OPINION OF THE COURT UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI STUDENT GOVERNMENT SUPREME COURT

ADVISORY ON VIOLATION OF ELECTION CODES

ASSOCIATE CHIEF JUSTICE ALLIE FRAGA delivered this opinion of the Court. Following the proceedings of the Trial Court, Elections Commission v. Paul Douillon/A U For You in re Campaigning in Prohibited Area, the Supreme Court has authored this opinion.

On March 2, 2022, Elections Chair Ms. Chester submitted a request for review, alleging that Mr. Douillon violated Title 5, Section 3-2 & 3-2.1 and Title 5, Section 3-5 § 4. Title 5, Section 3-2 & 3-2.1 reads, "There shall be no graphic or verbal campaigning for any individual candidates, tickets, or referenda in the following areas of campus: 1) In the entire area defined as the Student Center Complex (pursuant to Title 5, Section 3- 2.1.), including the Rathskeller and its patio, except for wearing graphic campaign materials. 2) In or immediately around any of the University Libraries, with the exception of wearing graphic campaign materials. 3) At University sporting events. For the purpose of this rule, students wearing graphic campaign materials shall be considered to be actively campaigning. 4) On University shuttles, except for student government organizational referendum. 6) In the Student Government office. The Student Center Complex shall be defined as the entire Shalala Student Center building, Rathskeller and its patio,

Whitten University Center building, the Food Court, the Rock, the Patio, UC Pool, and the Breezeway, as well as their immediate vicinities and the pathways around them, excluding the U Statue. No student employee of the Student Center Complex or an office located in the Student Center Complex may wear or display graphic campaign material during the time they are at work. No organization's office in the Student Center Complex may be used for campaign meetings, storing, or producing campaign materials or serving as a campaign base in any other way. This does not apply to the organizational referenda of those organizations possessing offices". Title 5, Section 3-5 § 4 reads, "Distributing graphic campaign material under doors in the student residence areas". After the Administrative Interrogatives were asked to both parties, Mr. Douillon entered a plea of NOT LIABLE.

In her testimony, Elections Chair Ms. Chester provided the Court with a picture where it was shown that an A U for You palm card was placed under a door on the floor 6 hallway of Lakeside Village Lobby C (Residential Area). However, there was no evidence on whether Mr. Douillon distributed any graphic campaign material under such doors in the student residence areas. There was also no evidence that anyone on his campaign team was distributing any graphic campaign material under such student residence doors. Lastly, there was no evidence submitted for other residential area hallways in which graphic campaign material was stationed.

In his testimony, Mr. Douillon provided the Court with documents showing his "Campaign Team" denying in placing such palm cards under the door on the floor 6 hallway of Lakeside Village Lobby C (Residential Area).

Ultimately, the Court decided that for the Court to impose sanctions, sufficient evidence that Mr. Douillon and/or his campaign were "distributing graphic campaign material under doors in the student residence areas" would be required.

Since there was no evidence to prove such actions occurred, at approximately 11:20pm, the Court ruled 4-0 that Mr. Douillon was NOT LIABLE and that NO SANCTIONS would be assessed against his campaign.

HELD: The Trial Court has NO SANCTIONS for Mr. Douillon