



JUDICIAL BOARD

UCLA UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS ASSOCIATION

MEMORANDUM

FROM: Chief Justice, Abigail Chapman
DATE: April 17, 2019
RE: Petition Denied: *Justin Jackson, Undergraduate Students of UCLA, et al. v. USAC Election Board (erroneously titled)*

On April 17, 2019, the JUDICIAL BOARD officially received a Petition for Consideration (No. 19-4) filed by PETITIONERS, Justin Jackson and the “Undergraduate Students of UCLA,” against the RESPONDENT, The USAC Election Board.

The Petition for Consideration alleges that the RESPONDENT violated the USAC Election Code Article 1.2., 2.6.1.a., 2.6.1.d., 2.6.1.g., 2.6.1.h., and 2.4.1. The PETITION argues that the violations are proven by the JUDICIAL BOARD ruling in 19-1, *Brandon J. Broukhim v. USAC Election Board*.

The Petition for Consideration also alleges that the RESPONDENT violated USAC Election Code Article 2.6.1.j., which requires extensive publicity of the candidate filing deadline, and “USA Bylaws Article VI, Section A2, Subsection B VII” which says that no “action” may be taken upon items in the Special Presentation Reports or Announcements Sections of the Agenda.

The PETITIONER sought two remedies. The first remedy is that the JUDICIAL BOARD orders the RESPONDENT to issue a new and legitimate calendar pursuant with the “Election Board Bylaws Article 7.1.1.” The second remedy is that the JUDICIAL BOARD orders the RESPONDENT to effectively advertise the new deadline to ensure “all elements of the campus community will receive equal notice,” pursuant to Election Code 2.6.1.g.

The JUDICIAL BOARD has DENIED the Petition for Consideration on the matter of Justin Jackson, Undergraduate Students of UCLA, et al. (erroneously titled) v. USAC Election Board for the following reasons:

1. Violations argued by the PETITIONER involving USAC Election Code Article 1.2., 2.6.1.a., 2.6.1.d., 2.6.1.g., 2.6.1.h., and 2.4.1., have already been ruled upon by the JUDICIAL BOARD in 19-1, *Brandon J. Broukhim v. USAC Election Board*, which concerned the same set of actions taken by the RESPONDENT. Specifically, the JUDICIAL BOARD has already issued judgment on the above violations concerning the same set of actions taken by the RESPONDENT as outlined in the PETITION.

Regarding the violation of Election Code Article 2.6.1.j., the JUDICIAL BOARD absolved the RESPONDENT from this violation in 19-1, *Brandon J. Broukhim v. USAC Election Board*, which was brought about by the same set of actions taken by the RESPONDENT as outlined in the PETITION. It is custom for the JUDICIAL BOARD to not consider alleged violations concerning a respondent who was absolved from committing the same violation in a case brought about by the same set of actions by the respondent.

2. With respect to the alleged violation of “USA Bylaws Article VI, Section A2, Section B VII,” the JUDICIAL BOARD believes that Petition for Consideration fails to explicitly outline how the action(s), or inaction, by the RESPONDENT brought about the violation in question.

The case will not be held for further review. As per the Official Rules of the Judicial Board, Article 1, §3, the denial of a “Petition for Consideration” should not be construed as an endorsement of either side of any issue.

Please refer to the Official Rules of the Judicial Board Article I for more information.

The Official Rules of the Judicial Board can be found on the USAC website at:
<https://www.usac.ucla.edu/jboard/docs/jboardrulesv2.pdf>