1.0 point to each candidate who submitted an initial financial report after the deadline, and 1.5 points to each candidate who failed to submit an initial financial report by the time of hearing.

It is so ordered.