

Texas State University Student Government Supreme Court

Syllabus

Kaden Farrington vs Jordan Hunter
Complaint No: 06-104: 141,119, and 103

Complaints received – March 26th, 2025. Argued – March 30th, 2025. Syllabus Issued – March 30th, 2025.

The Court received three complaints from Kaden Farrington (referred to as petitioner) alleging that Jordan Hunter (referred to as defendant) had violated Campaigning regulations as set forth by the Student Government Election Code (referred to as S.G.E.C) and a memorandum issued by the Court on March 26th, 2025. These complaints have been consolidated into two. The complaints alleged:

- 1- “A voting link was added to their Instagram bios after the end of the voting period. As this link did not previously exist, this is in violation of the memorandum issued by the Court.”
- 2- “After adding the link, the Instagram account followed a lot of new accounts. This is campaigning and was done after the ending of the campaign period.”

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- For the first complaint, Mr. Hunter is not guilty of violating the Code and the Memorandum issued by the Court.
- 2- For the second complaint, Mr. Hunter is guilty of violating the Code and the Memorandum issued by the court.
- 3- As stated in the memorandum, Mr. Hunter is guilty of 3 class A violations.
- 4- After the end of the campaigning window, the only remedy available to the Court is disqualification. Mr. Hunter will not be disqualified for this violation.

A detailed opinion on how the court reached these determinations will be issued at a later date. This is in accordance with policy changes that the Court has incorporated a timely election certification.

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