

**THE JUDICIAL BRANCH OF
THE STUDENT GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION OF
THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE-KNOXVILLE**

Case No. 2019-25

Impact UT, et al., Plaintiff

v.

Vols Vote Vision, Defendant

PER CURIAM

I

Campaign finances can be a controversial issue. There are many who feel disenfranchised with any electoral system in which they are a constituent; this is because the systems favor money. When those who have more of it inevitably end up in positions of power, the system continues to perpetuate itself. This leads to further constituent apathy, which leads to the same kinds of people being elected year in, year out. It is a self-fulfilling prophecy, and it happens at all levels of government. In an effort to combat this pervasive problem, UTK's SGA previously added a cap to the amount of money any campaign may spend during elections, with many strictures surrounding the what, who, and how of the ways the money is to be used.

When campaigns exceed this cap, the inherent unfair advantage they are afforded can hardly be understated. When they knowingly exceed this amount and attempt to conceal it, it is difficult to envision a more damning indictment of a campaign's integrity. Of course, most of the law lives somewhere in the gray areas. It is possible to make a series of mistakes that, while not intentional, are nonetheless violative of the rules. While these scenarios do not impugn anyone's character, they still demonstrate a level of carelessness to which some liability must attach. We believe that this is what has occurred in this case.

II

To say this election season has been the most contentious that this Court can remember would be a gross understatement. This year has seen more litigation than the last several combined. Now, we are hearing the first allegations to ever come before us after an election has concluded.

The 2019 campaign season resulted in a big victory for the Vision campaign. The presidential and vice-presidential candidates, Natalie Campbell (“Ms. Campbell”) and Isaac Holt (“Mr. Holt”) both won their respective positions by around 500 votes. Several Senators running under the Vision party were also elected, ensuring a strong mandate in the coming year.

However, the following day brought scrutiny. In particular, Impact UT, the generally second-place campaign, asked the Election Commission for a copy of all campaign’s Campaign Value Reports (“CVRs”). After close examination, Impact discovered what it believed were multiple discrepancies. They, in turn, alerted the Election Commission and filed a complaint with the Court. After their own independent analysis, the Election Commission signed on as a co-plaintiff. In all, Plaintiffs alleged a litany of violations, each of which taken together may be evidence of such gross misconduct as to have irreparably disrupted this election. We address each allegation in turn.

III A

First, Plaintiffs allege that Defendants obtained shirts used for their campaign without paying sales tax and at a steep discount. To support this claim, Plaintiffs offer a quote for a similar order from the same company, Black Gatsby Apparel (“Gatsby”), as well as a copy of the contract used to formalize the purchase of the shirts. Failure to pay sales tax, Plaintiffs contend, is a violation of state law, which in turn violates the Student Code of Conduct, which in turn violates the Election Packet. However, we find this contention wholly without merit.

While this Court is not designed to address purely legal issues, it is helpful to provide a cursory overview of how state sales tax works. Contrary to Plaintiffs’ assertions, the onus is not on the purchaser to pay sales tax; rather, it is *the seller* who must remit a portion of their income to the state. Most sales tax is paid by various purchasers simply because each seller may, under color of state or federal law, choose to “pass on” the tax to the consumer. While it might not always make economic sense to pay sales tax off the top line without collecting it from the consumer, all sellers must pay the tax regardless.

In this instance, the decision to charge sales tax lies entirely with Gatsby. Whether Gatsby chose to charge Defendants sales tax as part of their shirt purchase is of no concern to this Court. Furthermore, there is no violation of any law at any level. This claimed violation of the Election Packet cannot stand. For the same reasons, this deal cannot reasonably be construed as a donation or discount. While Plaintiffs offer a quote from Gatsby that evidences a different rate per shirt than was charged Defendants, they offer no proof that this was part of some deal. There are many factors that can determine fluctuating prices, from supply and demand issues to varying prices of materials. To engage in guesswork as to the multitude of possible reasons for these discrepancies and opine on matters of basic economics would be a fool’s errand. It cannot reasonably be maintained that this

shirt purchase is an unreported donation or discount.¹ Since there is no violation of the law and not enough evidence to support the allegations of a forged contract, we hold that the Plaintiffs' first claim fails. There is no violation here.

B

Next, Plaintiffs take issue with failure to include several cases of Red Bull on their CVR. Defendants did provide evidence that they paid approximately \$30 for the Red Bull from Hudson Anthony, a Vision campaign member and Red Bull Brand Manager. Additionally, it was explained that the drinks were not provided until *after* the final CVR report was filed; the evidence provided proves as much.² When asked by the Election Commission, Defendants provided proof of the transaction for \$30. Plaintiffs, meanwhile, maintain that this constitutes an impermissible "donation" from a "business," as defined in the Election Packet.

We dismiss outright that there is any "donation" here. Since the definition of "donation" is not specifically provided for in the Election Packet, we turn to its plain meaning. A donation necessarily implies that there was no money changing hands for the goods or service provided. The uncontroverted testimony in the record, however, shows that Vision intended at all times to pay for the Red Bull. The fact that Mr. Anthony offered the Red Bull at a steeply discounted rate does not bring it into the realm of being a donation for our purposes.³

Moreover, Plaintiffs contend that this is not a "student discount." The Election Packet also fails to provide us with a definition for this. Plaintiffs would have us hold that any "student discount" must be made available in the regular course of business and for all students. We decline to create a rule of such sweeping proportions. Plaintiffs' argument is further undermined by Mr. Anthony's testimony that he "would have given this discount to any other campaign that asked." Moreover, Mr. Anthony stated that, as a

¹ For many of the same reasons, Plaintiff's claims of a fabricated contract date are completely unsupported by the evidence. While any plaintiff is free to base their claims on nothing more than "we believe that . . .," this Court cannot seriously make its own determinations on the same dearth of information.

² To this end, next year's SGA should consider reconfiguring the timing of CVR filings, so that the last filing does not occur until after the polls are closed.

³ While this is not technically a "donation," we are worry what kinds of actions may be legitimized if this current system remains in place. As decided, we recognize campaigns could receive any amount of goods from a person or business for any amount of consideration and add it to the CVR at that recognized cost without any technical violation—their donation would be in order and their budget intact. Even still, our opinion does not foreclose that, in exceptional circumstances, a transaction that is done merely to avoid being labeled a "donation" (i.e., purchasing inordinately expensive equipment from a friend for \$1) may defeat this conclusion. The Court would invite further delineations between the two types of transactions in future Election Packets.

Brand Manager, he has full discretion to set the terms of his transactions. That each transaction may have its own unique terms makes it that much more difficult to determine when there is any “discount” being offered. In any event, Plaintiffs have offered no evidence to rebut this defense. We find that there has been no violation with regard to the Red Bull.

C

We turn next to the alleged discrepancies between hamburger and hotdog totals between what is listed on Defendant’s receipts and what was allegedly observed. These claims are pure conjecture, at best. The primary arguments appear to be that 1) because the amount of bread was not a 1:1 ratio with the hamburgers and hotdogs, there are unreported purchases; and 2) because other organizations and campaigns handed out many more grilled items in a much shorter period of time, Defendants handed out many more hamburgers and hotdogs than they claim to have bought. However, this claim would once again have us take “we believe” as cold, hard evidence of a violation. This is something we are not prepared to do.

During the hearing, Defendants offered plausible explanations for the discrepancies. There were fewer buns purchased in an effort to reduce spending, as the campaign could even hand out food without an accompanying bun with little pushback. Additionally, Defendants asserted a “quality over quantity” approach; that is, they focused on using food to bring people to their tent to meet the executive candidates and hear the campaigns ideas, rather than just handing out as many items as possible. Such a strategic use of limited resources may be unusual, but unusual campaigning does not equate to illegal campaigning.⁴

Furthermore, the evidence of “receipt splitting” does not hold water. There is nothing inherently wrong with making two purchases in consecutive transactions. Plaintiffs can only hint that this shows “[Vision] had separate receipts that were not recorded.” This is all that is shown or asserted that is not an impermissible inference. Furthermore, Ms. Campbell’s father provided uncontroverted testimony as to why two transactions were made: the campaign simply ran into an issue at the store and needed his help getting it sorted out. None of these events violate anything in the Election Packet. There is no violation with respect to the hamburgers and hotdogs.⁵

⁴ Were everyone forced to abide by “normal” campaign conventions, each campaign would operate in exactly the same manner. There would be no need for judicial hearings on any discrepancies. Moreover, there would be next to nothing distinguishing any campaign that would be apt for comparison, which is anathema to making a well-informed choice among competing groups.

⁵ We also note that some identifying information remained on receipts that were provided to both Election Commission and this Court. Failure to remove identifying information falls squarely on the Vision campaign. “In an effort to protect the confidentiality of the candidates and Parties, all account numbers

D 1

There is also an issue related to the “fatheads” that were made to promote the top three candidates that Vision fielded. Defendants admit that they made the cutouts “at Natalie’s uncle’s workplace.” Furthermore, they argue that, since this service was provided free of charge, there are no damages. This position misstates what needs to be included on a CVR.

Article E, Section VII.A.2 of the Election Packet provides that all “goods or services from a Business or individual intended to promote a particular candidate or party shall be designated as ‘Non-Monetary Donations.’ Non-Monetary Donations must be recorded in Appendix I.” As discussed in reference to other allegations, the exchange of goods or services for no consideration is a clear donation. Whether the provider would have charged \$0 in any other circumstance is irrelevant to our determination. The Election Packet is clear that *any* material that is provided exclusively to promote the campaign needs to be included in a campaign’s finances. It cannot seriously be argued that the fatheads were made for another purpose and their use during the campaign was merely incidental. Failure to report the cutouts is a violation of Election Packet Article E, Section VII.E.1.

2

A more difficult problem arises when we must determine the damages for this violation. Plaintiffs stated the value of the damages for these particular claims were “uncertain.” During the hearing, Defendants also suggested that if an item was “too difficult” to value, it may not have to be included in a CVR report. This position flies in the face of the Election Packet, general ethics, and all common sense. Valuing a certain item may be difficult, but it is not impossible; going forward, all campaigns and candidates would be wise to err on the side of caution. In a statement from Hayden Horton, who provided the material, the cost per fathead was estimated at \$0.76. This means that the total cost for the unreported fatheads was \$2.28. Therefore, Vision is deemed to have failed to report \$2.28 on their CVR for this expense.

E 1

Plaintiffs also allege that Defendants handed out multiple shaved ice treats that were also not reported on their CVR. Defendants admit that they failed to report \$4.96 of ice, but they assert that the shaved ice machine and materials were already owned by Mr. Holt’s family, as his father is a pastor and they frequently use the materials for various church events and parties. Defendants are correct in stating that the shaved ice machine itself

should be marked off all documents submitted. This includes, but is not limited to, credit card numbers of receipts and account numbers on bank statements.” Election Packet Article E, Section VII.F.2.g.

does not need to be reported on the CVR. Article E, Section VII.F.2.f. Of the Election Packet provides that “borrowed or previously owned portable stereo system [sic], personal grills, personal tents, and similar large and/or expensive objects do not have to be reported in the Campaign Value Reports as long as they are used exclusively for . . . a campaign stop and are not distributed to potential voters.”

The materials used in creating the shaved ice, however, should have been reported. To hold that ordinary foodstuffs could avoid being reported by virtue of coming from a candidate’s personal residence would necessarily invite candidates to bring as much from home as possible. This would also disproportionately benefit those candidates whose families may be independently wealthy and have access to many more materials. We therefore hold that the syrup, cups, and ice all failed to be properly reported.

2

We are again confronted with the difficulty of valuing exactly how much this expenditure was. Plaintiffs assert a cost of \$45.79. However, this number is based on a cursory price comparison from Amazon. This methodology is inherently suspect. There is no evidence that either the quantity or quality of supplies proffered by Plaintiffs is what was actually purchased or distributed. Evidence provided from Mr. Holt’s family indicates that the actual value is closer to \$9.44. We have no way to conclusively prove either value. We will therefore split the difference between the two and find that Vision failed to report materials totaling approximately \$27.87.

F 1

Plaintiffs also have provided evidence that Vision campaign members were handing out peanut butter crackers over a period of at least two hours. There are no crackers reported on Defendant’s CVR. Upon review, it appears that the crackers were originally purchased for Ms. Campbell’s personal consumption. The crackers were stored amongst campaign materials, and it is apparent the crackers were obtained and distributed accidentally. However, accidental spending is spending nonetheless. While we pass no judgment as to Defendant’s culpability in the distribution, failure to report said distribution is still a violation.

2

Fortunately, we have actual receipts indicating the cost of these crackers; unfortunately, we have no way of determining exactly how many crackers were passed out. It is undisputed that at least some of the crackers were used personally by Ms. Campbell. In order to remain consistent with our other findings, we must presume that at least half of the crackers were improperly distributed. This amounts to \$6.46 in unreported spending.

Therefore, we hold that this amount will be added to the running total of violative campaign finance expenditures.

G

Plaintiffs question the accounting practices utilized by Defendants. This, too, is purely speculative. Rather, it appears that Ms. Campbell and Mr. Holt fronted the full \$3000 in order to have cash on hand as needed. As shirt purchases came in, Vision's CVRs indicate that they deducted those costs from the total that had already been contributed. As we have previously stated, unusual campaign practices do not necessarily constitute improper campaign practices.

The allegation of anonymous donations is a much bigger problem. Anonymous donations are expressly prohibited by Election Packet Article E, Section VII.D.8. Allowing every individual payment to be deducted against Ms. Campbell and Mr. Holt's contributions could lead to a special kind of perfidiousness that we have an absolute obligation to prevent. However, Defendants are saved in this instance by one of the Plaintiffs. Evidence in the record shows that Ms. Campbell contacted the Election Commissioner before the first CVR was due to specifically inquire about this method of accounting; the Commissioner answered that this method, while unusual, would be satisfactory. While we question the wisdom of allowing campaign finances to be reported in this manner going forward, it would neither be just nor logical to find a violation for an action based on a good-faith reliance from SGA's chief election official. For these reasons, we hold there is no violation here.

H

Plaintiffs also included in their complaint an allegation that plastic name tags with printed inserts were purchased and displayed on campaign members' persons. Plaintiffs provided photos of Vision campaign members wearing such name tags pinned on their campaign shirts. No evidence was provided as to how many name tags Vision purchased. Plaintiffs argue this amounted to an unreported expense or donation and therefore a violation of the Election Packet. Defendants explained that the plastic name tags were borrowed from Ms. Campbell's father, who already owned them for personal uses. The tags were returned after use during campaign week. Vision conceded that inserts were printed for candidates. About 75 name tags were made, but most of them remained in a box during the week, as candidates chose not to wear them.

The parties centered their arguments around the "common office supplies" rule in the Election Packet. Were that the only guiding provision, perhaps the name tags would amount to a violation. However, Election Packet Article E, Section VII.A.2 provides us with the definition of "Non-Monetary Donations": "Donations, goods, or services from a

Business or individual *intended to promote a particular candidate or party* shall be designated as ‘Non-Monetary Donations.’ Non-Monetary Donations must be recorded in Appendix I” (emphasis added). These name tags were, as Defendants stated, intended for identification purposes within the campaign; no promotion intent has been found. Therefore, the name tags do not constitute a non-monetary donation under the current wording of the Election Packet. Further, the tags were returned after use, and were not “donated” as the plain meaning of the word entails. The same reasoning applies to the printed inserts used. No violation has occurred with the nametags.

I

In addition to the multiple violations of the letter of the Election Packet, there are unquestionably violations of its spirit, as well. “In determining sanctions against campaigns and individuals for violations of the election packet, the Judicial Branch will consider both the spirit and the letter of the statutes presented in the Election Packet.” Election Packet Article E, Section II.D. It has been well-established that the Election Packet operates to “ensur[e] a fair election process.” *Impact UT v. Vols Vote Vision*, Case No. 2019-12, at 2 (2019). While difficult to quantify, it is beyond doubt that unreported spending of *any amount* does not equal a fair election. As a result, we find it appropriate to sanction Defendants for two separate violations the spirit of the Election Packet: that relating to the fatheads and the shaved ice. Because it is clear that the distribution of the crackers was likely accidental, we do not find the same level of culpability necessary to impose a violation of the Election Packet’s spirit.

IV A

“Defendants at one point . . . asserted they ‘are not going to seek an opinion . . . every time they try something new.’ The Court would advise Defendants, and, indeed, all SGA candidates, not to adopt this line of thinking.” *Id.* at 3 n.4 (2019). Unfortunately, all of the violations found today could have likely been avoided by heeding this advice. To be sure, there is a tension between maximizing the amount of time spent campaigning and failing to engage in certain activity while one waits for an opinion.⁶ Resolution of this tension, however, clearly tips the scales in favor of the prophylactic measures afforded to all campaigns. As demonstrated in the results of this opinion, the persons affected would have been better off proceeding with more caution. In the future, this Court would welcome clearer rules in the Election Packet, clearer judgment by the Election

⁶ Indeed, other campaigns repeatedly asserted throughout this campaign season that events like hearings that ended up being frivolous were “wasting time that [they] could be out there campaigning.” While campaign time is indeed lost during litigation, we would stress that any potential penalty that may arise from failing to take the time to resolve the issue would in all likelihood be far more damaging than attending a hearing.

Commission, and more willingness for campaigns and candidates to consult those who enforce the rules, rather than dive headfirst into a gray area.

In sum, Defendants failed to report \$36.61 in various items. Because this amount is not incredibly excessive (especially in light of the large margin of Ms. Campbell's victory), we do not believe there is enough evidence to conclude that any "substantial irregularity" occurred so as to materially impact the overall outcome of the election. Accordingly, we instead believe that a vote reduction is in order. Because the Vision campaign as a whole benefitted from the unreported overspending, each candidate from Vision will suffer a proportional vote reduction. While debates on the merits of any particular formula are bound to be had, the Court feels that it is important to establish precedent as to how to properly calculate votes should we ever find ourselves in this unfortunate situation in the future. The method we establish today operates as follows:

The unreported amount equates to approximately 1.22% of the allowed \$3000 budget. As such, we find it appropriate to reduce each Vision candidate's vote totals by that amount. Additionally, we are adding an additional 1% deduction for each spirit violation. This, coupled with the previous 2% reduction leveled on the top three candidates, means that Vision's candidates for President, Vice President, and Student Services Director will have their votes reduced by 5.22%. Each Senatorial candidate will have their votes reduced by 3.22%.

B

Because these reductions in vote totals may affect some of the positions that were won, the Court feels it is helpful to run through each portion of the ballot, line by line, and determine the status of each seat:

Executive Officers

Student Body President

First Name	Last Name	Affiliation	Original Tally	Reductions	Final Tally
Natalie	Campbell	Vision	2875	-150	2725
Owen	Flomberg	Impact UT	2309	-46	2263
Chad	Smith	Thrive	2070		2070

Student Body Vice-
President

First Name	Last Name	Affiliation	Raw Tally	Reductions	Final Tally
Isaac	Holt	Vision	2730	-143	2587
Kaylee	Sheppard	Impact UT	2310	-46	2264
Kenzie	Bastian	Thrive	2232		2232

Student Services
Director

First Name	Last Name	Affiliation	Raw Tally	Reductions	Final Tally
Emerson	Burd	Vision	2582	-135	2447
Madison	Woods	Impact UT	2478	-50	2428
Justin	Cross	Thrive	2216		2216

No change.

Residential Senators

East Area

2019-25
Opinion of the Court

First Name	Last Name	Affiliation	Raw Tally	Reductions	Final Tally
Emily	Medford	Impact UT	450		450
Sascha	Richey	Impact UT	395		395
Zamir	Turner	Vision	317	-10	307
Haley	Dennis	Thrive	293		293
Caroline	Ong	Vision	276	-9	267
Ally	Boyte	Thrive	207		207

No change.

Central Area

First Name	Last Name	Affiliation	Raw Tally	Reductions	Final Tally
Cameron	Gracey	Vision	330	-11	319
Jaden	Hodges	Thrive	305		305
Uriah	Richey	Impact UT	294		294
Ameera	Bhatti	Impact UT	254		254

No change.

West Area

First Name	Last Name	Affiliation	Raw Tally	Reductions	Final Tally
Avery	Patterson	Vision	740	-24	716

Eli Pearson Impact UT 574 574

Nathaniel Howard Impact UT 531 531

No change.

Off-Campus

First Name	Last Name	Affiliation	Raw Tally	Reductions	Final Tally
Hannah	Blackwell	Thrive	1246		1246
Maria	Urias	Vision	1212	-39	1173
Mallika	Vohra	Vision	1207	-39	1168
Wesley	Smith	Vision	1179	-38	1141
Caroline	Waters	Vision	1154	-37	1117
Emma	Boyle	Vision	1152	-37	1115
Annelise	Brueher	Vision	1144	-37	1107
Paige	Shimer	Thrive	1105		1105
Catherine	Faulk	Thrive	1094		1094
Mary Grace	Hinton	Impact UT	1094		1094
Tonio	McKinley	Vision	1113	-36	1077
Eva	Henrikova	Vision	1100	-35	1065
Isabelle	Baker	Vision	1098	-35	1063

2019-25
Opinion of the Court

Rachl	Heckle	Thrive	1059		1059
Nikki	Hernandez	Impact UT	1030		1030
Joshua	LaTouche	Thrive	1023		1023
Christopher	Barnes	Vision	1056	-34	1022
William	Blankenship	Thrive	1009		1009
Jack	Davis	Thrive	999		999
Katie	Gouge	Impact UT	981		981
Meera	Kisan	Thrive	977		977
Foster	Slagle	Impact UT	974		974
Ashley	Moore	Impact UT	973		973
Audrey	Shrewsburg	Thrive	962		962
Ivoryna	Shutes	Thrive	948		948
Travis	Dukes	Impact UT	940		940
Taylor	Murmann	Impact UT	938		938
Serena	Smith	Impact UT	937		937
Cooper	Tentler	Impact UT	917		917
Alaia	Masri	Impact UT	914		914
Grayson	Fleshman	Impact UT	904		904
Liv	Bell	Impact UT	823		823

Aaron Northcutt Independent 387 387

Ms. Baker is no longer a duly-elected Senator. She will be replaced by Ms. Hinton.

Fraternity Park

First Name	Last Name	Affiliation	Raw Tally	Reductions	Final Tally
Ronald	Young	Vision	31	-1	30
Nico	Goldberg	Impact UT	25		25
Trent	Florey	Thrive	20		20
Jake	McKinley	Independent	13		13
Fife	Osikoya	Vision	7	0	7

No change.

Sorority Village

First Name	Last Name	Affiliation	Raw Tally	Reductions	Final Tally
Claire	Donelan	Vision	95	-3	92
Kendall	Martin	Thrive	79		79
Elise	Presberg	Impact UT	62		62
Carly	Broady	Vision	44	-1	43

No change.

Academic Senators

Architecture & Design

First Name	Last Name	Affiliation	Raw Tally	Reductions	Final Tally
Nadine	Ghezawi	Impact UT	65		65
Arden	Gillchrest	Thrive	39		39
Jessica	Rice	Vision	38	-1	37

No change.

Arts & Sciences

First Name	Last Name	Affiliation	Raw Tally	Reductions	Final Tally
Mustafa	Salameh	Impact UT	903		903
Sophia	Rhoades	Impact UT	776		776
Elijah	Ramsey	Impact UT	747		747
Noah	Smith	Impact UT	727		727
Sarah	Hodges	Vision	742	-24	718
Andrew	Fahim	Impact UT	717		717
Simon	Jolly	Impact UT	713		713
Katie	Bardwell	Impact UT	708		708

2019-25
Opinion of the Court

Kassie	Looschen	Impact UT	702		702
Carlos	Mancilla	Impact UT	694		694
Yasmine	Ly	Thrive	681		681
Neil	Patel	Vision	698	-23	675
Nisha	Zaver	Vision	691	-22	669
Clara	Miller	Impact UT	668		668
Destiny	Carter	Vision	688	-22	666
Sam	Turley	Vision	681	-22	659
Meghan	Moody	Thrive	659		659
Alissa	White	Thrive	646		646
Mariam	Husain	Thrive	641		641
Payton	White	Thrive	632		632
Blake	Turpin	Thrive	628		628
Walker	Hoover	Vision	637	-21	616
Codey	King	Vision	637	-21	616
Vasilios	Katsaitis	Thrive	613		613
Morgan	Graham	Thrive	606		606
Aruha	Khan	Thrive	605		605
Jacon	Lacy	Thrive	597		597

2019-25
Opinion of the Court

Paul	Macharia	Vision	609	-20	589
Chrystal	Pierce	Vision	598	-19	579
Symantha	Gregorash	Vision	568	-18	550

Mr. Patel is no longer a duly-elected Senator. He will be replaced by Mr. Mancilla.

Communication &
Information

First Name	Last Name	Affiliation	Raw Tally	Reductions	Final Tally
Carson	Burns	Vision	153	-5	148
Bryson	Atkins	Thrive	134		134
Joe	Staton	Impact UT	132		132
Carter	Oakley	Impact UT	129		139
Rainey	Dinsmore	Vision	122	-4	118
Thomas	Wahl	Vision	104	-3	101

No change.

EHHS

First Name	Last Name	Affiliation	Raw Tally	Reductions	Final Tally
Jonathan	Thompson	Vision	351	-11	340
Devanie	Carattini	Vision	327	-11	316

2019-25
Opinion of the Court

Julia	Schaefer	Impact UT	302	302
Caleb	Texeira	Impact UT	238	238
Simphany	Renee	Thrive	234	234
Brad	Ham	Impact UT	217	217
Noe	Monarrez	Thrive	215	215
Keith	Stipes	Thrive	209	209

No change.

College of Business

First Name	Last Name	Affiliation	Raw Tally	Reductions	Final Tally
Connor	Davis	Vision	603	-19	584
Mary	Ciochetty	Vision	602	-19	583
Michael	Banks	Vision	600	-19	581
Cailin	Bailey	Vision	565	-18	547
John Michael	Haren	Vision	536	-17	519
Drew	Hyler	Vision	536	-17	519
Liam	Robertson	Vision	514	-17	497
Savannah	Hall	Impact UT	491		491
Ian	Hall	Impact UT	444		444

2019-25
Opinion of the Court

Katelynn	Boshaw	Impact UT	422	422
Griffin	Klein	Impact UT	416	416
Zachary	Perez	Thrive	399	399
Jude	Cypher	Impact UT	395	395
Matt	Murray	Thrive	385	385
Angy	Wang	Thrive	370	370
Rachel	Walker	Thrive	363	363
Julency	Myrtill	Impact UT	360	360
Tiho	Nikolic	Impact UT	352	352
gabriel	Parish	Thrive	334	334
Jax	Taylor	Thrive	331	331
Danai	Lawson	Thrive	260	260

No change.

Agriculture

First Name	Last Name	Affiliation	Raw Tally	Reductions	Final Tally
Chloe	Ford	Thrive	201		201
Jerome	Linyear	Thrive	176		176
Leo	Spadafino	Impact UT	119		119

2019-25
Opinion of the Court

Ahmon	Watkins	Vision	113	-4	109
Kathryn	Fellhoelter	Vision	109	-4	105
Benjamin	Pritchard	Impact UT	100		100

No change.

Nursing

First Name	Last Name	Affiliation	Raw Tally	Reductions	Final Tally
Abigail	Haggard	Vision	80	-3	77
Kate	Klein	Thrive	69		69
Nicholas	Osteen	Impact UT	52		52

No change.

Social Work

First Name	Last Name	Affiliation	Raw Tally	Reductions	Final Tally
Ashlyn	Wood	Impact UT	35		35
Emma	Clancy	Vision	22	-1	21

No change.

Engineering

First Name	Last Name	Affiliation	Raw Tally	Reductions	Final Tally
Molly	Mays	Impact UT	380		380

2019-25
Opinion of the Court

Shivang	Patel	Impact UT	361		361
Raj	Patel	Thrive	333		333
Scott	Malone	Impact UT	318		318
Michael	Burnside	Vision	297	-10	287
Neel	Reeves	Impact UT	273		273
Jason	Pan	Impact UT	265		265
Matthew	Stuckey	Thrive	256		256
Will	Conroy	Thrive	251		251
Nick	Corbin	Vision	239	-8	231
Catherine	Fei	Vision	237	-8	229
Cody	Ramangkoun	Vision	236	-8	228
Brandon	Solsbee	Thrive	224		224
Rod	Tooles	Thrive	213		213
Chandler	Lampe	Vision	192	-6	186

No change.

Were it not obvious before, it should be now that major reforms are needed before next year's elections. Namely, the Election Packet must be made much more explicit, and all those involved in election must begin the campaign season with a much clearer idea of how the process is supposed to run. Hopefully, the incoming administration will take positive steps at once to ensure we do not find ourselves here again. Additionally, we feel that the results of this reduction properly reflect both the advantage that was obtained through the unreported spending, as well as an appropriate punitive measure that is proportional to the damage to the integrity not just of the election, but of SGA as

a whole, that this ordeal has caused. The table referenced above shall constitute the final, duly-elected slate of candidates-elect for the 2019-2020 SGA year.

It is so ordered.

MARSH and PAWLACZYK, JJ., took no part in the consideration of this case.