

**Texas State University**  
**Student Government**  
**Supreme Court**

Syllabus

Jim Demczak vs. Roderick Wilson

Complaint received March 25<sup>th</sup>, 2025. Argued March 30<sup>th</sup>, 2025. Syllabus Issued – March 30<sup>th</sup>, 2025. Opinion Issued – April 6<sup>th</sup>, 2025.

Opinion: 25-08

The Court received a complaint from Mr. Jim Demczak (referred to as petitioner) alleging that Mr. Roderick Wilson (referred to as defendant) had violated Campaigning regulations as set forth by the Student Government Election Code (referred to as S.G.E.C). The complaints alleged:

1. “Rick Wilson accessed the President’s List and sent out a campaign email using their Texas State Outlook email.”

The Court convened a hearing on this matter on March 30th, 2025. We analyzed the presented arguments from the petitioner and the defense, the submitted evidence, our cross examination, and the Code of Laws to make our determination on this matter.

The court holds:

1. Rick Wilson is not guilty of violating campaign regulations as found in the code.

A detailed opinion on how the court reached these determinations is found below.

Associate Justice Downey delivered the majority opinion for a unanimous court, in which Chief Justice Hanzala, Associate Justices Nguyen, and Hernandez joined. Justice Karki did not take part in this decision.

**Texas State University**  
**Student Government**  
**Supreme Court**

Majority Opinion  
Jim Demczak vs Roderick Wilson  
Opinion: 25-08

Associate Justice Downey delivered the majority opinion of the court.

The court received a complaint from the petitioner on March 26<sup>th</sup>, at 4:08 PM alleging that the defendant violated Article IV section 2 of the election code by using a university provided resource by using Texas State Outlook to email various students on the Presidents List which the petitioner alleged were an exclusive group of students. Furthermore, the petitioner requested that Presidential candidate Abby Myers be responsible for the actions of her agents as deemed necessary by Article 6 section 13 of the S.G.E.C. The petitioner submitted evidence which included a screenshot of the email sent. The defense provided the court with a link to the Presidents lists as part of their arguments. Furthermore, the petitioner Mr. Jim Demczak authorized Mr. Aidan Moorman to represent him on his behalf. The defense, Mr. Roderick Wilson, authorized presidential candidate Abby Myers to speak on his behalf, however Mr. Wilson would ultimately represent himself for the duration of the hearing.

Upon examining both pieces of evidence provided by both the Petitioner and Defense, the arguments presented at the hearing, and our interpretations of the S.G.E.C, we reach the conclusion that the defendant is not guilty of violating the code of laws.

The court will first respond to the arguments made by the petitioner.

The petitioner alleged that the defendant violated Article IV section 2 of the S.G.E.C by reaching out to an “exclusive group of students” over Texas State Outlook. The court unanimously agrees that while Outlook is university funded it is available to all students. The section cited by the petitioner is not valid in this case because the code specifically says in order to violate section 2 the campaigning must receive university funding AND not be available to all students. With this interpretation of the code, we do not agree with the petitioners' claim that the defendant violated the S.G.E.C.

The petitioner alleged not all people on the presidents list were included on the email thread sent and thus made that form of campaigning not available to the general student and in violation of the previously mentioned section of the S.G.E.C. However, the court continues to hold that candidates are allowed to campaign to whomever they choose and not campaign to people who they don't feel the need to campaign to.

The court questioned the defense and was presented with a link to the website in which all students eligible for the dean's list were listed. Additionally, it was presented to the court by the defendant that an asterisk is provided by each name that is on the list to show that the student is on the presidents list. Because of this evidence that was presented is the unanimous opinion of the court that because any person can view that list and see who is on it publicly it does not fit the definition of being a university funded facility, equipment, or service, that is also not available to the general student.

It is the opinion of the court that the evidence, testimony, and examination of both the petitioner and defendant show no violation of the S.G.E.C and the court hereby finds the defendant not guilty of violating the code of laws.

***It is so ordered . . .***