

IN THE SUPREME COURT )  
 )  
 Action No. 16-005 )  
 )  
 Matthew McKnight, )  
 PLAINTIFF )  
 )  
 Versus )  
 )  
 Paul Kushner, )  
 Chair, Board of Elections )  
 Andy Hoang, )  
 Member, Board of Elections )  
 Arunabha Debnath, )  
 Member, Board of Elections )  
 Joanna Zhang, )  
 Member, Board of Elections )  
 Zaid Khatib, )  
 Member, Board of Elections )  
 Zach Johnson, )  
 Member, Board of Elections )  
 DEFENDANTS )

**ORDER REJECTING APPEAL**

I. BACKGROUND

On February 23rd, 2017, the Board of Elections heard the case of Edwards v. McKnight III.

On February 24th, 2017, the Board of Elections delivered a decision to assign Matthew McKnight, a Student Body President candidate, a sanction of 8 points for Falsification under VI S.G.C. §801(E)(5). McKnight had already been assigned 7 points per the Board of Elections’ decision on Edwards v. McKnight I. With a total of 15 points, Matthew McKnight was disqualified as a candidate for Student Body President pursuant to VI S.G.C. §801(B).

On February 25th, 2017, Matthew McKnight requested an appeal of the Board of Elections’ decision to the Supreme Court.

On February 26th, 2017, the Supreme Court met to discuss Plaintiff’s request for appeal pursuant to VI S.G.C. §831(D).

II. ANALYSIS

Plaintiff argues that (1) because Ms. Shriver did not reply to the email he sent her on February 7th, 2017, she was not “involved” with his campaign, as the Board of Elections determined in its finding his campaign had committed a falsification in Edwards v. McKnight III, and (2) the Board erred in classifying this falsification as “material.”

Concerning the meaning of “involved,” as this Court stated in its rejection of appeals in *Nail v. Kushner et al.* (16-003) and *McKnight v. Kushner et al.* (16-004), the Board of Elections has wide latitude pursuant

to VI S.G.C. §801 to determine what constitutes a violation under each offense category and the number of points to assign for each violation. In this matter, the Board's determination that Mr. McKnight's intention to involve Ms. Shriver in his campaign by contacting her on February 7th constitutes involvement is a reasonable interpretation of involvement in his campaign, thus substantiating the Board's finding that Mr. McKnight committed a falsification.

Concerning the materiality of the falsification, the Court finds this point moot given its determination concerning Plaintiff's first argument in this appeal. A determination from this Court on this point would not undo Mr. McKnight's disqualification as a candidate for Student Body President pursuant to VI S.G.C. §801(B).

### III. ORDER

The Court rejects Plaintiff's request for appeal pursuant to VI S.G.C. §831(D). The Board of Elections decision is therefore binding.

*It is so ordered.*

Done this 26th day of February, 2017, at 4:30 p.m.