

Respondent: Ian Rodriguez

https://fsu.yul1.qualtrics.com/apps/single-response-reports/reports/ftiJIEG-2pcxRxOg5vGXc1b8E9ssa pXZzp0jdBQ6Y3_AkW3zAIEREY_iRtgehHMaVWhBcetECQFc0HvT8upgzYAgDEG8GaZiKfjWBikg-YBBuevV3Xa6v-9w5VDEOQptABf5ukHR43PRBnJFNK3n1x91CjGfopwpQSKANHCNbnGrqhbm0q_KSdxlyqxf-W2pzCAEvmvFjK-OhOs0tKAw6MTB00T-Jbo35AdmBQk7hZXtiLMHxtftuUukuvkciQeNS4LMDP1yrQF6Jvc7VTFRw900gWJQ9uVLNbafoGxQTvYi2kzh3G19_bpzRgIqEdexPa55DaqxXJ3WR LAhO2Jn0AA

Petitioner raises a complaint that Respondent, Ian Rodriguez, violated SBS 708.1 which falls under 710.6(C)(3) by speaking with members of the Student Body that could be interpreted as a regular non-campaigning interaction. After reviewing the evidence submitted, even though the respondent may be holding campaign materials (which I cannot determine with certainty as it is not in frame). I do not believe that petitioner has carried their burden to prove the violation by clear and convincing evidence SBS 710.4 (g).

Petitioner merely provided surface-level evidence that the interaction occurred based on the previous example, but this time nothing was audible besides a conversation. No evidence was provided showing the respondent had been actively campaigning within the building to this specific individual.

Based on the information reviewed, the alleged violation is dismissed upon lack of “clear and convincing evidence” SBS §710.4(G).

If you do not agree with the decision, it is within your right to appeal to the Electoral Commission to have it reviewed up to the Supreme Court. All students will have the option to present their case directly to the elections commission, choose a third-party to represent them, or be appointed a law student by the Supreme Court to represent their case before the Elections Commission.