

Complaint Three Ruling: IUSG Election Commission

Issued: 4/15/2020, 6:00 pm EST

This complaint focuses on the alleged behavior of Ms. Madeline Garcia and a potential meeting with the College Democrats at IU in search of endorsement. The potential violation is in reference to Section 510: Campaigning Outside of Designated Time Period, which dictates which behavior is permissible outside the 21-day period of public campaigning during the IUSG Executive Election.

In the original acceptance of the complaint, the Election Commission asked both Ms. Madeline Garcia, Ms. Samantha Waterman, and Mr. Daniel Pickard-Carlisle to provide statements to aid in the investigation of this complaint. At the time of publication, we were only able to retain the records of Ms. Garcia and Mr. Pickard-Carlisle. As such, we are forced to only consider these perspectives in this complaint.

In her reply brief, Ms. Garcia provides ample documentation that she did not attend a meeting with the College Democrats at IU on the night of Tuesday, March 10th. This is shown through google maps location tracking and iPhone location data taken from that day. Because of this, she is unable to directly say what was and was not specifically discussed at the meeting that occurred that night between members of her campaign and the College Democrats. That being the case, Ms. Garcia has provided statements from those on her staff that attended this meeting, as well as those from College Democrats that participated in the meeting. In these statements, all parties independently verify that the purpose of the meeting was not to gain an endorsement but rather to discuss how IUSG could better work with student organizations like College Democrats to improve life on campus for IU students.

The statements of Mr. Pickard-Carlisle do not offer definitive clarity on what occurred at the meeting. He did not attend the meeting and was obtaining his information from an individual who also did not attend the meeting. His statements also include fundamental discrepancies on the course of events. He claims that Ms. Garcia attended the meeting; to our knowledge, as demonstrated by location tracking data made available to us, she was not present for this meeting. These discrepancies coupled with his tangential connection to the events in question have implications on his reliability as a source of evidence in this complaint.

The unreliable evidence presented by the complainant along with the clarifying statements provided by the respondent do not show that these allegations are highly and substantially more likely to be true than not. Because of this, it does not meet the evidentiary standards necessary for a violation. **This complaint is dismissed.**

It is so ordered.

The Indiana University Election Commission

Quinn Gordon, Chair

Shems Al-Ubaidi

Runjin Li

Rachell Pena

Bethany Dillow

Shaam Badi

Lucy Newell