March 30, 2015

Question at hand:

On March 26, 2015, the Student Elections Commission (SEC) received the following complaint:

I am calling for the double appeal process which would go to the judicial commissioners.

Ruling of the first complaint: "In a separate 8-0 ruling the SEC found True BU in violation of campaigning outside of campaign season, but, given the uniqueness of the situation, ruled in favor of issuing a Cease and Desist order to the True BU slate for usage of the Facebook page."

While ordering a Cease and Desist is going to make the election fair again for all slates, TrueBU still should receive violation points for pre-campaigning.

According to the SEC 3.4.01: Campaigns that partake in campaigning outside the campaign period will be charged a minimum of 200 but no more than 600 violation points. TrueBU was found to have pre-campaigned and should be charged with violations between 200-600 points.

In the Cease and Desist Order, the SEC also explained that this is a unique pre-campaigning situation. However, pre-campaigning utilizing social media still should counts toward violation points.

Furthermore, the likes were generated as a pre-campaign effort and gave TrueBU a unfair advantage. The page was not 'inactive' as it was a live page, which anyone could search and see. Furthermore, if anyone even viewed the Facebook page this should be considered pre-campaigning and promotion of the slate—since no other slate was able to gain the same name recognition as TrueBU by having an live campaign page. People viewing and liking the page can be seen by Facebook's "insights." Any type of activity on the Facebook page gave TrueBU a clear advantage. This doesn't make the election fair.

While TrueBU did comply with the Cease and Desist order put forth by the SEC, this does not mean they followed the rules. This clearly is an unfair advantage aimed at using a recycled name to gain an advantage.

I have already submitted photo evidence to the SEC and can resend them if needed.
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On March 26, 2015 the request for a second appeal was submitted to the Tribunal composed of three members of the SEC as well as two members of the Judicial Commission and a stand in member of Senate due to the lack of a third Judicial Commissioner. In an overwhelming majority vote the Tribunal has found the original two rulings of the SEC sufficient and decided not to hear the second appeal.