

THE STUDENT BODY SUPREME COURT OF INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Request for Appellate Hearing Concerning the 2018 Indiana
University Student Association Executive Elections

Voice IUSA v. IUSA Election
Commission Docket Number: SBSC-
2018-03 (2018)

DENIAL OF REQUEST FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE IUSA ELECTION COMMISSION

Associate Justice Devin Haymond delivered the opinion of the Court.

I.

Any ticket running for executive office within the Indiana University Student Association has the ability to appeal a decision made by the Election Commission pursuant to the Procedural Election Code, Title VII, Section 707. **Voice IUSA** (“Voice”) petitioned this Court for appellate review of the **IUSA Election Commission** (“Election Commission”) decision entered April 3, 2018. Voice filed a timely appeal (as judged by Associate Justice Stephen Browne, Clerk of the Court) in response to the decisions reached by the Election Commission wherein the Election Commission dismissed Petitioner’s complaint against Reform IUSA (“Reform”). The complaint alleged that Reform filed a complaint with intent to deceive the Election Commission. The Election Commission declined to penalize Reform as it deemed that Reform’s complaint not violate the Procedural Election Code by deceiving or misleading the Election Commission. Voice now petitions this Court for appellate review of this decision claiming clear error by the Election Commission and requesting this Court disqualify Reform IUSA. Comes now the Student Body Supreme Court of Indiana University and denies this petition for a *writ of certiorari*.

II.

The Student Body Supreme Court of Indiana University has the authority to reject any appeal of decisions rendered by the Elections Commission pursuant to the Procedural Bylaws, Title II, Section 201. The Court has set forth clear precedent regarding its role in appellate review of Election Commission decisions. For this Court to overturn an Election Commission decision, “the petitioner must show clear error, blatant abuse of discretion, or personal bias in the resolution of their complaint or defense.” *Action v. Crimson*, (SBSC 03-01).

III.

The Supreme Court is not convinced that the Election Commission committed a clear error, and Petitioner has failed to present a genuine controversy.

V.

The Student Body Supreme Court of Indiana University reviews all appeals thoroughly and in accordance with applicable procedures. Both the merits and shortcomings of each appeal are considered and debated in an attempt to reach the most appropriate conclusion. Decisions of the Supreme Court will consistently adhere to the Election Code and Procedural Election Code while demonstrating an unwavering commitment to providing the fairest elections possible.

When the petitioner fails to show that Election Commission decisions suffer from “clear error, blatant abuse of discretion, or personal bias in the resolution of their complaint or defense,” the Court reserves the right to deny the appeal and should indeed do so. Failure to deny such appeals would be to encourage unsubstantiated future claims and to foster an environment in which parties routinely submit appeals, regardless of merit, to the Court.

These decisions of the Election Commission are hereby **AFFIRMED**, and this petition for a *writ of certiorari* is **DENIED**.

It is so ordered.

Chief Justice Richard Solomon and Associate Justices Stephen Browne, Beth Haxel, and Sophie Lahey join in this decision.