

Texas State University Student Government Supreme Court

Hunter Jordan vs Antonio Romo and Abby Myers

Opinion No: 25-13

Dismissal of complaint

Complaint received – March 27th, 2025.

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

This opinion dismisses the complaint brought to us by Jordan Hunter against Antonio Romo regarding an alleged violation of the Student Government election code at Texas State University.

The Supreme Court received a complaint submitted by a petitioner alleging that Antonio Romo engaged in prohibited campaigning activity during the designated voting period. Specifically, the allegation claimed that Romo posted an Instagram story on his private social media account on March 27th, promoting all candidates affiliated with the Bobcat's First alliance - a date that falls within the official voting period for the 2025 spring elections.

According to the petitioner, this promotion violated a memorandum issued by the Supreme Court on March 26th, which clearly stated that any campaign activity during the voting period would be considered 3 Class A violations.

As defined by the election code, three or more Class A violations may warrant significant disciplinary action, including disqualification or extended suspension from campaign activity.

After a thorough review of the complaint, evidence, and context, the Supreme Court, exercising its authority granted by the Code of Laws, unanimously voted to dismiss the complaint. This decision is based on several key findings.

First, the court determined that Antonio Romo was not a registered campaign agent or worker for any candidate alliance participating in the spring election, as defined in Article II of the election code. Therefore, his actions cannot be evaluated under the same restrictions imposed on initiates, agents, or workers.

Under the Election Code, Antonio Romo is considered a member of the general public, and as such, retains full rights to freedom of expression, including political speech-provided that such actions are not part of an official campaign infrastructure or coordination. The election code does not, and cannot, restrict non-affiliated students from expressing personal opinions or

endorsements during the voting period. Therefore, the Instagram post in question does not fall under the definition of "campaigning" provided by the code, nor can it be classified as a Class A violation.

Any ruling to the contrary would constitute an overreach of the court's authority and a misapplication of the election code. Additionally, no evidence indicates that Romo's post was part of a coordinated campaign strategy or that it significantly affected voter equity or election integrity.

The court is bound by a standard of preponderance of the evidence when evaluating claims (Chapter 101, Article 1, Section H). In this case, the evidence does not support a finding of wrongdoing. Antonio Romo's post falls entirely outside the regulatory framework governing campaign conduct, making the complaint an example where no relief can be granted, as outlined in Chapter 101, Article I, Section B. Antonio Romo has been fully vindicated in this matter.

Pg 46, Dismissal of Complaints, Article I, Chapter 101, of the S.G.E.C. states:

“The Supreme Court may only dismiss a complaint if:

(a) The complaint violates the statute of limitations.

(b) The complaint fails to state a cause of action for which relief may be granted.

(c) The complaint is deemed as being outside the board's jurisdiction.

(d) The complaint is clearly not a violation of the Election Code, because the action is expressly permitted by the S.G.C. or previous Court rulings.”

Pursuant to section (d), the complaint is dismissed.

It is so ordered...