

IN THE SUPREME COURT)	
)	
Action No. 23-002)	
)	
Tanner Jacob Edwards)	
PLAINTIFF)	
)	
Versus)	
)	
Board of Elections)	DEFENDANTS' MOTION
Sophie van Duin,)	FOR EXPEDITED
Acting Chair of the Board of Elections)	REVIEW
DEFENDANTS)	
)	
)	
)	
)	
)	
)	
)	
)	

MOTION

1. Pursuant to R. 36, a party may “petition the Court to take certain actions outside complaint or answer by means of motion.” R.37 requires that motions contain “(1) an allegation of the grounds for the order sought; (2) the order sought.”

2. Given the nature of the claims present, DEFENDANTS respectfully requests that the review of this case be expedited. This is to ensure that the normal election process is not significantly disrupted by any rulings stemming from this case and to ensure that the resources of DEFENDANTS are focused on administering the ongoing election. It would have a negative impact on the student body to allow an election to continue without certainty of the eligibility of a candidate for the office of Student Body President. If this election is allowed to proceed without an opinion of the Court in this case, there is the very real possibility that a lengthy process of re-running the election will have to be undertaken and leave the student body without representation until such time as the position is filled.

3. This Court has, in the 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. The Court reasoned that “The Court waived arguments on standing to bring suit, necessary defendants, and the jurisdictional issue. This was done to expedite the hearing because the standing to sue and the necessary defendants were not contested, were immediately clear from the pleadings, and are thoroughly and clearly spelled out in statute.” In this case, the jurisdiction of the Court is not in question, nor are the defendants. While there are many questions raised by this case, there is no reason to believe that these questions can not be resolved on an expedited timeline.

4. Plaintiff moves for expedited review or other extraordinary writ such that:
 - a. Discovery be completed not later than January 29th.
 - b. Expedited hearings be held not later than February 1st.

Filed this the 24th day of January, 2024, at 6:45 P.M.

/s/ Andrew H. Gary
COUNSEL

