Minutes
Sunday, October 6, 2013
7:00-9:45 pm

Appeal #1
Torch v. Supervisor of Elections

Torch: the statute requires that documentation of excuses be provided. Torch asked for proof of the excuses, but the Supervisor sent an email saying excuses wouldn't be required for the sessions. 710.2G.
Second issue: 703 F questions of interpretation to supreme court. It was a violation of that statute by having conversation with Lindsay. Alleging bias since Lindsay wouldn't allow torch to be part of election until day before election last year because Torch's logo looked too much like Ignite's. Also Lindsay supports Ignite supposedly. Supreme court overturned that opinion. Issue: do candidates have to attend both meetings?
SoE: simply consulted Lindsay, didn't ask for an advisory opinion. Lindsay didn't say torch couldn't be part of election. Says email doesn't exist that says he wasn't requiring excuses, that conversation happened in person. Names of the candidates who allegedly didn't attend any meetings are on the sign-in sheets. The people that attended the makeup didn't have legit excuses. But he was trying to be inclusive of all students, some of whom had to work the nights of the other meetings.
Opinion:
1) Don't have to attend both meetings. Though statute is ambiguous it seems clear it would be interpreted by most reasonable people that it is only required to attend one meeting.
2) yes statute does give Supervisor the power to have a makeup meeting (3-2) unanimous overrule the appeal.

#2
9 violations from Ignite against Torch

move to combine the violations
move to have candidates represented by their campaign manager

Ignite: 715a violation for false claims that these individuals didn't attend the required meeting. Have proof that 9 of the 11 alleged actually showed up. One person attended the makeup meeting.

Torch: Does not want violations combined because they were alleged against the individuals and not the party. Does not want to allow the ignite campaign manager to represent the individuals for the same reason. Alleges that the campaign manager forged the violations because the campaign manager submitted all of them using the individual's FSU SSNs and forged the sign in sheet. Some confusion about Janet Lorenz and Janell Laurens and another person who may or may not exist. Thrust of

appeal leading to violations was that the statute could be interpreted as requiring attendance by candidates of both meetings.

Our opinion:
Not a violation.

#3
Appeal by Torch against Supervisor of Elections.
Torch: It was unfair for SoE not to bring the appeal to the Elections Commission. Argues that the statute allows for too much bias and is unfair. There may be conflict btwn 703X and 702.2F7
SoE: 703X- doesn't have to bring appeals to us.
our opinion:
4-0 overruled