

Election Commission (EC) Violation Hearing Student Government Conference Room (SU 320) March 25, 2025 5:40 PM

EC VIOLATION HEARING

1. Call to Order: 5:48 PM

2. Roll Call & Verification of Quorum: 6/4

Name	Email	Initial	Final
Supervisor of Elections Luke Brown	sga_ec@ucf.edu sgec9@ucf.edu	Р	
Assistant Supervisor of Elections Alyssia Wright	sga_aec@ucf.edu sgec3@ucf.edu	Р	
Commissioner Norah Sackett	sgec1@ucf.edu	Р	
Commissioner VACANT	sgec2@ucf.edu	-	-
Commissioner Aneesha Nayak	sgec4@ucf.edu	Р	
Commissioner Amarah Presley	sgec5@ucf.edu	E	
Commissioner VACANT	sgec6@ucf.edu	1	-
Commissioner Jessica Vitarelli	sgec7@ucf.edu	Р	
Commissioner Brianna Phillips	sgec8@ucf.edu	Р	
Commissioner VACANT	sgec10@ucf.edu	-	-

- a. Introduction of Violation Hearing:
 - a. Tellez Affidavit (1).jpeg



Election Commission (EC) Violation Hearing Student Government Conference Room (SU 320) March 25, 2025 5:40 PM

b. Supervisor Brown: On March 12th, Lester Tellez submitted an affidavit regarding an event in where Luci Blanco and Jarib Benetiz attended a campaign-related event. At this event, there was pizza that was distributed to attendees. Today the Election Commission will be determining if this is a violation of the Election Statutes under Title VI, Chapter 606.3, Section E stating that "Providing food, drinks, or prizes to influence the action of another to vote, not vote, or vote for or against a particular candidate/ticket. This rule applies both on and off university-controlled property"

b. Statement of the Filer:

Tellez: I am filing an affidavit because of a potential violation of 604.2(F), which is: At no point can a candidate, group of candidates, ticket, or third party (with the exception of the Election Commission) provide food, drinks, or prizes to voters. Such items shall be considered bribes. This rule applies both on and off university-controlled property. A violation of this statue could lead to a violation of the two following violation statues: • 606.3(E): Providing food, drinks, or prizes to influence the action of another to vote, not vote, or vote for or against a particular candidate/ticket. This rule applies both on and off university-controlled property. • 606.4(F): Committing or attempting a bribe. The first one being a Tier III violation and the second one being a Tier IV violation, this can add up to being a Tier 7 violation. Mary pointed out, in Luci's evidence, that she invited Luci and Jarib to come speak at 6PM at the College Republican Meeting, after Anna Paulina Luna spoke, and showed the receipt for the pizza she purchased, which was distributed to multiple voters during the event and was available to voters when Luci and Jarib were speaking at the event, according to Luke and Kievon, who are my witnesses. They also show that the 15 minute delay of Luci showing up was not planned and rather was an inconvenience of traffic, contradicting Mary's statement of Luci showing up 15 minutes after the APL event was somehow planned, when it was in fact a delay since they had planned to meet at 6pm. My witnesses will be reading their statements describing the events they saw.

c. Statement of the Accused:

a. Blanco: Good Evening, Mister Supervisor, Madam Assistant Supervisor, and Members of the Commission, In response to the alleged violation of Statute 604.2(F) concerning our campaign activities, I, Luci Blanco, respectfully submit that a careful examination of Title VI: The Election Statutes clearly demonstrates that no violation has occurred. Statute 604.2(F) prohibits candidates or third parties from providing "food, drinks, or prizes" to voters, categorizing these actions explicitly as bribery. Bribery, as clarified by Statute 600.1(E), specifically requires that a gift or favor be provided with the explicit intent to influence voter action. Firstly, the pizza in question was independently purchased by Mary Connolly using her personal funds exclusively for members of the College Republicans. No evidence exists demonstrating that either Mister Benitez or myself authorized, funded,



Election Commission (EC) Violation Hearing Student Government Conference Room (SU 320) March 25, 2025 5:40 PM

facilitated, or were otherwise connected to the purchase or distribution of the pizza. Mary Connolly explicitly confirmed the independent nature of her action, clearly severing any connection to our campaign. Secondly, the timing of our attendance further clarifies this separation. Mister Benitez and I arrived at the venue only after the conclusion of the main event, featuring a virtual appearance by Congresswoman Anna Paulina Luna. By the time we began our campaign presentation, the food had already been independently provided without any involvement or promotion from our campaign. Moreover, the definition of active campaigning under Statute 600.1(B) involves explicit solicitation of votes through distributed materials or tangible inducements. Neither Mister Benitez nor myself engaged in actions meeting this definition concerning the pizza. We neither directly nor indirectly provided nor promoted the pizza as a means of inducing voter support. Additionally, no witness testimony or evidence provided shows any explicit association between the pizza's availability and our campaign activities or our presentation at the event. Such explicit linkage is required under Statute 600.1(E) to constitute bribery. In conclusion, although food was present at the event during which we campaigned, a thorough analysis of the relevant statutes clearly establishes that neither Mister Benitez nor I took any action, explicit or implicit, intended to distribute food as an inducement for voter support. Therefore, under the provisions of Statute 604.2(F), there is no valid basis for determining that a violation occurred. Thank you.

- d. Questioning of the Filer:
 - a. N/A
- e. Ouestioning of the Accused:
 - a. Supervisor Brown: Did you condone the distribution or purchase of the pizza in any way?
 - i. Blanco: Nope.
 - b. Requires Motion:
 - i. Tellez: Did you carefully review the Title VI Statues?
 - 1. Blanco: Yes, in my statement I tried to show you we understand and respect the rules and would never do anything to disrespect them.
 - ii. Tellez: Did Mary host you at the College Republicans RSO meeting
 - 1. Blanco: I'm unclear on the correct use of host. She is the president of the RSO. She allowed us to come. You can see in our evidence she said in a message there is a guest coming and you cannot interfere. We were totally cool with it and already knew we were completely separate from their event.
 - iii. Tellez: Was the plan to show up to the event at 6pm?
 - 1. Blanco: We were told to come after the speaker was done. We gave our presentation closer to 6:15. Also due to traffic, I was running a little late.



Election Commission (EC) Violation Hearing Student Government Conference Room (SU 320) March 25, 2025 5:40 PM

We were scheduled to come after the event was over, but ended up a little later anyways.

- iv. Tellez: Were you aware there was pizza given out to voters at this meeting?
 - 1. Already answered in their statement.
- v. Tellez: Were you aware of statue 604.2(F) prior to the event?
 - 1. Already answered in their statement
- f. Questioning of the Filers Witnesses and Evidence:
 - a. <u>Tellez Evidence</u>
 - b. Witness Keivan Sarajedini: On March 5th, 2025, I attended a meeting of the UCF College Republicans, this meeting was originally billed as an event where the congresswoman, Anna Paulina Luna would be giving a talk over Zoom, as well as answering questions that we at the meeting had. Prior to the official start time of the meeting, College Republicans president Mary Conolly stated to me, as well as a few individuals who had arrived early, that Luci Blanco and Jarib Benitez would be coming after the call with the congresswoman ended to discuss their campaign for student body president. It was also at this time that I had noticed Mary had brought pizza to give out to those in attendance. Following the congresswoman's call, Mary stated once again to all those in attendance that Luci and Jarib would be arriving to discuss their campaign. They would show up after a roughly 10-minute delay following the congresswoman's talk and give a roughly 15-minute presentation on their campaign goals and why we should vote for them. Primarily as people were arriving at the start of the meeting, the pizza was given out to people who were there. The pizza was available at any time during the meeting as it was on a table at the front of the room.
 - c. Witness Luke Paul: I, Luke Paul, hereby affirm that the following statements are true and accurate to the best of my knowledge. On March 5th Lucy Blanco and Jarib Benitez campaigned at the UCF GOP meeting that had pizza. I can also confirm that this meeting was announced February 27th, six days before the actual meeting, where it was revealed, we would have pizza. I could also tell that Mary Connolly was attempting to convince us to vote for the Blanco Benitez campaign due to her dislike of Lester Tellez. *The rest was added in the meeting* The event was scheduled a week or so in advance. We were scheduled to meet with her, and she said in the group chat we would have pizza, and she also said she wasn't sure if we would have added speakers so the event wouldn't be over until everyone already left
 - d. Sackett: You said you saw in an announcement what the event would entail. Did she make a statement at the beginning of the meeting, or did you know what was going on based on that announcement in the group chat?



Election Commission (EC) Violation Hearing Student Government Conference Room (SU 320) March 25, 2025 5:40 PM

- i. Luke: There was the announcement, and she went over everything that was going to happen on that day. She said that we would talk to the lady in DC and talk to students regarding their campaign
- e. Nayak: Does this club usually provide pizza during meetings?
 - i. No
- f. Vitarelli: Both Witnesses, when during the meeting was the Pizza distributed?
 - i. The pizza was at the front of the table and was taken at the start of the meeting during the first half when the congress women was speaking and was available to be taken the entire time.
 - ii. Paul: Mary did offer them pizza and people came through throughout the meeting
- g. Supervisor Brown: When you guys have guest speakers is it common to have food?
 - i. Its not common, it's usually just for special circumstances.
- h. Supervisor Brown: Was the congresswomen coming to a special event?
 - i. Yes
 - ii. The only other time we had food was during the watch party last semester for the presidential election.
- i. Nayak: to Paul Can you elaborate when you say Mary Connelly was attempting to campaign by telling the attendees to vote for Blanco/Benetiz
 - i. Tellez and Mary dislike each other. So, I felt that she invited Blanco and Benetiz in hopes that Tellez would attend it would be a stab at him and influence others to vote for Blanco and Benetiz
- j. Phillips: What time did this meeting start?
 - i. Usually at 7, but because this was a special circumstance we started at 5:30 to adjust for the congress women.
- g. Questioning of the Accused Candidate/Ticket's Witnesses and Evidence:
 - a. Blanco & Benitez Evidence
 - b. Written Statement of Mary Connolly
 - i. On March 5th, Luci Blanco and Jarib Benitez visited our RSO (College Republicans) to introduce themselves, discuss their initiatives, and answer questions. This visit took place after an event where Representative Anna Paulina Luna addressed the group virtually, which ran from 5:40 to 6:00 pm. However, Luci and Jarib did not arrive until 6:15 pm, well after the event had concluded and those who were there explicitly to hear the Congresswoman had left. They were not present during the speaker's address and did not provide any food or drinks. Pizza was provided at the event prior to Luci and Jarib's arrival. It was not associated with them or their campaign in any way, and it was purchased by me with my own money strictly for the College Republicans event. Although some pieces



Election Commission (EC) Violation Hearing Student Government Conference Room (SU 320) March 25, 2025 5:40 PM

remained in the room when they came in, it had no association with them or their campaign. Here is the receipt of my purchase: (Image of receipt attached in the document) Therefore, the candidates absolutely did not commit a violation of statute 604.2 F, which states: "At no point can a candidate, group of candidates, ticket, or third party (with the exception of the Election Commission) provide food, drinks, or prizes to voters. Such items shall be considered bribes. This rule applies both on and off university-controlled property." They were very careful to observe the statute and made sure to avoid associating with or involving themselves with the Congresswoman or any political matters at all. Therefore, these violations are unfounded and should be dismissed immediately.

h. Final Questioning:

- a. Nayak: to Blanco & Benitez, did Mary Connolly request for you to present?
 - i. Blanco: We reached out. She did not invite us personally. This was fully us to try to have all students to learn about our platform since there are a lot of tickets.
- b. Supervisor Brown: Were you aware that there was going to be Pizza at the event? Also, did you condoned the distribution of the pizza
 - i. Blanco: No, we were not a part of the pizza purchase or distribution. We were offered pizza and declined. No one came up during our presentation to get pizza. Also, a lot of the club members had already left. When the promotion of this event was happening, our names were not on it. We came just to present our platform.
 - ii. Benitez: No member walked out or in during our presentation. So, it was the same people at the beginning and end of our presentation.
- i. Closing Statement of the Filer:
 - a. Tellez: I will be waiting for the results of the affidavit hearing.
- j. Closing Statement of the Accused Candidate/Ticket:
 - a. Mister Supervisor, Madam Assistant Supervisor, and Members of the Commission, The evidence presented today clearly establishes that neither Mister Benitez nor I authorized, funded, or facilitated the pizza provided by Mary Connolly. The explicit separation in both purchase and timing, along with the absence of intent or explicit linkage to our campaign, conclusively demonstrates compliance with Statute 604.2(F). No tangible inducements or promotional connections to voter influence have been substantiated. We respectfully ask the Commission to find, based on the evidence and statutory definitions presented, that no violation has occurred. Thank you.
- k. Election Commission Deliberation:
 - a. Executive Session:
 - i. Vote on Violation: 0:6:0, a violation did not occur



Election Commission (EC) Violation Hearing Student Government Conference Room (SU 320) March 25, 2025 5:40 PM

- ii. After our deliberation, we as a commission believe that based on all of the evidence presented to us, a violation did not occur. According to Title VI 606.12 "All candidates/tickets must be aware that they are liable for actions in violation of any provisions of the Golden Rule, Student Body Constitution, or Student Body Statutes by an induced or condoned person because of authorization, assistance, or advisement from said candidate/ticket." Based on the evidence from both parties, the accused were not aware of nor condoned the pizza being served at the event. Additionally, it was made known, through the filer's witnesses, that guest speakers, such as the Congresswomen Anna Paulina Luna, constituted the food being served. Thusly, the commission has no grounds to issue a violation on this matter due to the distribution of all food and materials being independent of the ticket and was solely related to the RSO's decision to hold an event with the congresswomen. 6:0:0
- 1. Final Roll Call: 6/4
- m. Adjournment: 6:30 P.M.

Key:

- P Present
- A Absent
- E Excused
- MTD Move to Debate
- MTV Move to Vote
- MTA- Move to Amend
- MSQD Motion for Speech, Questioning, & Debate Time
- PP Postpone
- PPI Postpone Indefinitely
- GC General Consent