



ASUU Supreme Court

2025 Elections Grievance 003

Written Opinion

Plaintiff(s): Aynaelyssya Thomas (2025 ASUU Elections Director), Jacob Bastian

(Candidate for Attorney General), the Rose Ticket, and the ABC Ticket

Defendant(s): The Singh Ticket

Introduction:

This matter came before the ASUU Supreme Court as Elections Grievance 003, initiated by the Elections Director on behalf of the Elections Board, alongside grievances and evidence submitted by Jacob Bastian, the Rose Ticket, and the ABC Ticket, against the Singh Ticket. The complainants alleged that the respondent engaged in repeated, escalating violations of campaign conduct rules outlined in the ASUU Redbook and the 2024-2025 Elections Packet.

The controversy centers on alleged misconduct during the 2025 ASUU General Election campaign period. Specific issues included: sustained disrespect toward opposing candidates; the misuse of executive authority in campaign promises; pressuring or coercing students to vote, including by physically hovering during voting; spreading misleading or inaccurate information about election procedures and platforms; non-compliance with directives from the Elections Director; and other behaviors inconsistent with fair and respectful electioneering. Despite multiple informal interventions and warnings, the respondent's conduct allegedly continued and escalated.

The Court convened a grievance hearing on March 18, 2025, in Parlor B of the A. Ray Olpin Student Union. At this hearing, the Court considered testimonial evidence, subpoenaed records, witness statements, and oral arguments from both parties. After thorough deliberation, the Court determined that five of the nine allegations had been substantiated by a preponderance of the evidence.

This opinion is issued in accordance with the judicial authority granted to the ASUU Supreme Court under Redbook Bylaws Article III, including Sections 2.1.2, 3.2.1, and 5. The Court further exercised its discretion to interpret and enforce the Elections Packet, which governs campaign procedures, conduct, and remedies during ASUU elections.

Issues:

The Court considered the following *nine allegations* brought forward through the Writ of Certiorari and accompanying grievance materials:

1. Disrespect Toward Other Candidates — Alleged violations of Section 5.1 of the Elections Packet and Redbook Article V Section 1.1, which require candidates to show utmost respect to others.
2. Unauthorized Support from Non-RSOs — Alleged violations of endorsement policies under Section 6.3 of the Elections Packet, which prohibits endorsements from off-campus or non-registered entities.
3. Compelling or Intimidating Voters — Alleged violations of Section 5.3.2 of the Elections Packet, which prohibits hovering over or otherwise coercing active voters.
4. Spreading Misleading Information — Alleged violations of Section 5.3.1 of the Elections Packet, which prohibits dissemination of false or misleading campaign information.
5. Non-Compliance with Elections Director — Alleged violations of Section 7.2 of the Elections Packet, Redbook Article V Section 5, and other University policies.
6. Campaigning Within the Marriott Library — Alleged violations of location-based restrictions under Section 5.5 of the Elections Packet.
7. Violating Residence Hall Association (RHA) Rules — Alleged campaigning in restricted residence spaces, in violation of Section 5.6 of the Elections Packet.
8. Disobeying an Elections Committee Decision — Alleged violation of Redbook Article V Section 3.2 and Section 7.1 of the Elections Packet, which obligate candidates to comply with directives from the Elections Director and Board.
9. General Disrespect for the Elections Process — Alleged pattern of inappropriate behavior during ASUU-sponsored events and media interviews, in contravention of the Elections Packet's candidate expectations.

Ruling of Supreme Court:

The Court ruled unanimously on all nine allegations. Of the nine, five were found to be violations of the ASUU Elections Packet and Redbook by a preponderance of the evidence. Four were found not to constitute responsibility. The Court's findings on the five upheld allegations are as follows:

- **Disrespect Toward Other Candidates** — The respondent was found *responsible*. The Court determined that repeated instances of disrespect toward the Elections Director and

Associate Director constituted a violation of Section 5.1 of the Elections Packet, which requires the utmost respect for all candidates and election officials.

- **Compelling or Intimidating Voters** — The respondent was found *responsible*. Testimony from Gavin Reynolds, Kefa Abakuki, and secondhand reports provided by the Elections Board, along with subpoenaed evidence, supported the allegation that the respondent pressured or hovered over students during active voting, in violation of Section 5.3.2.
- **Spreading Misleading Information** — The respondent was found *responsible*. The Court identified continued dissemination of misleading campaign information after an informal resolution. Subpoenaed material, including communications referencing executive power, confirmed repeated violations of Section 5.3.1.
- **Non-Compliance with the Elections Director** — The respondent was found *responsible*. Kei Wong's testimony and subpoenaed documents showed clear non-compliance with directives from the Elections Director and Board, violating Section 7.2 of the Elections Packet and Article V Section 5 of the Redbook.
- **General Disrespect for the Elections Process** — The respondent was found *responsible*. Testimony from Elections Director Aynaelyssya Thomas and Associate Director Kei Wong, alongside subpoenaed communications, supported the allegation that the respondent failed to comply with expectations issued following the informal resolution of Grievance 002, in violation of Section 7.1 of the Elections Packet and Redbook Article V, Section 3.2.

The Court found the respondent *not responsible* for the remaining four allegations due to insufficient evidence to meet the threshold of a preponderance of the evidence. The Court emphasizes that this standard—more likely than not—must be satisfied for a finding of responsibility. A lack of such evidence does not exonerate the conduct alleged, nor should it be interpreted as a precedent that such actions are inherently permissible. Rather, it reflects the Court's duty to uphold procedural fairness and evidentiary rigor.

The Singh Ticket was found *not responsible* for the following four allegations:

- **Unauthorized Support from Non-RSOs** — The Court found that the alleged endorsement activity did not constitute an organizational endorsement but rather reflected the personal expression of individuals associated with the group. The evidence did not demonstrate that any non-Registered Student Organization (non-RSO) formally supported or coordinated with the Singh Ticket in violation of Section 6.3 of the Elections Packet.
- **Campaigning Within the Marriott Library** — The Court confirmed that while an A-frame sign affiliated with the Singh Ticket was briefly placed within the bounds of the

Marriott Library, it was promptly removed upon notification by elections officials. Given the respondent's cooperation and the isolated nature of the incident, the Court found that it did not rise to the level of a sanctionable offense under Section 5.5.

- **Violating Residence Hall Association (RHA) Rules** — The Elections Board presented concerns regarding potential violations in residence hall areas. However, the Court found the evidence insufficient to establish a violation of RHA campaigning restrictions as defined in Section 5.6.
- **General Disrespect for the Elections Process** — While concerns were raised about the respondent's tone and punctuality at official campaign events, the Court did not find these behaviors to constitute a violation of the Elections Packet's expectations for candidate decorum and professionalism. The conduct, though questionable in parts, did not meet the standard of severity required to uphold the allegation.

Notice on Supreme Court Ruling:

Chief Justice Gannett Fisk and Associate Justices Januel Gomez-Colon, Audrey Glende, Ryleigh Hertzberg, and Sergio Vasquez voted unanimously on all counts presented in this Opinion.

Reasoning for Opinion:

This grievance presented one of the more complex cases in recent ASUU elections history. The Court was tasked not only with evaluating multiple allegations but also with addressing them across complaints filed by several different parties. Each petitioner presented distinct arguments and sets of evidence that required careful review and individualized consideration.

At the center of this grievance lies the office of Student Body President, a position critical to representing and advocating for the interests of over 35,000 students at the University of Utah. The weight of that responsibility cannot be overstated. The population governed by this position exceeds that of over 150 municipalities across the State of Utah. Accordingly, any decision regarding the validity of the conduct of candidates aspiring to this role must be made with gravity and thorough deliberation.

It is not lost on the Court that the timing of these proceedings—after the conclusion of voting and the announcement of election results—has placed additional scrutiny on our process and decision. The Singh ticket, having won the election, stands at the center of these proceedings. However, justice and fairness in student government elections require that due process be afforded to all parties, regardless of the electoral calendar. The Supreme Court's role is not to determine outcomes based on political timing but to rule with integrity, independence, and adherence to the governing documents.

To that end, the Court deliberately chose to examine each count individually. Rather than allowing temporal events, political strategy, or the cumulative weight of accusations to influence

our findings, each alleged violation was assessed independently. This approach ensured that one violation, if proven, did not taint or color the analysis of another. The Court created analytical “bubbles” for each count—free from assumptions, external pressures, or contextual distractions—and applied a neutral and consistent evidentiary standard to all.

Moreover, the Court recognizes the foundational role of fair elections in maintaining student confidence in ASUU. Campaigns must be governed by rules, and those rules must be enforced impartially and transparently. While elections are inherently political, their administration and adjudication must not be. For that reason, the Court extended deliberation time and examined not only the evidence submitted but also the integrity of the processes involved in gathering and presenting that evidence.

This opinion thus serves two purposes: first, to resolve the specific grievances presented in EG 003, and second, to clarify and reinforce the expectations, rights, and obligations of candidates, elections officials, and the student body in future cycles. It is our hope that this decision, while bound to the facts of this case, will contribute to a more just and informed culture around ASUU elections.

Analysis of Rulings:

In this unanimous opinion, authored by Associate Justice Januel Gomez-Colon, the Defendant, the Singh Ticket, is found *responsible* for five of the nine allegations brought forth in Elections Grievance 003. Each allegation was examined under the standards set by the ASUU Redbook and the 2024–2025 Elections Packet. The Court applied a preponderance of the evidence standard to all claims, evaluating both documentary evidence and testimonial statements within the context of due process.

The following analysis outlines the reasoning for the five violations the Court upheld.

Allegation 1a & 1b: Disrespect Toward Other Candidates and Elections Officials

1a: Disrespect Toward Other Candidates

The Court unanimously found the Singh Ticket not responsible for this allegation. While several interactions with other candidates were described as terse or inappropriate, the Court determined that the evidence presented was insufficient to meet the threshold of a preponderance of the evidence required for a finding of responsibility under Section 5.1 of the Elections Packet and Redbook Article V, Section 1.1.

Complainants identified incidents such as dismissive comments made by Sunny Singh toward members of the ABC and Rose Tickets during tabling events, and a sarcastic remark in a group chat stating, “Good luck competing with reality.” The Court reviewed these and other examples and acknowledged that some conduct was unbecoming of a

candidate seeking the presidency of ASUU. However, these actions were either confined to private or semi-private spaces, or did not create a material impact on the campaigns of the Singh Ticket or their opponents. There was no clear evidence that such conduct impeded another campaign's ability to function or undermined the broader election process.

Ultimately, while some behavior fell short of the aspirational standard of professionalism and mutual respect, the evidence did not demonstrate a clear or sustained pattern of disrespect that would constitute a violation. The Court emphasizes to all future candidates that leadership requires measured conduct at all times, and even informal or internal interactions can reflect on a campaign's values and credibility.

1b: Disrespect Toward Elections Officials (Director & Associate Directors)

The Court unanimously found the Singh Ticket **responsible** for disrespecting the Elections Director and Associate Directors. While not candidates themselves, these individuals serve in roles fundamental to the fair and impartial execution of ASUU elections. The Court interprets the requirement in Section 5.1 of the Elections Packet that "candidates will show the utmost respect to all other candidates" as encompassing all participants in the elections process, including administrators. This reading is supported by Redbook Article V, Section 1.1, which emphasizes professionalism, fairness, and civility as core expectations of all participants in ASUU governance.

Testimony from Elections Director Aynaelyssya Thomas and Associate Director Kei Wong, supported by subpoenaed communications, revealed a sustained pattern of disrespect, dismissiveness, and hostility directed toward the Elections Board. Specific examples included:

- A message in a campaign group chat directed at Director Thomas reading, "You can't control everything," sent in response to a clarification of procedural expectations.
- A private message to Associate Director Wong stating, "Maybe try being neutral for once," following a dispute over flyer guidelines.
- Repeated references within campaign communications that characterized the Elections Board as "biased" or "out to get us," which were shared among team members and reinforced a narrative that delegitimized the Board's authority.

Most notably, the Singh Ticket was documented as stating, in internal campaign conversations, that they would not comply with any sanctions issued by the Court. While the Singh Ticket later claimed these statements were made in jest, the Court reiterates that the intent behind such statements is not the relevant standard. Instead, the standard

applied is that of a reasonable candidate—how a reasonable participant in the ASUU elections process would be expected to speak, behave, and respond to institutional authority. Regardless of subjective intent, public or internal remarks suggesting disregard for judicial authority erode the foundational integrity of ASUU’s student government.

The Court emphasizes that criticism of the Elections Board must be raised through the appropriate procedures—not through sarcasm, passive aggression, or group messages that disparage those fulfilling neutral, administrative roles. When such conduct is repeated and uncorrected, it constitutes not only a breach of decorum but an attack on the legitimacy of the electoral process itself.

Findings:

1a (Disrespect Toward Candidates): ***Not Responsible***

1b (Disrespect Toward Elections Board): ***Responsible***

Allegation 3: Compelling Active Voters

The Court unanimously found the Singh Ticket ***responsible*** for violating Section 5.3.2 of the 2024–2025 Elections Packet, which clearly states:

“Candidates are prohibited from compelling active voters to vote for any particular candidate.”

“Active Voter is defined as a student who is actively using the U of U voting software to cast their vote.”

The evidence presented—both testimonial and documentary—demonstrated that while the initial tactics employed by the Singh Ticket, such as distributing QR codes and encouraging civic participation, may have been within permissible bounds, those tactics were ultimately abused to the point of coercion. The Singh Ticket’s deliberate and repeated physical presence near students during the act of voting infringed on the expected norms of privacy, neutrality, and autonomy in the voting process.

Multiple witnesses, including Gavin Reynolds (Poll Ticket) and Kefa Abakuki (ABC Ticket), testified that Singh Ticket members hovered over students while they had the ballot open on their devices. In some instances, Singh Ticket members were observed offering verbal guidance or encouragement while a student was in the act of voting. These claims were supported by subpoenaed group messages in which campaign staff discussed aggressive turnout efforts, with specific direction to target students already on the ballot page. Several secondhand reports from the Elections Board further corroborated the description of high-pressure tactics coordinated through tabling efforts.

The Court acknowledges that other presidential campaigns also encouraged students to vote during tabling efforts. However, based on the evidence and testimony presented, there was no indication that any other ticket engaged in behavior that crossed into the realm of coercing active voters. While multiple campaigns used QR codes and promoted participation, the Singh Ticket was uniquely cited for their failure to respect personal space, continued presence during active voting, and direct communication with students mid-ballot.

The distinction lies in both degree and proximity. Encouraging voting is not a violation; remaining beside voters, observing their screens, and influencing their choices while voting is. The Elections Packet establishes a clear boundary to protect voter autonomy, and that boundary was breached here. The Court further held that even if such conduct was not malicious in intent, a reasonable student could perceive it as coercive or uncomfortable, especially in settings where peer dynamics or physical proximity inhibit independent decision-making.

Therefore, the Court concludes that the actions of the Singh Ticket—viewed collectively and in comparison to the conduct of other campaigns—constituted a violation of the rule prohibiting the compelling of active voters.

Finding: ***Responsible***

Allegation 4: Dissemination of False or Misleading Information

The Court unanimously found the Singh Ticket ***responsible*** for violating Section 5.3.1 of the Elections Packet, which prohibits “dissemination of false or misleading campaign information, including about campaign policies, polling data, or electoral procedures.”

Though the Singh Ticket did provide documentation and context supporting its policy goals—such as examples of meetings with administrators and references to potential university collaborations—the messaging presented to the student body during the campaign cycle crossed a threshold. Rather than clearly outlining what was aspirational versus what was achievable within the defined powers of the Executive Branch, the language used by the Singh Ticket rendered these distinctions nearly invisible. Campaign slogans, social media posts, and club outreach materials, while technically not making false claims, distilled and reframed complex processes into overpromised guarantees, thereby shaping a misleading narrative.

The misleading nature of the Singh Ticket’s messaging stemmed from how complex proposals were reduced to oversimplified and assertive slogans that distorted their feasibility. For example, platform points stated intentions to “create a shuttle-service that goes directly from campus to the Cottonwoods” and “free up near-\$600k from the ASUU

Activity Fee through shifting the burden of funding full-time ASUU staff to other University sources of revenue.” However, in outreach materials and social media posts, these nuanced policies were often transformed into statements such as ‘free ski bus’ and ‘you’ll get \$600k freed’, stripping the proposals of critical context. These phrases implied guaranteed outcomes under Executive authority, when in fact both proposals would require administrative approval, interdepartmental coordination, and financial restructuring beyond the Executive Branch’s constitutional control. By framing these initiatives as imminent or fully executable, rather than aspirational, the Singh Ticket misrepresented their capacity to deliver on campaign promises, thereby misleading voters and violating Section 5.3.1 of the Elections Packet.

This blurring of boundaries compromised the fundamental purpose of student elections, which is not only to generate engagement but to educate students on how their student government operates. The opportunity to campaign is also an opportunity to clarify—rather than distort—the role and function of ASUU’s Executive Branch. By diminishing that clarity, the Singh Ticket leveraged oversimplified rhetoric to gain political advantage. The Court found this to be a direct violation of the expectations outlined in Section 5.3.1 of the Elections Packet, which exists to preserve trust in the information environment of student elections.

During the General Elections Voting Period, Aynaelyssya Thomas, ASUU Elections Director, reported multiple complaints from both candidates and students at large regarding the Singh Ticket making false promises and misleading voters. On February 24, 2025, the Elections Board and the Singh Ticket mutually agreed upon an informal resolution which intended to address these concerns. As a result, the Singh Ticket was barred from campaigning for a period of 24 hours, to which they complied. Though the resolution included a “No Further Action” clause, which prohibited the Court from further adjudicating the Singh Ticket for those same violations prior to February 24, 2025, it also required good faith compliance after the Singh Ticket had fulfilled their informal resolution sanction. Acting in good faith implies that the Singh Ticket would adjust its approach going forward so as to not create the same disruption that initially led to this informal resolution sanction. The Court honors the terms of the informal resolution and acknowledges that it resolved these prior concerns without issue.

However, following their fulfillment of their informal resolution sanction, the Singh Ticket did not meaningfully modify its messaging. In the period immediately following their 24-hour campaign break, the Singh Ticket proceeded to take further actions in direct continuation of their prior violations. The Singh Ticket chose to continue to promote the same misleading claims, which diluted the core message of their platform, through the conclusion of the election on February 28. This continuation was viewed by the Court as a breach of the spirit—if not the letter—of the agreement. While the resolution did not

explicitly mandate revised messaging, the failure to take corrective action contradicted the good faith clause. A reasonable campaign, operating under a settlement that acknowledged harm or confusion, would have reassessed its materials or strategy. By not doing so, the Singh Ticket signaled to the Court a disregard for the corrective purpose of the agreement.

Finding: ***Responsible***

Allegation 5: Non-Compliance with the Elections Director

The Court unanimously found the Singh Ticket responsible for violating Section 7.2 of the Elections Packet, which requires all candidates to comply with “University policies, ASUU Judicial Branch rulings, and regulations set by the Elections Director.” The Elections Director, acting in coordination with the Elections Board and under the authority granted by Redbook Article V, Section 5, has the power to set and enforce election rules as they pertain to all candidates.

In this case, the Court was presented with extensive evidence demonstrating that the Singh Ticket consistently disregarded instructions, expectations, and procedural guidance from the Elections Director. Testimony from Associate Elections Director Kei Wong, corroborated by subpoenaed messages and internal communications, established a timeline of repeated non-compliance, including failure to respond promptly to official emails, ignoring tabling boundaries after clarification, and disregarding specific advisories issued after campaign complaints. One notable example included the Singh Ticket’s failure to revise their campaign messaging following the informal resolution on February 24, 2025—despite being verbally advised to do so by Director Thomas. Another instance occurred on February 21, when Singh campaign members continued to use a club’s email list to promote their platform after being explicitly warned by the Elections Board that such outreach was not permitted without prior consent from the organization and the Board. Additionally, last-minute and incomplete responses to clarification requests—such as the Singh Ticket’s delayed response regarding the content of their A-frame signage—created logistical difficulties for elections enforcement and obstructed the Board’s ability to effectively administer a fair and orderly election.

Subpoenaed documents provided a compelling trail of correspondence indicating that the Elections Director and her associates made several good-faith efforts to guide the Singh Ticket toward compliance. Instead of taking these opportunities to resolve misunderstandings or conflicts, the campaign’s responses were often dismissive, argumentative, or selectively responsive. These behaviors, considered collectively, did not reflect a sincere attempt to comply with the Elections Director’s expectations, but rather a pattern of passive resistance that burdened the Elections Board’s ability to administer a fair and orderly election.

The Court emphasized that compliance is not measured merely by the absence of overt defiance—it includes active cooperation and timely adherence to the guidelines and processes established by the Elections Board’s authority. Given the repeated nature of the non-compliance, and the reasonable nature of the Elections Director’s expectations, the Court found that the Singh Ticket failed to meet this standard.

Finding: ***Responsible***

Allegation 8: Disobeying an Elections Committee Decision

The Court unanimously found the Singh Ticket responsible for violating Section 7.1 of the Elections Packet and Redbook Article V, Section 3.2, which obligate candidates to follow decisions rendered by the Elections Committee and Elections Director when those decisions are consistent with ASUU governing documents.

This allegation stemmed from the Singh Ticket’s failure to adhere to an administrative directive related to campaign messaging. After the informal resolution of Grievance 002 was signed, the Elections Director issued an advisory intended to maintain the terms of that agreement and preserve the neutral administration of the final days of the election. Though that resolution itself did not impose penalties or find fault, it did signal that the Singh Ticket’s prior messaging had raised substantial concerns requiring corrective action. The Court viewed this advisory—and the reasonable expectations that followed—as carrying the weight of a decision issued under the Director’s enforcement authority.

Despite this, the Singh Ticket proceeded in a manner that the Elections Board interpreted as inconsistent with the terms and spirit of the resolution. While the Singh Ticket may have believed they were still operating within allowable bounds, their decision to continue disseminating the same campaign messaging—including announcements and comments posted on social media stating “I see almost \$600k begging to be freed up from the ASUU budget for them clubs...” and “TAKES 20 SECONDS PLEASE VOTE FOR A SKI SHUTTLE”—constituted, in effect, a defiance of the resolution’s outcome and the Elections Director’s associated guidance. This messaging persisted after the February 24 informal resolution and remained publicly accessible through the close of the election on February 28, despite the original grievance having been raised on these exact grounds.

Testimony from Elections Director Aynaelyssya Thomas and Associate Director Kei Wong confirmed that the Elections Board had explicitly communicated to the Singh Ticket during and after the resolution process that they were expected to act in good faith and avoid further confusion regarding the scope of executive powers. The Elections Director specifically referenced a February 25 conversation in which she advised the Singh Ticket to refrain from using language that suggested unilateral control over student

fees or university transit systems. The Court found that the Singh Ticket’s continuation of the same claims constituted a clear failure to adhere to the expectations set forth in both the agreement and the Elections Director’s direct advisories.

The Court emphasizes that candidates are not permitted to selectively interpret or ignore directives issued by the Elections Committee. Decisions and resolutions—formal or informal—are part of a system designed to prevent escalation, reduce conflict, and maintain fairness. Disregarding the outcomes of these processes threatens the legitimacy of elections governance and creates a precedent of noncompliance that, if unaddressed, could significantly impair future enforcement.

Therefore, the Court finds that the Singh Ticket disobeyed an Elections Committee decision and the reasonable post-resolution expectations that followed.

Finding: ***Responsible***

The following analysis outlines the reasoning for the four violations the Court did not uphold.

Allegation 2: Unauthorized Support from Non-RSOs

The Court unanimously found the Singh Ticket ***not responsible*** for violating Section 6.3 of the Elections Packet, which prohibits endorsements from non-Registered Student Organizations (non-RSOs) and off-campus entities. Precedent from Elections Grievance 009 (2023) reinforced the seriousness of this restriction, stating that “endorsements from university employees who are not enrolled students in the ASUU, or any off-campus entities, are strictly forbidden,” and emphasizing that endorsements will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

In the case at hand, the primary evidence was a campaign video that included a brief clip—approximately two seconds—of ski patrollers saying “Vote for Singh.” The Court carefully considered whether this moment constituted a prohibited external endorsement. While individual endorsements by those outside of ASUU membership or university status are generally impermissible, the Court found that this specific instance did not rise to the level of a violation. There was no indication that the individuals were speaking on behalf of an organization, nor was their inclusion prominent or persuasive enough to reasonably influence a student's vote. The appearance was brief, lacking context, and insufficient to convince a reasonable voter that the ski patrollers' views should guide their electoral decision.

Additionally, the Court reviewed evidence that a Community Assistant (CA) within Housing & Residential Education shared a Singh Ticket campaign flyer in a group chat with other CAs. While the Elections Packet prohibits the use of institutional influence to

advance campaigns, the Court found no substantiated evidence that this action was instigated, coordinated, or encouraged by the Singh Ticket. There was no indication that the campaign had knowledge of or consented to the distribution, and no testimony or subpoenaed materials linked the campaign's conduct to the behavior of the CA. As such, the responsibility for this act remained with the individual, and could not be fairly attributed to the Singh Ticket. The Elections Packet holds candidates accountable for the conduct of campaign staff and affiliates, but does not extend liability to all third-party actions beyond the campaign's knowledge or control.

However, the Court finds it necessary to reiterate the critical importance of proactive candidate responsibility. While this case did not meet the threshold for a finding of responsibility, it exposed a potential gray area in how informal or unsolicited support may influence elections. Candidates must take meaningful steps to discourage unauthorized advocacy by individuals—especially those in professional roles or positions of perceived authority. Furthermore, the Court affirms that individual endorsements from persons outside the University of Utah community are prohibited under the Elections Packet. The only reason this instance did not result in a violation was because the Court determined that a reasonable voter would not have been meaningfully swayed by the brief, two-second video clip of ski patrollers saying “Vote for Singh.” The content lacked organizational context, continuity, and persuasive weight.

In future cases, similar conduct may warrant responsibility if a campaign fails to draw clear boundaries between itself and external advocates, or if the appearance of influence is stronger or more sustained. Campaigns must safeguard the fairness of elections by setting firm expectations and correcting problematic behavior, even when done by individuals acting independently.

Finding: ***Not Responsible***

Allegation 6: Campaigning Within the Marriott Library

The Court unanimously found the Singh Ticket ***not responsible*** for violating Section 5.5 of the Elections Packet, which prohibits campaign materials or activities within designated restricted zones, including the Marriott Library. The policy enforces a 75-foot boundary from any library entrance, within which no campaign signage or activity is permitted.

In this case, the evidence presented involved an A-frame sign placed within the 75-foot restricted boundary outside the Marriott Library. The Elections Board issued a notice to the Singh Ticket shortly after the infraction was observed, and the sign was promptly removed. The Court recognizes and appreciates the campaign's immediate compliance upon receiving the warning. Given the isolated nature of the violation, the lack of further

infractions, and the respondent's timely response, the Court determined that the conduct did not rise to the level of a sanctionable offense.

However, the Court strongly cautions future candidates against viewing this outcome as an endorsement of the “warn-and-correct” approach to rule compliance. The existence of a warning mechanism does not grant permission to test or bend campaign boundaries. Candidates must not operate under the assumption that violations will be excused so long as they cease after notice. This mindset invites unnecessary strain on elections enforcement and diminishes fairness for those campaigns who rigorously self-regulate.

As reiterated in prior case precedent, including Elections Grievance 009 (2023), the Elections Packet includes a “Do Not Assume” clause, which places the burden on candidates to seek clarification when uncertain. The Court urges all future campaigns to adopt a compliance-first approach: when in doubt, ask—do not assume.

Finding: ***Not Responsible***

Allegation 7: Violating Residence Hall Association (RHA) Rules

The Court unanimously found the Singh Ticket ***not responsible*** for violating Section 5.6 of the Elections Packet, which governs campaign activity within residence halls and other Housing & Residential Education (HRE) spaces. The Elections Packet prohibits candidates from campaigning in non-public areas of residence halls, including any space not accessible to the general student population.

The allegation centered around a report that a Community Assistant (CA) shared a campaign flyer promoting the Singh Ticket in a group chat with other CAs. However, consistent with the Court's reasoning in Allegation 2, there was insufficient evidence to substantiate that this act was coordinated by, initiated by, or otherwise influenced by the Singh Ticket. No subpoenaed communications, testimony, or circumstantial evidence linked the campaign to the CA's decision to share the flyer. Accordingly, the Court determined that this act was performed independently of the campaign and could not be attributed to the Singh Ticket.

While the Court acknowledges the potential for confusion or inadvertent violations when campaign materials are disseminated by individuals in university-affiliated roles, the standard for responsibility requires affirmative linkage or influence. In this case, that standard was not met. The Court reiterates, however, that candidates must actively educate their supporters—especially those affiliated with university departments—about the boundaries of appropriate campaign activity. Campaigns that fail to do so risk enabling third-party conduct that could cross into prohibited zones.

Finding: ***Not Responsible***

Allegation 9: General Disrespect for the Elections Process

The Court unanimously found the Singh Ticket ***not responsible*** for violating the general expectations of professionalism and decorum under the Elections Packet’s candidate conduct provisions, including Section 5.1 and the broader standards of respectful participation implied throughout the elections process.

This allegation focused on a pattern of alleged behavior by the Singh Ticket, including lateness to campaign events such as the Platform Statement and Presidential Debate, and alleged rudeness or dismissiveness during interactions with members of the press and the Elections Board. While such conduct, if demonstrated to be pervasive or malicious, could undermine the integrity and tone of the electoral process, the Court determined that the evidence presented did not rise to the level necessary to support a finding of responsibility.

The Court reviewed timing records, communication logs, and witness testimony. It found that while some instances of tardiness and tone were unprofessional or disruptive, they did not constitute intentional disrespect or violations of procedural obligations. The Elections Packet does not assign specific penalties for minor punctuality issues, and the Court was not presented with sufficient evidence that any specific comments or interactions constituted harassment, targeted disrespect, or obstruction.

That said, the Court affirms the importance of candidate decorum in fostering a fair, respectful, and inclusive elections environment. While this allegation was not upheld, the Court urges future candidates to be mindful that their conduct—especially in high-visibility roles such as presidential campaigns—sets the tone for engagement within ASUU and can either strengthen or weaken institutional legitimacy.

Finding: ***Not Responsible***

Sanctions:

The ASUU Supreme Court has voted *unanimously* to issue the Singh Ticket the following *two sanctions*:

All students who voted for the Singh Ticket will be informed of the Court’s findings and allowed to reconsider their vote. Student voters who originally voted for the Singh Ticket may reconsider their vote and take one of the following actions: 1) leave their vote with the Singh ticket; 2) vote for one of the other parties (the Rose Ticket or the ABC Ticket); or, 3) remove their vote entirely.

- a. An email will be sent out to every student who originally voted for the Singh Ticket, which will include a copy of this decision of the Supreme Court. It will also inform these students of the opportunity to reconsider their vote now that they are fully aware of the Singh Ticket's violations.
 - b. This ballot shall only be open to students who originally voted for the Singh Ticket. No new votes will be cast, and no other students will be permitted to amend their vote.
 - c. The opportunity to reconsider the vote will be open to these students for three (3) days (the "reconsideration deadline").
 - d. Any students who take no action by the voting deadline, after receiving this email, will not have any changes made to their original vote and it will stay with the Singh Ticket.
 - e. The Rose Ticket and the ABC Ticket may post a copy of this Supreme Court decision on their social media site two days before the vote reconsideration period opens. No further narrative about this decision will be included in the post and tickets may not conduct any further campaigning to voters around this or any other issue. These posts will be allowed to go up at least 2 days before voting reopens.
 - f. Any strong evidence brought forth proving that one of the presidential tickets has been campaigning will result in the removal of that ticket from consideration.
 - g. All voting will be final once the reconsideration period ends, and the resulting vote count will stand. The Ticket with the most votes in their favor once the re-voting ballot closes will be elected as the incoming ASUU Presidency to be inaugurated in April 2025.
2. The Singh Ticket must publish a copy of this Supreme Court decision on their social media website without further comment or narrative concerning the decision and without any further campaigning to ticket followers. In addition to posting the decision, the Singh Ticket will include a sincere written apology for their actions which have resulted in this decision.
 - a. The Singh Ticket's formal announcement of the Court's ruling and the apology must be published at least 2 days before the re-voting period begins, allowing students time to be fully informed of the circumstances before re-voting.
 - b. A separate formal letter of apology must be written by Sunny Singh and directed to the Elections Director (Aynaelyssya Thomas) and the Elections Associate Director (Kei Man Wong), apologizing for his attitude and behavior directed towards them

throughout the 2025 ASUU Elections process, specifically acknowledging his disobedience of the elections guidelines despite being given multiple warnings.

- c. Both of these statements must be formally approved by the Court before publishing.

Reasoning for Sanctions:

While the Court deliberated on each allegation independently—ensuring that each count was weighed solely on its own evidentiary merits—the question of sanctions required a more holistic approach. Sanctions cannot be assessed in isolation from the broader context in which the violations occurred. Thus, in crafting an appropriate remedy, the Court considered the totality of the conduct, the timing and nature of the election, and the principles of fairness and accountability that guide ASUU’s democratic process.

Individually, many of the upheld allegations could have warranted minor corrective sanctions, such as formal warnings or required clarifications. However, viewed collectively, the conduct of the Singh Ticket reflected a pattern of disregard for the spirit and structure of the election process. The five violations found by this Court—spanning from voter influence to persistent non-compliance with the Elections Director—created a cumulative harm that could not be addressed by piecemeal remedies. The allegations did not occur in a vacuum, and their combined impact compromised both the informational clarity available to voters and the institutional integrity of the election.

The Court also faced a unique procedural challenge: by the time these findings were rendered, the general election had concluded, and the Singh Ticket had already been declared the winner. This placed significant constraints on the Court’s sanctioning authority. A full disqualification, while considered, was deemed by the Court to be an extreme and final measure. Though the violations were serious enough to merit disqualification, such a sanction would circumvent the will of the electorate and potentially undermine confidence in ASUU’s representative process.

Instead, the Court chose a sanction that aligns with the principles of student voice, informed consent, and democratic integrity. Several of the upheld allegations—particularly the dissemination of misleading information and the coercion of active voters—introduced asymmetries of information and influence that may have affected how students voted. In light of this, the Court found it just and proper to return agency to the voters themselves, allowing those who initially voted for the Singh Ticket the opportunity to affirm, recast, or rescind their vote with full knowledge of the violations.

In addition to the voting remedy, the Court determined that the disrespect shown toward the Elections Board and the elections process itself warranted a public response. The Elections Director and Associate Director are not merely administrative actors—they are stewards of fairness, and disrespect directed toward them erodes the authority and neutrality of the election

system. For this reason, a formal apology and public acknowledgment of wrongdoing were included in the final sanctions.

In all, the sanctions imposed by the Court are designed to uphold accountability, restore confidence in the electoral process, and preserve the right of the student body to select its representatives under conditions of fairness, transparency, integrity, and respect.