



**University of Maryland, College Park
Student Government Association (SGA)
Elections Commission**

April 13, 2026

Case: 8. 03/31/26 RollTerps v. JusticeUMD

Petitioner: RollTerps

Respondent: JusticeUMD

On April 13th, at 3:00 pm, the SGA Elections Commission convened to deliberate whether JusticeUMD was responsible for their alleged violations of campaigning prior to the official start of campaigning. With a majority vote, the Commission has ruled that JusticeUMD is responsible. The Commission has determined the following point penalties and sanctions:

- Point penalty : **90 Points**
- Sanction 1: **Disqualification**

The Commission ultimately ruled that the aforementioned violation occurred based on preponderance of the evidence.

Please refer to the report on the following page for an in-depth description of the Commission's rulings.

Elections Commission

Head Elections Commissioner – Leonard Fomin

Deputy Commissioner of Publicity – Sofia Perez

Deputy Commissioner of Campaigning – Emilio Difilippantonio

Deputy Commissioner of Candidacy – Hannah Resnick

Deputy Commissioner of Election Education – Maahe Kunvar

Staff Advisor – William R. Post



FINAL REPORT:

Reported Violation:

- Article VI, Section 2, Subsection B, Part 1b(iii): “Campaigning prior to the official start of campaigning.”
- Screenshots from a JusticeUMD group chat in December
 - “Upcoming Election” ([#1](#) and [#2](#))
 - [“Commuter seats”](#)

SGA Rule in Violation:

- Article VI, Section 2, Subsection B, Part 1b(iii): “Campaigning prior to the official start of campaigning.”

Final Decisions:

- Jurisdiction
 - The respondent, JusticeUMD, challenges the jurisdiction of the Elections Commission to review and investigate internal group chats. The Elections Commission refutes with this assertion. Upon receipt of evidence, there are no restrictions in the Election Rules & Regulations as to the kind of evidence the Commission may consider. In this election cycle, the Commission has already set a precedent of using text messages to investigate claims of violations, including the case that the respondent submitted (6. 03/27/26 JusticeUMD v. RollTerps). Moreover, text messages are the most reliable form of evidence as they remove the possibility of hearsay (who said it, when it was said, where it was said, what was said).
- Violation
 - Article V, Section 2, Subsection A, Part 1a(iii) states: „Taking actions which a reasonable person would believe are intended to impact the election may be considered active campaigning by the Elections Commission under this clause.“
 - The evidence clearly indicates a concerted effort to impact the election; this effort was successful. Though voting may not initially seem like campaigning, voting in a way that intentionally shapes an election in one’s favor meets the definition above of active campaigning. Specifically, the respondent stated, “the reason why I advocated for the removal of residential seats is because just as we can easily get an advantage by

running a bunch of candidates in uncontested seats, the Zionists can easily



do the same” ([Upcoming Election #1 Par. 2](#)). This statement clearly shows that the individual committed to establishing rules that favored their ticket. The purpose of revising election rules should always be in the best interest of all students whether already familiar with SGA or not. It is undeniable that by coordinating with members of a prospective ticket who have the power to alter the Election Rules to manipulate them in a manner that will advantage themselves is undeniable a violation. Furthermore, the respondent confirms this by stating “...our win for this upcoming election was absolutely uncertain under the current rules” ([Upcoming Election #2 Par. 2](#)). The fact that this vote was coordinated specifically to benefit JusticeUMD, evidenced especially through someone’s decision to vote for the change despite reservations about its effect on democracy, informs our decision to consider it active campaigning. While discussing how to vote in a prescribed way is a normal practice in the legislature, the Elections Commission finds that these messages are intended benefit the ticket rather than to improve the SGA and student body, the Elections Commission considers it active campaigning under the definition above.

○ Coordinating a vote on election rules to benefit one’s own ticket reasonably can be understood to impact the election. “ In fact, their justification for coordinating their vote in that way was literally *because it would impact the election by giving them an advantage in future elections.*

- “Upcoming Election”
- [“Commuter seats”](#)

○ Second Instance!

- In [Commuter Seats #1](#), “guys listen I think it’s good to be democratic in principle, but for **jumd to get more seats haing more commuter seats would be very helpful**”.

- Respondent’s context for the message: “...this was just a normal discussion between individuals that took place in an internal group chat and had nothing to do with elections or campaigning, and absolutely was not campaigning anything to the student body.”

- The bolded section unequivocally contradicts the context offered by the respondent. The individual in the text message is actively considering as to how to get more seats for “jumd” (JusticeUMD) and hoping to convince others of this changes. To claim that this message was unrelated to the Election is disregarding a simple black letter reading of the message. Also,

the text message's hope at step-stepping of democratic principles is



concerning given that democratic processes and procedures are the core of SGA Elections.

- Double jeopardy
 - This is the second case of JusticeUMD receiving a “campaigning prior to the official start of campaigning” violation, but this is a broad category. The previous violation was for a social media post, whereas this violation is for coordinated abuse of voting power to unfairly alter the voting landscape of the next election in their favor. These two violations, while under the same title, are distinctly different, as active campaigning encompasses a wide range of activities, and as such, this cannot reasonably be seen as a case of double jeopardy.

Sanctions:

- Points: 90
 - Effect:
 - What was the effect on voters?
 - Severe; how their votes were counted was manipulated
 - How many voters were potentially impacted?
 - All voters
 - To what extent did the violation impact the validity/legitimacy of the elections or SGA?
 - Severely: tickets should not be able to manipulate election rules to their own advantage, and the appearance of such an occurrence greatly undermines faith in the SGAs' democratic process
 - To what extent did the violation cause undue harm to a member/multiple members of the student body?
 - Not physical harm, but significant social and political harm
 - Intent:
 - Were there steps taken to avoid or prevent the violation?
 - No
 - Were there steps taken to hide the violation?
 - No
 - Has the offender demonstrated continued neglect of the election

rules and procedures?

- Yes, they committed another violation of a similar nature



- A member of the ticket voted for the rule change to help JusticeUMD despite having reservations about the rule being undemocratic, clearly indicating a higher regard for winning as a ticket rather than upholding democracy
- Was there harmful intent toward another candidate or Ticket? ●
Yes, there was a clear, stated intent to defeat another ticket and their candidates
 - This was based on a hypothetical “Zionist ticket” that, at the time, had not even been registered for the election, demonstrating an attempt to ensure an entire sect of students would be defeated in future elections
- Were multiple members of a ticket involved in the violation?
 - Yes, they all voted in unison
 - Multiple candidate and affiliates from the ticket were in the conversation, as well as multiple registered affiliates
- Is it more than likely that the accused committed the violation of their own volition?
 - Yes, the ticket chair created the plan. Even if other members of the ticket simply followed along, the ticket chair created and pursued the plan of his own volition, and his violation reflects on the entire ticket.
- Is there a reasonable expectation that the accused knew the impact of the violation?
 - Yes, they explicitly cited the intended impact of their actions as their reason for taking said actions; they knew that changing the rules in a certain way would give them an advantage, and voted with that in mind
- There are many aggravating factors (almost all aggravating factors have been met in some way), and there aren't any mitigating factors. As such, the Elections Commission is issuing a point penalty near the maximum allowable penalty for a Class B violation because we believe that this

violation was close to being as bad as a Class B violation can reasonably be.

- Sanction: disqualification



- The ticket has 165 total points, which exceeds the 100-point threshold for automatic disqualification. Under the Election Rules, the only appropriate penalty is automatic disqualification.

Remaining budget of ticket:

- NA

Total points of ticket:

- 165 points