

Attendees: Mike Stearney, Stephany Haack, Adrian Canilho-Burke, Kristine Alvarez

Meeting Convened: 3:50 p.m.

- Discussed whether it Student Court needed to attend Student Senate Emergency meeting
 - Reasons to attend: this would be an opportunity to explain to Student Senate our rationale for revisions made to President Heba's referendum. Otherwise Senate would only be exposed to one side of the issue. This would also be an opportunity to rebuttal complaints of miscommunication expressed by the Present and members of Student Senate.
 - Reasons not to attend: The executive and legislative branch lack the authority to summon the judicial branch. It is Student Courts obligation to ensure neutrality; therefore, the Court reserves the authority to ensure that a referendum is clear, precise, and fair. Attending the Senate meeting might result in a debate.
 - Therefore, the Court concluded that any email shall be sent to the executive and legislative branch with the rationale of Student Court 3-0-1
- Student Court discussed whether it was in violation of elections timeline
 - Timeline was initially changed to due to technical difficulties beyond the control of Student Court, and other changes were made to work with President Heba and Student Senate. Essentially, the timeline is set as a guideline. The only two days strictly specified are the referendum deadline and elections date.
- Student Court is unsure if the there is a misunderstanding of the Courts role, and that the Court reserves the authority to secure the precision and neutrality of referendum questions?
 - There were concerns about whether Student Court should eliminate "binding" from election rules
- The Court elaborated a communication sent to the executive and legislative branch via email as approved by Student Court to address Student Senate. **Attached is communication sent via email.**
- Student Court unanimously certified all candidates received to date (3/6/14)
- Motion to adjourn

The Student Court met at 3:50pm today and respectfully declines the invitation to attend the emergency senate meeting of March 6th, 2014 for the following reasons:

- No agenda was provided to the Student Court for the emergency Senate meeting.
Consequently, the Student Court could not prepare a proper response for the meeting.
- The Student Court holds that it is not within the authority of the Executive or Legislative branch to summon the Student Court to a Senate meeting. There are no explicit Constitutional powers stating such authority exists.
- The Student Court has worked with the SGA President to resolve lingering issues about the referendum question since February 23rd, and continues to negotiate a mutually satisfactory agreement.
- The election rules are approved by senate to grant Court the authority to validate the wording of referendum questions. This is to assure that the questions are unambiguous, clear, and unbiased. This is a vital check and balance in the SGA system and the Student Court has taken its role in this regard seriously.
- The Student Court has made a good faith effort to meet with the SGA President to resolve any miscommunications. Furthermore, any decision made by the Student Court requires a meeting (with quorum) and conflicting schedules inherently delay the deliberation process.
- It's the Student Court's interpretation that the only two firm deadlines exist in the election timeline per the Election Rules Spring 2014. These deadlines are found in: Article I Election Materials, section A, Article VI Referendums, section A1. This is to assure proper communication to the student body of the referendum question. The

Student Court has demonstrated a willingness to be flexible with other deadlines.

However, the Senate bears mutual responsibility for sharing information about deadlines to the Senate and potential candidates.

- The Student Court has attempted to maintain its unbiased position within the SGA, and to fulfill its duties per the SGA Constitution and the Election Rules in all steps of the election process.
- It's the Student Court's opinion that participating in this emergency meeting would be an infringement of our neutrality. Since no other body has the ability to call emergency meetings to resolve referendum question wording, the Student Court does not see special status of the SGA President in this regard. Furthermore, the Student Court refers to Article IV Section G of the Spring 2014 Election Rules. If any further activity is taken the SGA could risk violating the Election Rules.
- Any action the SGA Senate should take on the referendum question would be considered advisory to the Student Court per the Election Rules that govern referenda.
- The Student Court respectfully reminds the Executive and Legislative branches that a validated referendum questions needs to be submitted with signatures by March 9th, (30 days prior to the election day). A validated referendum meets the neutrality requirement of Article VI Section A1.