

As written by Justice Matthew Okocha

JUDICIAL PANEL
UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT GOVERNMENT
THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

CELEBRITY DAILEY-BROWN

Plaintiff

v.

AFHAN TAHA

Defendant

MARCH 18, 2025

As written by Justice Matthew Okocha

In the matter of DAILEY-BROWN v. TAHA, the plaintiff alleges that the defendant violated [insert citation] 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's bylaw references were improperly cited, missing Article headers and subclauses, as well as incomplete and/or incorrect in-text citations, 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:

*"According to the Elections Bylaws, Section B: "Petitions and Nominations," any candidate must submit a pre-verified petition to be eligible to appear on a campaign slate. - Specifically, *Section B.f.i and B.f.ii* stipulate that a candidate's name can only be added to a slate after completing the nomination process by obtaining valid candidate signatures."*

Held: The Judicial Panel dismisses the case due to improper bylaw citations.

Opinion

In the matter of Brown v. Taha, the plaintiff, Ms. Celebrity Dailey Brown, alleges that the defendant, Mr. Afhan Taha, failed to register under a slate despite his apparent association with the Almuti-Jasim campaign, as evidenced by his presence in campaign pictures and on their website. The plaintiff asserts that this gave Mr. Taha an unfair advantage over her candidacy, as both were running for the same Senate seat.

However, the Judicial Panel finds that the plaintiff's brief contains multiple bylaw citations that are either incomplete or do not exist. Because there is no clear bylaw framework under which these allegations can be assessed, the Judicial Panel is unable to render a verdict.

The Judicial Panel has consistently ruled that we cannot make determinations on cases with improper or nonexistent bylaw citations, including in *Almuti v. Cox (2025)*, *Almuti v. Griffith (2025)*, and *Cox v. Griffith (2025)*. The 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 fairness for all parties, as the Judicial Panel cannot interpret the intent of the plaintiff or infer bylaws that were not properly cited.

Without complete and proper citations—including both the clause and an in-text reference—the Panel would be forced to speculate on the intended rules and their applicability to the case. This would not only introduce subjectivity into our ruling but would also set a dangerous precedent by

As written by Justice Matthew Okocha

allowing claims to proceed without a legal basis. The burden is on the plaintiff to present clear and precise bylaw citations, and failing to do so undermines the fairness of the proceedings.

Due to the absence of complete and proper citations, the Judicial Panel is unable to assess the validity of the plaintiff's claims. As a result, the case is dismissed without a ruling on the merits.

It is so ordered.

Signed: The Judicial Panel

Majority:

Chief Justice Matt Okocha

Justice Laila Coats

Justice Ethan Moore

Justice Emily Doucette

Justice Ryan Buchko