

**FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY  
STUDENT ELECTIONS COMMISSION**

---

No's:                    SPR-2025-2  
                              SPR-2025-7  
                              SPR-2025-9

---

Attorney General Christian Velasquez, on behalf of Jacob  
Rampino, Supervisor of Elections & Florida State  
University Student Government Association, Petitioner

v.

Brooke Taylor, Bebe Taylor, Jeffery Dominick,  
Respondents.

March 17, 2025

*Argued 17 March 2025 and Decided on 17 March 2025.  
Attorney General with Supervisor of Elections for the  
Petitioner. Brooke Taylor, Bebe Taylor, Jeffery Dominick  
for Respondents. Opinions delivered electronically on 19  
March 2025.*

*Supervisor of Elections and Chair Jacob Rampino was in  
attendance. Commissioners in attendance included, Vice-  
Chair Andrew Barrineau, Cole McLellan, Andrew Otones,  
Emma Smith, and Jake Still.*

## SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS

This action was brought before this Commission by Jacob Rampino on behalf of The Florida State University Student Government Association, in his role as supervisor of elections. (“Petitioner”). As the Supervisor of Elections the Petitioner forwarded the allegations to this Commission—alleging that Brooke Taylor, Bebe Taylor, Jeffery Dominick, Non-party affiliated candidates representing RunIndependentFSU (“Respondents”), are responsible for actions that violated Student Body Statute (“SBS”) § 710.6(d)(5), one count for each respondent for not following the rules and regulations of the Student Body Statutes.

## 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

Under SBS § 710.6(d)(5) does an independent candidate perform an activity that would intentionally place another party or candidate in violation of the election code, when they improperly use and campaign at a Registered Student Organization belonging to another political party during Market Wednesday in violation of SBS § 710.6(c)(3).

## HOLDING

For the Respondents.

## FACTUAL BACKGROUND

On February 26 at 11:24 a.m., Respondents were found tabling at Markey Wednesday utilizing the Surge Party's Registered Student Organization status to obtain a space and table at the event. Surge is a Florida State University political organization, that has historically run candidates in Student Government Association elections. Surge chair Megan McEnery did not authorize the use of Surge's RSO status to table at Market Wednesday for the RunIndependentFSU candidates.

Ella Garcia, a Florida State University student not running as a candidate, organized the collection and placement of the table. Garcia was in direct contact with Party Chair McEnery preceding the event of the alleged violation. Garcia never received official confirmation that the use of the table was allowed from Surge Chair Megan McEnery.

Garcia relayed to the Respondents that the use of the table at Market Wednesday was allowed following a zoom meeting in the days before the event of the alleged violation, no further clarification was sought by Ms. Garcia with Surge Chair on the day of the event.

Respondents procured the table from Raeshaun Coonce, Student Program Coordinator of the Office of Student Organizations & Involvement, by Surge Party's External Affairs Vice-Chair Josiah Rivette, a Florida State University Student.

All Respondents were under the understanding that their use of the table was permitted by surge party, and that they received permission to be in the place they were at the time of the violation. Following a short period of time the parties to these allegations were made aware of the claimed violations, and the table was taken down and respondents disbanded.

## OPINION

COMMISSIONER OTANES delivers the opinion on behalf of the Court, with whom VICE-CHAIR BARRINEAU, and COMMISSIONERS MCLELLAN, SMITH, and STILL join.

## ANALYSIS

We reject the Petitioner's argument that the Respondents actions amounted to activities that places another party or candidate in violation of the election code. The committee moves to DISMISS with this opinion for clarification.

The statute plainly states that for the actions to constitute a violation they must "intentionally place another party or candidate in violation of the election code." SBS § 710.6(d)(5). While the Petitioner alleged that the Respondents in their actions broke posting violations for candidates under SBS 710.6.(c)(3), and this commission found in favor of the Petitioners for this violation, we have not found that the Petitioners satisfied the burden of evidence against the respondent. Despite the alleged violations arising from the same event, there is no evidence to support that the Respondents behaved in such a way that would have intentionally placed Surge Party and other independent candidates at risk of violating any relevant election codes.

It is the opinion of this committee that the government did not sufficiently state a harm that the Surge Party or other independent candidates suffered rising out of Respondents Action. Respondents' behavior

while improper, and a violation of posting guidelines, was additionally unintentional.

Due to the failure of the government to state the harm suffered, and if we are to look at the evidence in the most favorable light to the Respondents finding that their actions were unintentional. A ruling in favor of Petitioners is untenable. We find the respondents not guilty of the violation alleged.

### CONCLUSION

Respondent is adjudicated not guilty. 5-0.