



Associated Students University of Washington

Election Complaints Hearing | **Minutes** | Session 129th

May 6th, 2026 | HUB 337 | 5:00 PM

The ASUW acknowledges the stewards of Coast Salish lands, the lands on which we currently sit, and the UW occupies. We acknowledge the original and current caretakers; Duwamish, Suquamish, Tulalip, and Muckleshoot nations and peoples.

Microsoft Teams Meeting:

[https://teams.microsoft.com/meet/257878071850959?p=LSBo6uTE2pgvOB
SMkC](https://teams.microsoft.com/meet/257878071850959?p=LSBo6uTE2pgvOBSMkC)

Meeting ID: 257 878 071 850 959

Passcode: x8Qd97r3

AGENDA

Call to Order

Madisen calls the meeting to order at 5:11 pm.

Land Acknowledgement

Roll Call | 11 total. *5 voting. 3 quorum | # present (P). # excused (E). # absent (A).

P | * Chair; Secretary of Judgments – **Madisen Newbury**

P | * Secretary of Recommendations – **Brian Kim**

P | * At-Large Member – **Sejal Dogiparthi**

P | * At-Large Member – **Abby Sengendo**

P | Ex-Officio Member – **Nardos Kidane**

P | Ex-Officio Member – **Sanjana Sivaraj**

P | *Senate Liaison – **Leila De Folo**

A | ASUW Vice President – **Sonal Virk**

A | Office Coordinator Proxy; Personnel Coordinator – ***Shriya Sundar***

P | Student Activities Office Advisor – **Alan Galvez**

P | Student Legal Services Liaison – ***Vacant***

NEW BUSINESS

Madisen conducts roll call in alphabetical order of last name.

The chair members of judicial introduce themselves and ask whether the parties have any procedural questions, and judicial will respond as appropriate.

Madisen explains that the complainant may make an opening statement followed by the respondent, but the respondent may reserve the opportunity until later in the hearing. Complainant may call witnesses examined in the manner described above. They can make an opening statement, respond, closing statement, and then make a rebuttal statement.

Madisen states that they will begin with DeGaetano v. Golden Ticket. Then they begin with complaint 2, which is Dureja vs Cruz.

Dureja says that one of her volunteers told her that she saw a candidate campaigning in the dorms. Cruz had approached them and said that he was running for ASUW and campaigning. Dureja had told Gavin he couldn't do that. She later found that he is a resident of Lander, so it is up to judicial interpretation.

Madisen gives Cruz time to respond.

Cruz reaffirms that he is an active resident of Lander Hall. He says that this was not the door-to-door solicitation, and that instead, he was speaking with close family friends who

were asking about the elections. It was not an intimidation tactic, just an informal conversation.

Madisen asks if there any questions from the committee. There are none, so they move on.

Cruz says he does not know the specific EPP policy that was violated or who the intern in question was. The only people he talked to were his close friends, and the EAC intern might have happened to be a part of this group of people. He says that there was no malicious intent and that it was simply an informal conversation. He says that he was trying to put himself out there, as expected of candidates. He mentions that there has been certain solicitation within the dorms that has not been reported. He says that it is important to raise awareness and asks for leniency and consideration from judicial.

Madisen asks whether there is a rebuttal, but Dureja declines. They move on to the next complaint, which is Dureja v. Lawson, O'Connor, Sharma, Nair, Cruz, Olivera, Roberts, and Thompson. She asks for representatives from the list of defendants. She asks whether Betty is online, but she is not present.

Dureja says that they posted campaign materials on multiple business on the Ave and did not submit the posts on their campaign registry. She sent a seize and desist and says that the EPP should have mentioned candidates and not affiliates. The minutes from November 6, 2025 say that the posters should be submitted to the registry 24 hours before they intend to put them up. The motion was not written in the minutes and was not edited on time. Tammy mistakenly wrote affiliates. However, Kate was present when those discussions were being made, since she is a Board member. They discussed it and they took down the poster and then somebody submitted everything in campaign advertisement registry.

Lawson responds that she apologizes for not making a mental record of every motion that was made. She assumed that all motions would be reflected in the EPP. She reads the email that was sent after receiving notification of the violation. She reads from the

document and says that it seemed the issue was cleared up and they did everything that was asked of them and she says she has nothing to say other than that.

Judicial asks about the time frame that EAC had reached or texted and when she had taken down the flyers.

Lawson clarifies that the flyers were taken down immediately upon receiving the email, under 24 hours.

Judicial asks Dureja whether they realized once Tammy made the mistake within the EPP or only after it was pointed out by Kate.

Dureja responds that it was only after Kate pointed it out and that she had assumed, as co-chair, Tammy would be able to make the correct adjustments, but that was not done.

Madisen asks whether there are any other questions and there are none, so they move on to the next case, which is Dureja v Amaral.

Dureja says that it was brought to her attention that the Instagram account that Justin had used to campaign for presidency had a post made from March 28. There were four posts that had been posted prior to the campaigning start date. She reads from the EPP that campaigning includes use of electronic social media. However, section 6 of campaigning C2 states that campaigning does not include private organization planning and development of a campaign, including the recruitment of volunteers, planning of strategies, and production of campaign materials. She was told that it was a private account before, but there is no way of verifying that.

Amaral asks how to present evidence.

Madisen says that it is preferable to have a physical copy, but that they can also email the judicial account later to consider the evidence.

Amaral says that the EPP talks about public campaigning and that the account was private when it posted, which is not against the rules. He did not have the foresight to

screenshot the icon saying that the account if private, but that based on analytics, the post only reached 6 accounts, and he can verify that the first six accounts were only people that were on his team.

Dureja responds that the EPP does not look at views to determine whether something is public or private and that there is no way of verifying it. The point is that it was posted and not just produced.

Amaral asks to look at the EPP and reads through, saying that the biggest issue is whether the account was public or not. The proof is that only people that were on his team saw the account. He asks how many hours he would receive as penalty.

Madisen says that the number of hours will not be decided upon until deliberation and will depend on whether it is a major, minor, or severe violation. She asks whether he is asking this question in order to reveal more information.

Amaral responds that he made it public at the start time of 9:00 AM on March, but does not remember the exact date.

Madisen asks why he created the account but then made it private.

Amaral responds that during the ethics meeting, he believed that private accounts could be created with content as long as there was no identifying information.

Judicial asks what the username of the account was before it was made private or public.

Amaral says that he can get that information. He also says that he was under the impression that he could make the Instagram account as long as there was no picture or other information on it, based on what he was told at the ethics seminar.

Judicial asks how he is able to determine whether the account was private or not.

Amaral says that there is no way for Instagram to show that the account if private from day-to-day but that it can be based on analytics. The account apparently showed that

hundred percent of the people looking at the account were followers and that the account only reached six people. This can be referenced with the earliest followers and there were only six accounts from his team initially. He says that there were only preparation materials and not publicly available campaigning.

Dureja says that this would set a dangerous precedent where people can simply claim that they don't have evidence of the account being private and start campaigning prior to the start date. The EPP only says that materials can be produced but not that they can be used for campaigning afterwards.

Judicial gives a point of information as to how volunteer hours might be given.

Amaral says that he was under the false assumption that people could still prepare materials beforehand and post on a private Instagram account. He emphasizes that there is not enough evidence to prove that the account was public beforehand and that it can not be based on timestamp alone.

Judicial makes a motion to table since the conversation just seems to be going back and forth.

Dureja offers to make a closing argument. She says that there is no evidence to prove that it wasn't public or private but that this could set a dangerous precedent and become an advantage for candidates.

Amaral says that the EPP should be revised rather than trying to punish him for something he did not do.

Madisen says that they will be moving on to the next complainant, which is Dureja v. Teshome, Garimella, Adams, Foulks, Hafezi, Chen, Bristol, and Misumi.

Dureja says that it was brought to her attention that posters were put up in Mercer Court. She had agreed as long as they went through the proper procedure. They violated section 6 F5 of the EPP and Dureja reads this part of the EPP out loud.

Madisen says that the original complaint has only identified Mercer Court and asks whether she wants to introduce Spratlen as a new complaint or include new evidence.

Dureja confirms that she has RCSA as a witness and calls them as a stand.

Naomi (RCSA) says that it is HFS policy that signs may not be put up without approval.

Teshome responds that they did not put up a single poster by themselves. They had to go to HFS and ask the front desk for approval several times. Additionally, the front desk had told them they could just put up the posters, but Teshome did not want to get into trouble. The front desk gave an index card with all of the different dorms. The dorm told him they needed signature to put the posters up, so Teshome talked to somebody at the front desk who offered to put up the posters in exchange for 30 dollars.

Dureja asks if he knows the name of the person.

Madisen says that everyone should follow the procedure instead of going back and forth.

Dureja says that there is no way to prove this happened and that she only knows that posters were not approved by HFS.

(Name not captured) says that the HFS front desk did not have the authority to do that and should have redirected them specifically to the facility worker.

Teshome says that they were redirected to the front desk guy, and he was the one who had offered to put up the posters in exchange for the 30 dollars.

Garimella says that if there determined to put up posters against the rules, they would not have spent so much time ensuring that they were operating within the rules.

Judicial asks if they have proof that they talked to the rest of the team about what was going on since the EPP clearly states that approval is needed, regardless of what front desk may have said.

Teshome says they asked everyone at HFS to get the approval before this one person said that it would be fine.

Judicial asks whether they ever reached out to Dureja.

Teshome says they did.

Dureja says that she did say that they need HFS approval and that it was not within her jurisdiction.

Teshome says that is exactly what they did and that they did not put up the posters themselves.

Judicial makes a point of inquiry and asks whether they handed out the posters.

Teshome says that the process seemed official, since they had a laminated index card with the halls and checked it off.

Madisen says that unfortunately, the posters were still up so they would be held liable. If they get evidence, they need to email that immediately.

Dureja says that there is another evidence on page 3 that there is a poster in Spratlen Hall that does not look like it has been put up by an HFS employee. She yields her time to Naomi.

Naomi says that the specific location is up to discretion of HFS and that the issue is more about the fact that there is no sign that it was approved by HFS.

Judicial asks whether there was a back and forth between them and the HFS personnel or whether they had specifically asked for review and approval from HFS.

Teshome says that they gave the posters but did not know how the process worked.

Garimella says that he had seen the post in Spratlen and that he did not think that any member of their team had put it up. They had supported handing out flyers.

Madisen makes a point or personal privilege to ask side conversation to cease since everything needs to be transcribed.

Judicial clarifies that the poster in Spratlen was not put up by either of them or authorized by them. For Terry Hall, they had said that it could be reviewed for further approval and not that it could be cleared for posting anywhere around the dorms. They also ask about Mercer Court.

Teshome says they had given the posters to the HFS office to approve and that it had every single dorm listed there.

Madisen asks them to say their closing statements.

Dureja says she was never made aware of the issue with HFS and might have been able to help if she were made aware. The conversation was never brought up after the first time. She says that they should have received consent to put up flyer regardless since they would have a fair advantage over other candidates.

Teshome says that they did their due diligence and that they were unsure of what to do in that situation.

Judicial says that according to the EPP, they should have received approval from the HFS.

Teshome says that they had printed flyers and then talked to Dureja about it. She had told them to get HFS approval. They went to Terry Hall first and had got sent to the office and back and forth. He says they are being held accountable to the actions of others.

Judicial asks whether they can verify exactly what HFS had told them.

Teshome says their takeaway is that HFS provides written approval.

Judicial says that it was on them to ask for approval since no explicit approval was given.

Teshome says they asked for as much approval as possible. They make a point of information that when they submitted the note card, the front desk staff said that he would get it done once it gets approved and that all they need is the written approval that they were giving him.

Dureja makes a point of information that she made herself very available during the election period over email and held regular office hours so that these kinds of incidents could be brought up to her.

Teshome says that they did not know this.

Madisen makes a point of order that not knowing something on the EPP is not a proper defense as a general rule for everyone. Reading and understanding the EPP is a requirement for anyone running for a position in ASUW.

Teshome asks if that includes UW employees.

Madisen says that ultimately, they were the ones to make the materials and authorize them to be put up.

Teshome responds that they did not put them up.

Madisen asks whether they asked others to put up the flyers.

Teshome says that they asked and others put them up.

Madisen makes a point of order, saying that the decision is not final right now and that there is a thorough review process to decide whether or not they violated the rules. However, not knowing something is not a valid excuse going forward when it comes to any of the complaints.

Christina calls for a short recess.

After recess, **Madisen** resumes with complaint 6, which is Dureja v. Bianchi and Roberts.

Bianchi asks a question about the evidence and whether complainants will have to respond to evidence even if they are only being shown it for the first time during the hearing.

Madisen reminds that if there is additional direct evidence that will help the case, it must be submitted by the end of the day.

Dureja says they reached out to Dylan and Roberts and matters were handled within 24 hours, so she recommends a dismissal.

Bianchi says that this is an accurate assessment of the situation.

Madisen asks whether there any comments from the committee and seeing none, dismissed the case. She moves on to the next case, which is Dureja v. Hafezi, Adams, and Bristol.

There is some conversation about whether Adams has joined. Adams is on the Teams meeting and there are some audio issues on his side.

Madisen makes a point of order and asks the complainant to make their case.

Dureja makes a point of information to ask whether her intern can speak on her behalf and gets approval from Madisen.

Sky, the intern, says the complaint is straightforward since they directly violated the EPP by not RSVPing to the forums.

Adams says that he has an autoimmune compromised condition and has to be hospitalized when he is sick. During this time, he was sick and was at home with a high fever and only conscious for two hours per day. This made it difficult for him to respond and says that he takes responsibility for his actions.

Judicial makes a point of information, asking if there was any attempt to communicate with anyone of EAC to let them know they were not going to be able to make it.

Adams says that he does not have proof of a confirmation.

Sky says that there are serious extenuating circumstances to consider but that they were made available to communicate and that a heads up would have been nice. However, this would only be a minor violation.

Adams concedes that it would be a minor violation says that he understood he might face this at the beginning of his campaign.

Madisen moves on to the next case, which is Dureja v. Adams and Bristol.

Sky says that the situation is very similar and it was just a failure to RSVP for a different forum. Complaints 7 through 9 are about the same thing. This complaint was about the JCC forum.

Adams makes an all-encompassing statement that the email sent out to RSVP had one specific deadline for all of the forums. Missing one deadline would therefore mean missing all. He says his reasoning is the same, citing the extenuating circumstances and says he is unable to speak on behalf of his fellow candidate Bristol.

Dureja says that the original timeline was March 8 and that the deadline had been extended by two days.

Adams makes a closing statement, saying that he takes issue with how there is only deadline for all forums and claims that it is silly to have one form designated to cover all necessary events and for it to be due on the same day. He understands that it is more convenient but says that it is difficult for those with extenuating circumstances.

Madisen asks him to stay on track.

Adams concludes saying that there should be multiple different links with different due dates.

Madisen moves on to case 9, which is Dureja v. Adams, Bristol, and Misumi.

Dureja says that this is the same complaint but for the Senate forum.

Adams reiterates his explanation and apologizes for not signing up.

Madisen moves on to case 10, which is Riggio v Dureja. She tells Dureja that she does not have to move to the other side of the table.

Riggio introduces himself and says that the EAC violated section 5 as well as various Senate bills and Article 2 Section A of the EPP due to failure to impartially discharge administration of the April 14 ASUW Joint Senate Elections Forum. 7 audience questions were asked, with 3 questions being extremely modified, one Director of Internal Policy question and one Presidential question. There was some extreme modification that omitted context while another was a minor modification for clarity sake. The questions were extremely relevant to the positions. The EAC wrote brand new questions based on some language found in 3 to 4 different submitted questions while ignoring language about tri-campus relationships despite it being the President's responsibility to foster healthy tri-campus relationships. This alteration was intentional and deliberate since other questions were not received with as much scrutiny. He says that the rest of the evidence has been included in the packet.

Madisen asks if he has any witnesses.

Riggio says that he has submitted five witness testimonies but that the people he contacted did not want to appear in the hearing. But, their written testimonies are submitted along with contact information.

Dureja says that she appreciates Joseph bringing this forward but questions why Erick and Ryan are not mentioned on the complaint. She says that her name being on the complaint as the only woman of color, apart from Tammy, is concerning. She agrees that their conduct was a bit messed up. They prepared questions before winter quarter at the Ethics Seminar. She provided a study guide made available to them so they could ask questions or go over any topics. She says they read questions and then go into the Living Communities Forum. One of the candidates had spoken on public record about the

Senate Bill so they had asked a personal question about ensuring that this would not happen again in their position. She says that there might have been a better way to frame these questions. Additionally, they had asked Simon, a Community Relations candidate, about stakeholders. They added a few “gotcha” questions asking the name of Presidents of each stakeholder association and asked two candidates about that but then asked a question about the difference between communities to the last candidate. The framing of the questions was highly inappropriate. Candidate said they did not feel safe with the questions and did not want to run again, so she was very concerned. After the forum, she asked how it had gone for them. 4 candidates spoke up and were very disrespectful, which was hurtful for her to hear as an immigrant woman of color. She did not feel safe in that environment. She concedes that the candidate made fair points about their experiences but that the tone was very inconsiderate. She emailed the candidates explaining that the questions may have come across as attacking, but that was not the intention and that their tone was very rude. She says that the election is run by the EAC and that it is not a collaborative process for candidates. She takes accountability but points out that she is the only one doing so. After the email, a few candidates replied with apologies so she felt more comfortable amending questions but still not with apologies. After, she felt more comfortable and safe.

Riggio thanks her for sharing her experiences. He says that the only reason she was mentioned in the complaint is that this falls under the responsibility of the EAC to carry out impartial, fair Senate Forums. She was also their main point of contact for GPSS leadership and ASUW leadership. He had access to the Microsoft form because Skyler had invited him and Erick as collaborators. Erick is also very prominently mentioned in evidence. Ryan only asked one question, which was verbatim what the senator has asked. He asks her to elaborate what she meant about not feeling comfortable with the candidates in the room.

Dureja says she understands it was her responsibility to make forms but it is not Erick's responsibility to put senators first. She says she takes accountability but believes that Erick should be held accountable too.

Madisen says that there can not be discourse between both parties and that this is something that both parties can privately discuss afterwards. If there is evidence, it should be submitted by the end of the day.

Dureja calls a witness to the stand.

Naomi testifies that there was extreme backlash against the questions from the Living Communities Forum. She does not want to form opinions on how this might influence how somebody behaves in later forums but says that they had to navigate an interesting situation. The questions were all public information and on record.

Judicial asks if she can testify as to details of the hostility and specifically what said or done.

Naomi says that she is only able to speak to what happened in the intermission since that was the only portion she was present for.

Judicial asks that considering the sensitivity and stressful nature of the situation, whether it would be possible for Naomi to submit testimony regarding the details of the hostility.

Naomi says that would be great since she does not want to misrepresent the situation.

Madisen tells her she has the end of the day and Naomi agrees. Madisen also tells Dureja to write down specific questions that she asked that were deemed too personal.

Dureja concludes that tensions may have been high and she appreciates the apologies. She also apologizes to any senator whose work may have been altered. She wants to include in the EPP that the ECC does not work for candidates, since that was not clear during the most recent election.

Madisen makes a motion to end consideration and move on to the next complaint.

Complaint 11:

Shantanu asks if he can see what evidence was submitted during the hearing

Madisen states he cannot

Rhea states that she filled out a complaint on behalf of someone else and asks for time to speak with the witness

Gavin provides his testimony, stating that he was approached on April 20th at 11:00a.m. by the respondent asking him if he voted yet. While submitting his vote, he claims that the respondent positioned himself to where he could see his ballot. He states that his vote was influenced because of this and he couldn't fully exercise his right to vote.

Madisen allows the respondent to respond

Shantanu states that he didn't pressure anyone to vote and didn't stand over anyone's shoulder. He claims that he directed voters to copies of the EAC voters guides and didn't tell anyone to rank candidates.

Madisen allows the petitioner to make a rebuttal

Gavin states that this isn't true and refers to a witness statement also submitted from a friend observing this occurrence. He asks if he can read the statement

Madisen agrees

Gavin reads the witness statement provided in the complaint file

Madisen allows for the respondent to respond

Shantu says that there is a high chance that this statement is misconstrued, as he didn't force or inhibit anyone from voting. He says while tabling from 8a.m. to midnight, he didn't force anyone to stay at their table.

Madisen asks if the petitioner for a closing statement

Rhea states that she has an extra statement as a point of information. She states that this incident falls under Section 8 of the EPP and was told that Shantu intentionally viewed Gavin's ballot.

Madisen asks the petitioner if they would like to respond

Shantanu reiterates his previous points and states he never tried to harm or make someone uncomfortable while voting, emphasizing that voters are free to walk away

Madisen interrupts with a point of order to stop outside conversations and directs Shantanu to continue

Shantanu finishes his response by explaining he let things be as democratic as possible

Madisen asks petitioner to make closing statement

Gavin closes by affirming his statement and explaining that he was uncomfortable during the interaction

Shantu closes by stating he tried to be as friendly and respectful as possible for voters

[x judicial member] asks Gavin if he submitted his ballot while talking to Shantu

Gavin confirms

[x judicial member] asks if Gavin felt he wasn't allowed to leave

Gavin confirms and says he felt uncomfortable

Madisen moves onto the next complaint

Compliant 12:

Rhea says she didn't receive the final financial form from the respondent

Madisen allows for the respondent to respond

Lali says she brought Anabel to speak on her behalf to give her testimony, where she will read her statement

Anabel reads Lali's statement, stating that the failure to submit the document wasn't because of negligence but instead because of the lack of accessibility throughout the campaign. She explains that because Excel is not accessible for her she wasn't able to submit the form properly, which she already communicated these limitations to the elections committee beforehand. She expected that the committee would follow up and provide alternative accessibility formats, but they didn't despite their responsibility to accommodate candidates. She has faced barriers since the beginning of the election, as she couldn't fully access the packet without assistance from another person. She didn't make a formal complaint because this is a broader issue and makes the complaint filed against her unfair due to lack of accessibility. These are the reasons why she wasn't able to submit the form.

Madisen allows the complainant to respond

Rhea agrees with Lali that some of the processes weren't accessible and says she should try to work with you to make it more accessible. She apologizes if Lali felt that this wasn't an accessible election for her and says she tried her best. She explains she didn't receive an email or any communication from Lali about the forms, but Tammy was dealing with sending the reminders about the financial forms. She says if Lali just sent an email about this, then she wouldn't file a complaint as done by another candidate. She says she tried to work with Anabel to everything accessible, and would've appreciated an email from Lali

Lali agrees with Rhea. She didn't send an email about this document, but because she thought Rhea was aware of her limitations and the inaccessibility of the documents. She states that she told Rhea she couldn't access certain documents previously, where Rhea understood the issues she was facing. Rhea and Tammy didn't follow up about any of this and she didn't think she needed to send another email because they were already made aware.

Madisen allows the complainant to respond

Rhea apologizes and understands her concerns while also stating she didn't remember sending an email

Madisen makes a point of order to ensure people are talking to the board and not each other

Rhea says she wasn't aware of any email about missing any form, but acknowledges Tammy was also a part of communications. She says she didn't know she couldn't fill out the financial form and agrees she hasn't been perfect this election. She reasserts that she had no knowledge of the fact that Lali couldn't fill out the form and hopes to have more accommodations next year.

Madisen allows for the respondent to respond

Lali says she might have made a mistake because she didn't know which person was Rhea and which was Tammy, but asserts that EAC knew about her accessibility issues. She explains her mother had to help her because of this, emphasizing that at 20 years old she shouldn't need her mother to help file a document for UW. She is just tired of the inaccessibility of the entire campaign and appreciates Rhea working with her.

Madisen asks the committee if they have any questions and allows for the complaint to respond

Rhea says Lali raises a good point and will leave notes in the EPP to make it more accessible. She restates that she would've appreciated an email but acknowledges about some accessibility limitations for Lali. She apologizes if this hindered her election experience and ensures this won't happen in the future. She acknowledges her and Tammy weren't communicating well and that mistake falls on her. She recommends dismissal.

Madisen calls a point of information and asks Lali if she has the email she sent to Tammy about her situation.

Lali says she has the email sent to Rhea but needs to find the one sent to Tammy

Rhea says she can try to find it through Tammy's account, which she has access to

Madisen asks if they can find that evidence to submit it and moves on to the next complaint

Complaint 13:

Rhea says the Instagram story from the campaign account posted that they were giving out swag in the library. She emailed them not to do that and didn't receive an email in response.

Dagwami says they stopped tabling within three hours of Rhea sending that email

Madisen asks if the committee has any questions and asks Rhea to confirm this

Rhea says she has no knowledge of this action so she can't confirm

Madisen moves onto the next complaint and says the respondents can stay up

Complaint 14:

Rhea says she couldn't understand the ticket's receipts. She says the financial statements don't match some of the receipts, where the 200 Gatorades in the form weren't in the receipts.

Madisen says they can bring the evidence to the stand to explain further

Dagwami says he emailed Rhea and Tammy three times about the receipts because he was confused on how to submit the form. After lots of back and forth, he states he couldn't find all of the receipts needed, but EAC said they can submit the forms as is.

Rhea says the filing wasn't the issue, but that the gatorades weren't in the receipts

Dagwami says he didn't have those receipts on him

[x judicial member] asks if he could submit additional evidence by the end of the day so they can consider the receipts

Rhea clarifies that many candidates email Tammy thinking it's her and says she can't speak for her. She adds that she responds to every email she receives as soon as possible.

Madisen asks if there are any questions from the committee

Brians suggests the respondents to contact Safeway to gather all of the receipt information, and says all of the stickers were consistent in the financial statement

Dagwami says he contacted Safeway this morning

Madisen moves on to the next complaint and asks the respondents to stay on the stand

Complaint 15:

Rhea states that the condoms in the financial statement violate Section 9 of the EPP because the price of each condom was more than the one dollar limit.

Madisen allows for the respondent to respond

Dagwami says the market value of the condom is 25 cents

Vishal states that the stickers indicate they were more expensive because they had a rush on shipping

Madisen allows the complainant to respond

Rhea says this price was given as one product at \$1.187, which is her concern

Madisen calls for a point of order and allows the respondent to respond

Dagwami asks if they give out multiple pieces of candy over a dollar would that be over the limit. He states that since this is ok wouldn't their condoms be within the limit as well.

[x judicial member] calls for a point of information stating that its based individually if you don't file the total cost

Madisen asks if there are any questions from the committee or any closing statements. She then moves onto the next complaint

Complaint 16:

Madisen calls for a point of personal privilege and moves onto the next complaint

Rhea says she didn't file this complaint on her behalf but on someone else's, so she is reading it as she received the complaint. She submitted evidence related to this case from the other complainant

Rhea reads the statement from the original person who filed, stating that the UW for U ticket came to her while studying and told her to vote for them without reading other bios.

Madisen allows the respondent to respond

Dylan clarifies that there are many inconsistencies with this complaint, as they contacted the appropriate people and had permission to campaign in the buildings they did. He also states that no one can discern who the complainant is talking about because they didn't indicate as such, considering she also referred to the whole ticket. He asserts that that the complainant wasn't specific in her claim and that all of their practices didn't pressure anyone into voting

Madisen allows for complainant to respond

Rhea says she has no context on this and assumes the facts got somewhat messed up. She refers back to the EPP when talking about the complainant's statement and says candidates can use threats to deter voters from voting

[unknown] asks if there are texts regarding the campaigning in the life sciences building, as the complainant refers to the whole ticket and not just one person.

Dylan says their tabling was informal and Carlos ended up tabling during this instance, and that no one else has entered that building in a very long time

Rhea clarifies that she doesn't believe this complaint addresses any candidate. It addresses a type of candidate EAC doesn't recognize. Because they didn't cite a specific

candidate's name, she doesn't believe this is reasonable as it also referenced the entire ticket.

Madisen moves on to the next complaint

Complaint 17:

Madisen calls for a recess until 7:10

Rhea refers to testimony stating that Shantanu said if you vote he will give you a snack. She says this violates RCW and has gotten multiple complaints for this issue. She attached emails from witnesses who wanted to remain anonymous, where they all include testimony about similar instances with energy drinks.

Rhea reads direct statements and reads from Section 8 of the EPP

Madisen allows the respondent to respond

Shantanu says he isn't a felon and only used these items as incentives to get people's attention, and offered these items regardless of voting. He denies all of the testimonies brought against him.

Rhea states that she had a conversation with Shantanu about not saying "if you vote you can get a snack" before these instances.

Madisen calls for a point of order to have the respondents answer the committee and not each other

[x judicial member] calls a point of information and asks if Shantanu gave a red bull to someone if they voted.

Shantanu says they had a spinner so people could get prizes that way, where voting had nothing to do with it. They used energy drinks to get people to come to their table.

Anyone had the opportunity to grab a snack regardless of if they voted or not. He asserts that no bribery took place

[x judicial member] asks if anyone came to their table would you give them a snack whether they voted or not

Shantanu confirms and says many different people grabbed stuff from their table

[x judicial member] asks to clarify if the testimony emails are from two different people

Rhea confirms

[x judicial member] asks if Rhea talked to the defendant before or after she got those emails

Rhea confirms

[x judicial member] clarifies if it was before both

Rhea confirms and says it was during early voting period

Madisen allows complainant to respond

Rhea restates her testimony about her prior conversation with Shantanu

[x judicial member] calls for a point of information and asks what Shantanu said after their conversation

Rhea says he say "okay thank you"

Madisen allows the respondent to respond

Shantanu says he doesn't recall this conversation happening and states that there wasn't any follow ups if he supposedly broke the RCW, as he would've corrected his behavior within 24 hours. He says he tries to follow the rules as close as possible and has previously communicated with her properly about all other issues

Madisen asks for closing statements

Rhea says that while she doesn't believe this was a violation of the RCW, she affirms her statement about her conversation with Shantanu about giving snacks for votes. She refers to a conversation in the past with Dagwami's ticket where something similar happened.

Madisen clarifies that this case is about the RCW violation and not the conversation

Rhea understands but affirms her conversation with Shantanu, stating that him denying the conversation isn't ok. She says this issue has been raised multiple times and this complaint isn't an isolated incident.

[x judicial member] calls for a point of inquiry and asks Rhea if the witnesses were aware of when their specific encounter happened

Rhea says she can email them and send that information by 1 am

Shantanu says that the evidence stating he said he spent a lot of money on drinks for people to vote is false. He explains how the spinner worked, and that just because someone voted didn't mean that they would get something from the spinner.

[x judicial member] calls for a point of information and asks if Shantanu would give someone a red bull if he knew they voted for him

Shantanu says no and says he doesn't discriminate, stating anyone can spin the spinner

Madisen asks if there are any other questions from the committee and moves onto the next complaint

Complaint 18:

Rhea makes an opening statement before witness testimony. She addresses the cyberbullying on multiple social media platforms during the election. She says EAC has heard multiple concerns about this issue and takes this matter very seriously. She says it's hard to do something about this because these comments are all anonymous, but provided resources with the help of advisors for a safe campus. She mentioned a conversation with Kate about this during a senate meeting. She says this election has been horrific for everyone as multiple people have been the victim of bullying and transitions into the witness testimony.

Kaitlyn says she didn't post before, during, or after the election and can only speak for her ticket. She explains that she was referred to as spiritually Israel, been called a mean white girl, referred to as Charlie Kirk, and called a sorority girl among other things. She states she didn't retaliate. She denounces the online bullying and wants to address the use of social media and that there should be consequences for misuse.

Madisen allows for the respondent to respond

Towa asks if there was more evidence than just the one screenshot. She says she deleted Yikyak during the election season because of online bullying posts. She states she hasn't posted anything about any candidate negative or positive. She also comments on the specific screenshot saying the only person she knew who was running was Dylan, who isn't a woman.

Dylan states that he isn't named once in this complaint and asked why he is involved

Kaitlyn said that wasn't personal and wanted to file this case to just address social media use during elections moving forward.

[x judicial member] asks why file a complaint against these two specific people

Kaitlyn says she was made aware of this post by someone on her ticket and didn't know who posted it

[x judicial member] calls for a point of information and clarifies if Kaitlyn filed this claim over overall use of social media. If this is the case, the committee should dismiss this case and suggest changes to the EPP

[unknown] says its a violation of the campaign statement so its dismissed either way

Madisen asks if there are any more questions from the committee and moves on to the next complaint

Complaint 19:

Madisen calls a point of personal privilege and says they will be in when everyone is on the stand, sitting down, and quiet

Rhea advises dismissal

Madisen asks if the committee has any comments or questions

Rhea says if anyone is curious all the information is in the complaint informal agreements

Complaint 20:

Rhea says a lot happened after filing this complaint. Tammy resigned and she got access to her account, getting access to Spencer's receipts and financial forms. She says she found that Spencer submitted these documents way before the deadline and just sent them over to Tammy. She says this is an EAC fault

Spencer says he was denied when he first submitted his final financial disclosure form, but sorted things out with Tammy

Madisen moves on to the next complaint

Complaint 21:

Nardos says Cathrine isn't in the Teams meeting

Madisen says this case isn't dismissed

Madisen moves to formally adjourn

Meeting is adjourned at 7:41 p.m..