

# Supreme Court of the Student Body

No. 23-002

T.J. EDWARDS

Plaintiff

v.

BOARD OF ELECTIONS

Defendant

---

## ORDER

---

The motion to dismiss and strike the defendant’s answer from the record is **DENIED** per curiam. The Court agrees with the defendant's characterization of this motion as “frivolous” and in conflict with R. 40 and R. 41. *Response in Opposition to Motion to Dismiss* ¶ 4-5. We note that striking the entirety of the defendant’s answer would impose a massive burden on the Board of Elections, making it far more difficult for it to fulfill its statutory obligations. We strongly discourage parties from filing dilatory motions, especially as this case is deeply time sensitive. Deliberately slowing Court proceedings or weighing down opposing parties with unnecessary filings is always inadvisable.

We reaffirm our previous order that only current students of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill can serve as counsel in cases before this Court. Implicit in the third title of the Joint Code of Student Government is the idea that, as a principle of student self-governance, student law must be practiced by and on behalf of the students of this University. Both parties should bear this in mind. However, the defendant has made very clear they are represented by Andrew Gary, and that the title “Consulting Counsel” is merely to convey Callie Stevens’s supplementary contributions. Accordingly, we further **ORDER** the

defendant to refile their answer while only striking Stevens's name. The performance of this action will not substantively affect any aspect of this case.

/s/Nathaniel Shue  
Chief Justice of the Student  
Supreme Court

Dated this 27th of January,  
2024