

As written by Justice Matthew Okocha

**JUDICIAL PANEL**  
**UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT GOVERNMENT**  
**THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY**

**AMJAD ALMUTI**

Plaintiff

v.

**MATTHEW LEVINE**

Defendant

**FEBRUARY 26, 2025**

As written by Justice Matthew Okocha

In the matter of *Almuti v. Levine*, the plaintiff alleges that the defendant violated Article II A (v) and Article II A(i) of the Undergraduate Student Government Election Bylaws.

### **Election Bylaws**

First, it must be mentioned that the Plaintiff's brief gave an incomplete citation of the bylaws listed. The Judicial Panel Standing Rules on Plaintiff briefs state that they must include, "The specific bylaw alleged to have been violated." The Plaintiff only included only an in-text citation of these rules, not the clause, which the Judicial Panel finds, and had found previously (in *Almuti v. Cox (2025)*, *Almuti v. Griffith (2025)*, and *Cox v. Griffith (2025)*), to be an incomplete citation. Below are the bylaws stated by the plaintiff in their brief:

#### Article II A (v)

*"Any candidate seeking election to any position is required to abstain from engaging in any type of bullying or harassment of other candidates. This includes, but is not limited to, actions such as mockery, belittlement, intimidation, or any other behavior intended to harm, demean, or undermine the candidacy of others. This is a type IV bylaw."*

#### Article II A(i)

*"Candidates, candidate teams, and slates may not disseminate libelous or slanderous information against another candidate. This is a type III bylaw."*

*Held:* The Judicial Panel cannot render an opinion as to whether the Defendant is guilty or not guilty.

### **Opinion**

In the matter of *Almuti v. Levine*, the plaintiff, Mr. Almuti, alleged that the defendant, Mr. Levine, engaged in misconduct through the use of aggressive and discriminatory rhetoric directed at the plaintiff's campaign team. Additionally, the plaintiff alleged that Mr. Levine engaged in coercion and intimidation by demanding that a student run for a Senate seat in the Undergraduate Student Government. Finally, the plaintiff claimed that Mr. Levine sought to frame Mr. Almuti's slate as "inferior, rather than engaging in substantive campaign discourse."

While the Judicial Panel recognizes the seriousness of these allegations, we are unable to issue a ruling due to improper bylaw citation. The plaintiff's brief contains incomplete and incorrectly cited bylaws, which prevent the Panel from properly assessing the claims presented. In accordance with the precedent established in *Almuti v. Cox (2025)*, *Almuti v. Griffith (2025)*, and *Cox v. Griffith (2025)*, the Judicial Panel cannot issue rulings on claims that cite election bylaws

As written by Justice Matthew Okocha

improperly or incompletely. The Panel has consistently upheld this standard to ensure the integrity and fairness of the judicial process.

Upon comparison of the Undergraduate Student Government Election Bylaws with the bylaws cited in the plaintiff's brief (Article II A (v) and Article II A(i)), the Panel found that these citations do not exist within the governing documents. This failure to provide the correct bylaw references means that the Panel has no legal framework within which to evaluate the claims presented.

This standard is in place to ensure that the Judicial Panel remains fair to both parties in all cases. Without complete and proper citations—including both the clause and an in-text reference—the Panel would be forced to interpret the intent of the plaintiff, which risks overstepping our role. The burden is on the plaintiff to present clear and precise citations, and failing to do so not only undermines the fairness of the proceedings but also makes it impossible for the Panel to apply the bylaws as written. Allowing cases to proceed with incomplete citations would introduce subjectivity into our rulings, which is fundamentally unfair to both the plaintiff and the defendant and would set a dangerous precedent for future cases.

Due to the absence of complete and proper citations, the Judicial Panel is unable to assess the validity of the plaintiff's claims.

**It is so ordered.**

Signed: The Judicial Panel

Majority:

Chief Justice Matthew Okocha

Justice RiverJordan Carr

Justice Ethan Moore

Justice Sean O'Brien

Justice Judith Vega