

# SUPREME COURT OF ENGLAND

Opinion of the Court

SC-4

Nightflyerkilo v. Ally.the.young, joined  
by Twitchymcjoe

[November 3rd]

JUSTICE WesGutt DELIVERED THE OPINION OF THE COURT

*Chief Justice Solace005 concurring*

*Justice Hendrik recused.*

The Plaintiff sued regarding the distribution of former Senator Vladimir Oppenheimer's (aka desertfox13) Representation percentage upon their announced resignation from the Senate. Oppenheimer had, as per Article 2, Section 1, Subsection 2.e of the Constitution, distributed their Representation “equally among my fellow LTP senators”

It is the view of the Court that this attempt at distribution is invalid for two reasons:

1. As per Article 2, Section 1, Subsection 2.e the Senator must distribute their *entire* Representation percentage to *an* individual, they may not distribute their representation percentages to multiple individuals
2. As per Article 2, Section 1, Subsection 2.e.i The individual must not be an elected official, all three of “[Oppenheimer]’s fellow LTP senators” were elected officials by virtue of being Senators

During the hearing there was extensive discussion on whether or not Senators are to be considered “elected officials.” It is the view of the Court that the Constitutional Framers clearly indicate that the Senators are to be considered elected by virtue of the header of Article 2 Section 1 stating “Composition and Election.” This is in contrast to, for example, Article 3 Section 1’s header “Composition and Judicial Appointment.”

The Defendant, the Speaker of the Senate and “Senior Senator of the LTP”, upon recognizing a deficiency in Oppenheimer's distribution, decided to assign the LTP Senator Sean Lambert the entirety of Oppenheimer's Representation. As per the Speakers testimony and the contents of the public record (the Discord search function), Oppenheimer did not approve or instruct this distribution.

It is the view of the Court that this attempt at distribution is invalid because as per Article 2, Section 1, Subsection 2.e, the Senator may make the distribution, not the Speaker, nor the Party the Senator belongs too.

It is therefore the opinion of the Court that no valid Article 2, Section 1, Subsection 2.e distribution occurred upon Oppenheimer's resignation and therefore the distribution of his Representation shall occur according to Section 1.2.d.ii as per Article 2, Section 1, Subsection 2.e.iii -- that is to say their Representation shall automatically be distributed by the Electioneers 1% at a time to the qualified candidate with the lowest Representation until all Representation has been assigned.

The Court has found that no outcome determinative difference in Senate voting has been associated with this incident however, as per Article 3 Section 2 Subsection 2.c of the Constitution the Speaker is mandated to ensure that any public voting record properly reflects that Senator Sean Lambert only wielded 5% Representation in all votes.