

## **ASUCSB Judicial Council Petition for Hearing**

*We the undersigned:* Nawar NemeH

*Bring attention to the actions of:* Campus United represented by Party Chair Sarah Swinnerton.

Email: [ucsbcampusunited@gmail.com](mailto:ucsbcampusunited@gmail.com) Phone: (650) 474-9856

*And draw the attention of Judicial Council to the following:*

That, throughout the 2018 A.S. Elections, Campus United engaged in practices that gave them disproportionate advantages in securing seats. The Associated Students Elections Board, when confronted with these violations, did not take measurable action to account for the advantages Campus United had that were outside of the A.S. Legal Code, and thus Campus United was able to improperly influence the A.S. Elections results, permanently damaging the integrity of Associated Students Elections.

Throughout the campaign, Campus United engaged in the slander of Isla Vista Party candidates. Evidence was provided to the Elections Board showing two different occasions where Campus United candidates engaged in slander against the Isla Vista Party, misinforming voters and telling them that the I.V. Party wanted to raise the noise ordinance to 10pm. When asked for details, the Campus United candidate stated that he was told to say that by party leadership.

Campus United candidates also actively used Associated Students as a tool towards campaigning in irreversible manners. Campus United candidates campaigned at EAB's Earth Day, an event funded through AS student fees. The Isla Vista Party specifically instructed its candidates not to seek votes in that space, understanding that it is against Associated Students Elections policy. As a result, Campus United held an unfair advantage against Isla Vista Party candidates when seeking those specific votes.

Additionally, Campus United executive candidates used their AS positions to promote their campaigns on social media, which is a strict violation of A.S. Elections Code. Isla Vista Party candidates were specifically instructed to use their positions with a direct disclaimer, which CU candidates did not do. This allowed many voters speaking with IV Party to believe that Campus United candidates were more qualified, because they alleged closer ties to the Association.

Campus United received the unique benefit of having its Facebook page promoted by the official Associated Students UCSB Facebook page. During one of the forums, Campus United livestreamed one of their candidates on Facebook, and the Associated Students page, whose posts can be seen by over 3,000 UCSB students who follow it, shared the video from CU's Facebook page. As a member of the Isla Vista Party, I talked to several voters who, as a result of that mistake, believed that Campus United and Associated Students were one and the same.

Campus United candidate Gabriella Shofet was reported to have coerced students into voting for her on several occasions. The first being when she entered the University Center and took her friends phone in order to fill out their ballot in their name, and the second was a similar incident

near HSSB. The A.S. Elections Board did not issue any decisions rectifying the potential affect her actions could have on the elections results. One of Campus United's volunteers additionally engaged in repeated verbal harassment against Isla Vista Party candidate Diego Cobos and his volunteer, to which they can provide verbal testimony.

Outside of those, it is important to note that the Isla Vista Party and other students ceased submission of complaints with the Elections Board. While we understood that the Elections Board may be taking *some* actions against Campus United, we did not see any substantial action that affected the election and equalized the status for all participants. Thus, our party members found Campus United committing a variety of other violations but determined that it was in our best interests to allow Campus United to break the rules, as it was a waste of our time to tell anyone.

Finally, the petitioner would like a full investigation of Campus United's budget expenditures. Comparing the quality of materials purchased by Campus United this year, the petitioner sees that there is a discrepancy with the budget submitted to the Elections Board, as the campaign materials could not have cost under the \$6,000 campaign limit.

*Under Associated Students By-law, policy, or constitutional clause:*

These constitute a series of violations of the A.S. Elections Code, including but not limited to:

- I.** Article XVIII, Section 5, Subsection D: Student Conduct Policy
- II.** Article XVIII, Section 5, Subsection E: Student Conduct Policy Enforcement
- III.** Article XVIII, Section 7, Subsection C-3: Use of Associated Students funds & materials

THEREFORE, *we request that the Judicial Council*

- I.** Investigate the records of Elections Boards decisions regarding every Campus United violation submitted and contacting those who submitted complaints to seek better clarity.
- II.** Issue a disqualification against UCSB Campus United and their candidates in the 2018 Spring Election, as dictated for parties that violate the Student Conduct Policy.
- III.** Outline a transparent process for elections enforcement that is not solely based on complaints and empowers the Elections Board to actively enforce the Elections Code for all students.
- IV.** Investigate Campus United's spending practices in the 2018 Election in detail and issue respective punishments if party leadership does not issue clarifying policies and evidence.

*I hereby acknowledge that the statements herein are true to the best of my knowledge.*

**Signature,**

Nawar Nemeh

Wednesday, May 23, 2018

[nawarnemeh@umail.ucsb.edu](mailto:nawarnemeh@umail.ucsb.edu)

(619) 757-4792