

IN THE SUPREME COURT)	
)	
Action No. _____)	
)	
Andrew H. Gary)	
PLAINTIFF)	PLAINTIFF'S MOTION
)	FOR EXPEDITED
Versus)	REVIEW
)	
Board of Elections,)	
DEFENDANT)	
)	
)	

MOTION

1. Pursuant to R. 34, a party may “petition the Court to take certain actions outside complaint or answer by means of motion”.
2. This court has in past granted requests for expedited proceedings, see *Levy v. Ruffin* 1 S.S.C. 5 (1971). In this case, the Court took action to expedite the hearing by waiving certain arguments.
3. We assert that the electoral fundamentals are shaped by DEFENDANT’s improper administration of elections. Denial of this motion would cause substantive harm to the electoral process and the rights of the PLAINTIFF. Continuing to allow DEFENDANT to act in an illegal manner jeopardizes the results of the referendum (see Exhibit A of PLAINTIFF’s Complaint) and increases the need for a complete rerun of the election because the longer the election continues, the more graduate students will be able to unduly influence the outcome of the referendum.
4. Violations of electoral law which occur earlier in an election cycle are viewed by this Court as more significant and a greater cause for relief, per *Klein v. Morgan* 1 S.S.C. 212 (2008).
5. Plaintiff moves for expedited review or other extraordinary writ such that:
 - a. The Court directs DEFENDANT to respond within thirty-six (36) hours to PLANTIFF’s complaint;
 - b. Expedited hearings be held and written judgement of the Court published prior to the conclusion of voting on November 3rd, 2023.

I do affirm that I have read in full the foregoing complaint and that the allegations contained therein are true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

/s/ Andrew H. Gary



Filed this the 31st day of October, 2023, at 2:15 a.m.