

**FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY
STUDENT ELECTIONS COMMISSION**

No: AV 21 – FY25

Jordan Brown, Petitioner v.
ForwardFSU, Respondent.

October 31, 2025

*Argued 28 October, 2025 and Decided on 28 October, 2025.
For Petitioner Jordan Brown and Riley Perantoni. Logan
Rubenstein and Faisal Lalani for the Respondent. Opinions
delivered electronically on 31 October, 2025.*

*Supervisor of Elections Sara Larancuent was in
attendance. Commissioners in attendance included Angel
Colon, Serena Cochran, Nathan Grodsky, and Ethan
Schaefer.*

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS

Jordan Brown (“Petitioner”) brought forward this claim against ForwardFSU (“Respondent”), as a party, regarding Violations of FSU SGA Election Code Sections 705.1, 705.2, and 705.4; Violations regarding the Student Code of Conduct, Sections 3(e), 3(f), 3(m), 3(s); and a Violation of an FSU Regulation, 6C2R-3.004.

JURISDICTION

The Elections Commission has the power to investigate and make findings of fact regarding alleged violations of the Elections Code pursuant to SBS §703.2(f) and §703.2(g). Chapter 700 of the SBS states, “Once the date of an election has been determined, according to 705.4 and 706.5, the election code used for that election cannot be changed. The Election Code will be enforced in a time period beginning three (3) weeks prior to an election and ending upon the certification of that election. This does not preclude the reporting of violations later enumerated in Chapter 711.”

RIGHT TO APPEAL

According to SBS §703.2(i), “Any decision made by the Elections Commission may be appealed by a party to the hearing to the Student Supreme Court no later than thirty-six (36) hours after said decision and all accompanying opinions have posted to the SGA website pursuant to Chapter §703.2(f)(1) of the Student Body Statutes. No appeals of decisions made by the Elections Commission shall be accepted after this thirty-six (36) hour period.”

ISSUE

May factual allegations that are linked to fabricated Codes be deliberated upon for their substance in light of a Motion to Dismiss?

HOLDING

No. Commissioners rule on minimally sufficient claims and grant dismissal when Respondent raises a motion to dismiss.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Petitioners raised claims against Respondent, who moved to dismiss the allegations prior to the hearing claiming: (1) that the SGA Election Codes were fabricated and (2) that the Election Commission may not deliberate violations of the Student Code of Conduct.

OPINION

COMMISSIONER Schaefer delivers the opinion on behalf of the Commission, with whom VICE-CHAIR Still, and COMMISSIONERS Cochran, Colon, and Grodsky join.

ANALYSIS

The specifics of the alleged rules and their actual counterparts are unnecessary. Where Violations are linked to fabricated rules and the Respondent makes the court aware by a Motion to Dismiss, that Motion will be granted. As to the claims arising from outside The Commissions Jurisdiction, those claims will be left to the appropriate Forum by Petitioners prerogative.

CONCLUSION

Motion to Dismiss Granted. The Commission rules in favor of Respondent 4-0.