

As written by Justice Matthew Okocha

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

**AFHAN TAHA**

Plaintiff

v.

**CELEBRITY DAILEY-BROWN**

Defendant

**MARCH 18, 2025**

As written by Justice Matthew Okocha

In the matter of TAHA v. DAILEY-BROWN, the plaintiff alleges that the defendant violated Article IV.D.b and Article II.A.a.v of the Undergraduate Student Government Election Bylaws.

### **Election Bylaws**

Article IV.D.b.

*“Candidates may not knowingly falsify any documents submitted to the Judicial Panel at any time or falsely testify/present false evidence in a Judicial Panel proceeding. This is a Type V bylaw.”*

Article II.A.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.”*

*Held:* The Judicial Panel finds Ms. Celebrity Dailey-Brown not guilty of all alleged violations.

### **Opinion**

In the matter of Taha v. Dailey-Brown, the plaintiff, Mr. Afhan Taha, alleges that the defendant, Ms. Celebrity Dailey-Brown, violated Article IV.D.b twice, which prohibits candidates from submitting false testimony or information to the Judicial Panel, and Article II.A.a.v, which prohibits candidates from undermining an opponent’s candidacy through intimidation, belittlement, or other forms of harm. After reviewing the evidence and arguments presented, the Judicial Panel finds that the defendant is not guilty of any of the alleged violations.

The first alleged violation concerns Ms. Dailey-Brown’s claim that Mr. Taha had not submitted a petition as part of his candidacy. However, as Mr. Taha was on the ballot, he necessarily had to have submitted a petition. While this statement appears to be factually incorrect, the Judicial Panel finds that Ms. Dailey-Brown did not knowingly submit false information.

During the hearing, it was clarified that Ms. Dailey-Brown believed that a candidate must submit a separate petition to be part of a slate. Her statement was based on her incorrect assumption that Mr. Taha was a member of the Almuti-Jasim slate, and she believed that because he had not submitted such a petition, he was not in compliance with election rules. While her assumption was incorrect, there is no evidence to suggest that she knowingly submitted false information with intent to mislead the Panel.

As written by Justice Matthew Okocha

The second alleged violation of false testimony concerns Ms. Dailey-Brown's claim that Mr. Taha was part of the Almuti-Jasim slate. The Judicial Panel finds that this claim was made based on evidence the defendant believed to be true. Ms. Dailey-Brown presented Mr. Taha's involvement in campaign pictures and on the Almuti-Jasim website as justification for her claim. The Judicial Panel recognizes that her argument was ultimately incorrect, as Mr. Taha was officially registered as an independent candidate. However, an incorrect statement made with supporting evidence does not equate to knowingly submitting false information. Because Ms. Dailey-Brown's claim was based on her interpretation of the evidence, rather than an intentional attempt to deceive the Panel; she is not guilty of violating Article IV.D.b.

Mr. Taha further alleges that Ms. Dailey-Brown's brief was filed as a deliberate attempt to sabotage his candidacy by spreading false claims and misinformation. However, the Judicial Panel does not find evidence that her brief was submitted with malicious intent.

The Judicial Panel acknowledges that the process of submitting complaints is an essential component of fair elections, and candidates should feel free to raise concerns about potential violations without fear of retribution. While Ms. Dailey-Brown's case against Mr. Taha was ultimately based on incorrect assumptions, the Judicial Panel finds that her actions were not meant to deliberately harm or undermine Mr. Taha's candidacy but were instead an attempt to seek clarification on election procedures. Thus, the Judicial Panel finds the defendant not guilty of violating Article II.A.a.v.

After reviewing the case, the Judicial Panel finds that Ms. Dailey-Brown did not knowingly submit false information nor attempt to maliciously undermine Mr. Taha's candidacy. Her statements were based on misinterpretations of election procedures rather than deliberate falsifications. The Judicial Panel advises all candidates to thoroughly understand the election bylaws before making claims about their opponents. While the Panel does not discourage candidates from filing complaints they believe to be valid, the Panel warns against making allegations based on assumptions rather than verifiable facts.

**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