



JUDICIAL BOARD

UCLA UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS ASSOCIATION

MEMORANDUM

FROM: Chief Justice, Abigail Chapman
DATE: April 18, 2019
RE: Petition Denied: *Justin Jackson v. USAC Election Board*

On April 18, 2019, the JUDICIAL BOARD officially received a Petition for Consideration (No. 19-6) filed by PETITIONER, Justin Jackson, against the RESPONDENT, The USAC Election Board.

The Petition for Consideration alleges that the RESPONDENT violated the USA Bylaws Article VI, Section A2, Subsection B VII, which says that no “action” may be taken upon items in the Special Presentations, Reports or Announcements Sections of the Agenda.

The PETITIONER sought five remedies. The first remedy is that the allegedly illegitimate action taken by the USAC is to be ruled as not in accordance with the guiding bylaws for the USAC and its elected council members. The second remedy is that the JUDICIAL BOARD strike the allegedly illegitimate action of the USAC and the implications of said allegedly illegitimate action as null and void. The third remedy is that the JUDICIAL BOARD issue a writ of mandate to call the USAC immediately into action on order that it may do a full review of its meeting minutes on 02/19/19 and 02/26/19 and strike all illegitimate actions as they pertain to the election process. The fourth remedy is that the JUDICIAL BOARD calls on the USAC to vote in approval of a new and legitimate calendar. The fifth remedy is that the JUDICIAL BOARD offers extensive comment on the actions taken and the implications thereafter of the USAC as it pertains to their handling of the 2019-2020 elections. Specifically, as it pertains to the USAC’s responsibility to vote and approve Election Board members, pursuant of USA Constitution Article IX, Section B.

The JUDICIAL BOARD has DENIED the Petition for Consideration on the matter of *Justin Jackson v. USAC Election Board* for the following reasons:

1. Given the ramifications outlined in Part III, the JUDICIAL BOARD does not believe it is clear how the RESPONDENT is beholden to alleged violations made by the USAC regarding their procedural processes.

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.