

## **Team DiBrina vs. University Students' Council Elections Governance Committee**

On Tuesday, January 31st, Team DiBrina submitted a violation complaint against Team Tobi on the basis of violating Rule #2 of the Division of Housing and Ancillary Services Policy on USC Campaigning in Residence, which states:

*“Door-to-door campaigning may take place from Monday to Friday door campaigning may take place from Monday to Friday, from Monday to Friday, between any, between 4:30 pm to 8:30 pm only”*

The incident in question, included members of Team Tobi's campaign team (including the candidates themselves), breaching Rule #2 by campaigning in Essex Hall and Delaware Hall on January 28th. The Elections Governance Committee (EGC) responded to this violation submission form by sanctioning Team Tobi with a major violation for eight (8) points.

However, the EGC erred in combining both of these violations into one major violation instead of considering them separately. Given that each of the violations occurred at different residences, they should be judged differently.

In Team Sophie vs. Elections Committee 2015, Part III detailed distributing physical campaign material without consent. This violation included members of Team Litchfield's campaign team distributing campaign material without consent to both residents of 1209 Richmond Street (Somerset Place) and 1235 Richmond Street (Luxe). The Elections Committee treated these as two separate violations and classified one as major and one as minor.

During this appeal, the Elections Committee set precedence of treating violations occurring in different residences as separate. The location of the residence or infraction committed should not have any bearing on whether the Essex Hall and Delaware Hall violations are treated separately. It is our contention that both must be treated separately as Team Tobi committed the same violation twice in two separate places.

Furthermore, Team DiBrina contests that each should be determined to be a major violation. Presumably they knocked on every door of each residence, as they claim to have done with Perth Hall, meaning they had access to the 465 residents of Delaware Hall and the 508 residents of Essex Hall. Overall, this violation allowed them to potentially reach and influence

973 students or over 10% of the total voter turnout in this year's election. The source for the number of residents can be found in Appendix A.

Given that each residence provided the opportunity to influence hundreds of potential voters, the Appeals Board should determine that each be determined a major violation and sanctioned appropriately.