

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON STUDENT GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION

[No. 2020-0003]

February 24, 2020

Response to Appeal for Complaint 20-17

The Court rejects to grant a writ of certiorari based on the appeal filed by Isaiah Martin on behalf of #ForTheStudents. In the appeal, the court was requested to provide guidance on two particular questions:

Does a flawed logic system matter when deciding whether or not a case has merit?

The court may not unilaterally decide the competency of an official to do their job. The court may interpret how legislation is applied, its constitutionality, or conflicts between two parties. The question of whether an official has the proper understanding to do their job is not a question for the court to answer. Rather, this consideration is made by the Senate through the confirmation process and may be revisited through the issuance of sanctions or through impeachment. Parties further have the option to provide, through their Statement of Defense, any information they feel is necessary for the Attorney General to make a decision.

Does “turning off” the text code satisfy the qualifications for removing “all mentions” of the giveaway? The Attorney General mentioned in complaint 20-03 that #ForTheStudents is ordered to take down their website as well as “all references to the Party’s giveaways.” In this specific case, the Attorney General ruled that disabling the text code but keeping up social media advertizing is a violation of the campaign ban. The Court believes that it is reasonable to conclude that “all” references include every reference beyond just a text code. Furthermore, If the petitioners had any doubt as to what the Attorney General meant by “all references”, they had the option to clarify this with him. They also had the option to appeal this part of complaint 20-03 if they felt that it was too broad or unreasonably severe.