

**FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY
STUDENT ELECTIONS COMMISSION**

No: SPR-2025-6

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

March 17, 2025

*Argued 17 March 2025 and Decided on 17 March 2025.
Petitioner, Jacob Rampino. Bebe Taylor for the Respondent.
Opinions delivered electronically on 19 March 2025*

Supervisor of Elections and Chair Spencer Greenwood was in attendance. Commissioners in attendance included Andrew Barrineau, Emma Smith, Jake Still, Andrew Otanes, and Cole McLellan.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS

This action was brought before this Commission by Jacob Rampino, (“Petitioner”). Petitioner Rampino, Supervisor of Elections filed these complaints with the Supervisor of Elections and forwarded them to this Commission—alleging that Bebe Taylor, an independent campaigner (“Respondent”), is responsible for her actions violating Student Body Statute (“SBS”) §§ 710.6(c)(3), 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

Does the use of campaign materials in a manner and from a platform in violation of university policy 2.0131, F.A.C. constitute a schedule one violation under SBS § 710.6(c)(3) which prohibits using campaign materials which fail to comply with university regulations, building regulations, or fail to comply with such regulations in academic classrooms?

HOLDING

For the Petitioner.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

On or about February 26 at 11:24 p.m., Supervisor Jacob Rampino (petitioner) became aware of independent candidate, Bebe Taylor, present at a table, owned by Surge Party on “Market Wednesday.” Market Wednesday is a showcase of various student vendors who wish to sell their goods on campus. Market Wednesday requires that vendors who wish to participate must obtain RSO status before tabling at the showcase. Respondent lacked RSO status at the time she used the table at Market Wednesday. The material that Petitioner asserts qualifies as campaign material per the definition in the student body election code included (1) the table used for campaign materials as well as (2) the mere presence of the Respondent at Market Wednesday for the purpose of campaigning. This violation was evidenced by photo evidence that was gathered from the Petitioner. These photos included images of the Respondent present at the Surge table during Market Wednesday and images of the tabling list for Market Wednesday lacking specification of the Respondent’s name. The list did; however, specify “Surge Party” as a tabling RSO. Petitioner alleges that Respondent was expressly denied permission to use the Surge Party’s table. Petitioner also submitted screenshots of iMessage communications between Surge Chair, Megan McEnry and Independent Campaigner Recruiter, Ella Garcia, which detailed express denial of use of the Surge table for independent campaigners, such as the Respondent.

Respondent contends that he was acting under the complete directive of Ella Garcia. By testimony, Ella affirmed this contention. The Respondent contends that although he was aware that the table belonged to Surge party, he was unaware that they had been denied RSO status. He argues that because he was unaware of the denial that he cannot be held liable under SBS § 710.6(c)(3).

OPINION

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

ANALYSIS

SBS § 710.6(c)(3) prohibits the use of campaign materials which fail to comply with university regulations, building regulations, or fail to comply with such regulations in academic classrooms.

We reject the Respondent's argument that a lack of knowledge prevents liability under SBS § 710.6(c)(3). The statute does not require intent nor knowledge of the use of campaign materials which fail to comply with university regulations. Nonetheless, the Respondent was clearly aware of her own presence as a campaigner at Market Wednesday. We accept the Petitioner's argument that the distribution of campaign materials in a manner and from a platform which violates university policy 2.0131, F.A.C. constitutes a schedule one violation under SBS § 710.6(c)(3). We accept the contention that the Surge table and the Respondent's presence at Market Wednesday constitute "campaign materials" per the statute. We accept the Petitioner's argument that violation of university policy 2.0131, F.A.C. and thus constitutes a "failure to comply with university regulations."

CONCLUSION

Respondent is adjudicated guilty. 5-0.