

After reviewing the evidence you submitted, this alleged violation does not constitute a violation of the Student Body Statutes.

The complaint appears to rest on the assertion that, because the individual holds an office, any public statement made by that individual constitutes an official pronouncement or campaign activity attributable to a political party. However, the mere possession of a title does not render every statement an official act, nor does it automatically place the individual in an official campaign capacity. Holding office does not eliminate First Amendment protections, nor does it transform personal opinion into institutional advocacy.

Further, the materials provided do not demonstrate campaigning as defined by the Student Body Statutes. The evidence reflects that the individual expressed a personal opinion. There is no indication that the individual urged others to support, vote for, or otherwise take electoral action in favor of any candidate or party. An expression of opinion, without an express appeal for votes or advocacy for electoral success, does not constitute campaigning under the applicable statutes.

Additionally, the complaint suggests party affiliation or officer status as a basis for liability. In *Ohja v. ForwardFSU*, the Student Court addressed the definition of an “officer” for purposes of Title VII liability. The Court rejected an overly broad, functional interpretation and emphasized the statutory language requiring that a person be “acting as an officer of a party.” SBS § 719(5)(c)(1). The statute does not impose liability merely because a person holds a title, nor because a person acts in a manner similar to what an officer might do. Rather, liability attaches only where an individual is formally acting as an officer of a registered political party.

In this matter, the individual is not listed as a member or officer in any of the party registration materials submitted. There is no evidence establishing formal affiliation or that the individual was acting in an official party capacity at the time of the statement.

Because the evidence does not demonstrate campaigning, solicitation of support, or official action attributable to a registered political party under the Student Body Statutes, the alleged violation is denied.

Accordingly, this case is dismissed.

[Download as PDF](#)

***URL to view
Results***

[\[Click Here\]](#)

Response Summary:

Q2.

The Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida 32306-4027

Alleged Violation Information

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>Candidate or Party in alleged violation:</i> | Carson Dale, LegacyFSU, Ian Seibert |
| <i>Statute Allegedly Broken:</i> | Chapter 709.4 (a)(1) Chapter 710.6 (d)(4) Chapter 710.6 (d)(7) Chapter 710.6 (d)(8) Chapter 710.6 (e)(3) Chapter 710. 4(c)(1)-(2) |

Q4. Violations may only be filed up to two (2) business days after their discovery by the party alleging.

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>Discovery Date/Time:</i> | 02/08/2026 at 4:28 PM |
| <i>Location of the Violation:</i> | 1105 E Lafayette St, Tallahassee, FL 32301 |

Q5. Please present any arguments for this alleged violation along with any relevant evidence.

On or about February 6, during the Fight Against Suicide Fight Night event, Student Body President Carson Dale publicly endorsed Ian Seibert for Student Body President.

At the event, Current Student Body President Carson Dale stated:

“I am Carson Dale, the current Student Body President. Ian’s put a whole lot of work in this, and it sure is giving Student Body President.”

At the time of the endorsement, Carson Dale

Was acting in his official capacity as Student Body President

The endorsement was made publicly and explicitly, identifying both Carson Dale’s official title and Ian Seibert’s candidacy.

The campaign constitutes impermissible campaigning:

Carson Dale’s statement was not educational, neutral, or informational. It was a direct endorsement of a declared candidate for Student Body President. By explicitly identifying himself as “the current Student Body President,” Dale invoked the authority and platform of an SGA entity, which is expressly prohibited under Chapter 709 §4(a)(1).

The endorsement utilized SGA resources and platforms to support a candidate, in violation of Chapter 710 Schedule 2 §§6(d)(8)

Arguably, if one is given the authority to narrate a video showcasing the E-board of a political party, otherwise known as LegacyFSU, they have been delegated authority to advance the interests of said political party; this is, quite literally, the definition of an officer.

The endorsement was not incidental or private; it was public, intentional, and made in a context that directly advanced the candidate’s campaign.

Furthermore, this statement was made by Carson Dale on 02/06/2026, about 16

days before the election period was set to begin, or about 2 weeks. Chapter 701.1 (a): Campaigning shall be defined as the distribution of campaign materials, use of campaign materials, or the solicitation of support for or against a ballot item, political party, or candidate for an elected office of the Student Body. Campaigning shall begin on Monday at 12 a.m., one week prior to the day of the Election.

Carson Dale, acting as an officer of the political party LegacyFSU, violated the processes outlined in Chapter 705.1 (c): Election Procedures of Student Body Statutes and Chapter 710.6 (d)(4).

The facts establish that Carson Dale, acting in his official capacity as Student Body President, engaged in prohibited campaigning by explicitly endorsing a candidate at an event promoted by a political party and its officers, and by perpetuating it as an affiliated event of the political party LegacyFSU. This conduct violates Chapter 709 and Chapter 710 of the Elections Code.

Because the endorsement materially benefited a political party's candidate and reflects conduct that undermines the neutrality of SGA institutions, and because the individual, Carson Dale, acted as an officer of the party, in collaboration with more than one member (Ian Seibert) of the same party, the violation may properly be alleged against the party under Chapter 710. 4(c)(1)-(2).

Accordingly, sufficient grounds exist for a party-level election violation and the imposition of appropriate penalties under the Elections Code

Q8. Please upload any specific evidence. Combine any individual files into a single .pdf file. This is not required, but strongly recommended. The Supervisor of Elections will consider a lack of presented evidence as grounds for dismissal of the violation. Such a decision may be appealed to the Elections Commission within twenty-four (24) hours.

[\[Click here\]](#)

Q7. Please list any witnesses you may call upon for support of the allegation. Witnesses before a hearing of the Elections Commission must sign in with the Supervisor of Elections within one (1) hour of the scheduled hearing.

N/A

Q6. Signature

| | |
|----------------|----------------|
| Name: | Bella Rios |
| EMPLID: | 201201222 |
| Email: | btr24a@fsu.edu |

Embedded Data:

| | |
|-------------------|--------|
| First Name | btr24a |
| Last Name | btr24a |

