

**IN THE SUPREME COURT**

Action No. \_\_\_\_\_

Amol Garg, )  
Undergraduate Senator; )  
Wil Wiener, )  
Undergraduate Senator; )  
Tanner Henson, )  
Undergraduate Senator; )

PLAINTIFFS. )

VERSUS )

Arunabha Debnath, )  
Chair of the BoE; )  
Joanna Zhang, )  
Vice Chair of the BoE; )  
Elaine James, )  
Treasurer of the BoE; )

COMPLAINT

DEFENDANTS )

---

**I. JURISDICTION**

The Supreme Court holds jurisdiction as authorized under III S.G.C. §600 (a)(1) and III S.G.C. §600 (a)(2). Which state that the Supreme Court’s jurisdiction extends to controversies of “all independent agencies” and “questions of law arising under this Constitution, the laws enacted under its authority of action of the Executive Branch, Legislative Branch, Board of Elections...”

The Plaintiff alleges that the Defendant(s), members of the UNC Board of Elections, unlawfully and willingly decided to violate the student code and thus have violated the law.

## **II. STANDING**

The Plaintiffs have standing, as required under III S.G.C. §630, due to the fact that the Board of Elections decision can severely affect senatorial candidates for office, by limiting the ability of senators to advertise and campaign for office during an election that has so many candidates running.

Nowhere in the Student Governance Code or Student constitution does the Board of Elections have the authority to violate the Student Code and make personal rulings on appropriations.

## **III. NECESSARY DEFENDANTS**

Pursuant to III S.G.C. §707(a), the members of the Board of Elections, by majority vote, have “caused” and “contributed to the plaintiff’s injury.” Their vote, which has caused this unlawful injury, is the direct cause of this suit, and is the reason their presence is necessary in this hearing.

The members of the Board of Elections directly attempted to make a dangerous precedent of being able to ignore the Student Code as they seem fit. Seeing as many of the members are also continuing a future on the Board of Elections it is imperative that the Supreme Court sets clear precedent to these members that clearly defined rules and regulations of elections are necessary to ensure fair elections. Also, it is necessary it is made clear that the decisions made by the Board of Elections must follow the codified decisions. Each board member has incorrectly administered this election and attempted to establish a dangerous precedent of being able to ignore decisions made by the Undergraduate Senate.

## **IV. RELIEF**

- A. On January 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2019 the Undergraduate Senate approved the updating of the Student Code, in time for the Spring 2019 elections.
- B. On January 27<sup>th</sup>, 2019 the Student Body President signed the legislation into law.
- C. The first training mechanism for the general body was held by the Board of Elections on January 28<sup>th</sup>.
- D. The plaintiffs deem themselves entitled to the relief, under principles of justice, of the Board of Elections fulfilling its Constitutional duties of appropriating funding based solely on codified rules.

## **V. DEMAND FOR JUDGEMENT**

The plaintiffs respectfully request that the Supreme Court enforce the financial funding appropriated by the Undergraduate Senate this election cycle and issue correct election funding allotments based on the Student Code.



Amol Garg  
COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF

520 Williamson Dr, Chapel Hill,  
NC 27514  
[amolgarg@live.unc.edu](mailto:amolgarg@live.unc.edu)  
336-601-9545

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Amol Garg', written in a cursive style.

Amol Garg  
LEAD PLAINTIFF

520 Williamson Dr, Chapel Hill,  
NC 27514  
[amolgarg@live.unc.edu](mailto:amolgarg@live.unc.edu)  
336-601-9545

Filed on this the 6<sup>th</sup> day of February 2019, at **4:58 pm**