

As written by Justice Matthew Okocha

JUDICIAL PANEL
UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT GOVERNMENT
THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

OLIVER GRIFFITH

Plaintiff

v.

ROBERT ROSSING-NOMA CAMPAIGN

Defendant(s)

February 23, 2025

As written by Justice Matthew Okocha

In the matter of Griffith vs. Rossing-Noma Campaign, the plaintiffs allege that the defendants violated Digital Petitioning Guidelines of the Undergraduate Student Government.

Bylaws

Digital Petitioning Guidelines, Section 6

“Digital petition forms must collect the following information from signatories:

a. First Name

b. Last Name.#

c. Date

d. Typed Signature

*e. Name(s) of Student(s) Who Circulated the Form to You**

*i. *This can be selected from a list (dropdown, multiple choice, etc.) or typed manually (short answer, extended response, etc.), however an option to manually type an answer must be available to signatories.”*

Held: The Judicial Panel finds that the Defendants are in violation of the Digital Petitioning Guidelines, Section 6.

Opinion

In the matter of Griffith vs. Rossing-Noma, the plaintiffs alleged that the defendants failed to provide a required field for circulators to input their names on the Rossing-Noma petition, in violation of the Digital Petition Guidelines, Section 6.

The Judicial Panel finds that the defendants did, in fact, fail to provide a designated box for circulators to type in their names, resulting in a procedural deficiency in the petition collection process. The plaintiffs’ brief explicitly stated:

“As late as 23 January 2025, the Robert Rossing–Noma petition could be observed without an option to type a circulator’s name.”

Given this assertion, the Judicial Panel reviewed the evidence and determined that any petition signatures collected prior to January 24, 2025, could not be validated due to the missing circulator field. As a result, all signatures obtained on or before January 23, 2025, were struck from the Rossing-Noma petition.

Following this correction, the Judicial Panel proceeded with a revalidation of the remaining signatures submitted by the Rossing-Noma campaign. After removing the invalidated signatures, the campaign still retained 539 valid signatures, exceeding the threshold required to appear on the ballot.

As written by Justice Matthew Okocha

Accordingly, the Judicial Panel rules that despite the procedural error, the Rossing-Noma campaign has met the necessary signature requirement and will remain eligible for placement on the ballot.

It is so ordered.

Signed: The Judicial Panel

Majority:

Chief Justice Matthew Okocha

Justice Judith Vega

Justice Abby Yallop

Justice Sean O'Brien