

redacted

Associated Students Judicial Council
University of California, Santa Barbara

Case number: 002-2025

Petitioner: Attorney General Eric Carlson

Respondent: Senator Enri Lala

Judicial Council Chair Krishna Thaker and Council Members Harriet Jackson, Josie Penix, and Mason Miller writing for the majority:

In the case, *The Office of Attorney General vs. Senator Enri Lala* the Petitioner alleged that the Respondent willingly participated in electoral interference by convincing his opponents to drop out of this race for executive office. He is subsequently alleged to have used the legislative institution and privileged information to prevent candidates from running against them.

The AS UCSB Judicial Council received the petition for this matter on Wednesday, April 23, 2025, and held a closed hearing on this case at 1 PM on Friday, April 25, 2025. The hearing was closed by request of the Petitioner and consent of the Respondent to ensure statements made during it are not used as campaign materials against the candidate.

The ASUCSB Judicial Council adheres to a standardized burden of proof taken on by the Petitioner described as Clear and Convincing Evidence. Proof by clear and convincing evidence means that the petitioner must prove their case with evidence that leaves the Judicial Council with a firm conviction that it is highly probable that the factual contentions of the claim or defense are true. This burden of proof is higher than a burden of proof by a preponderance of the evidence, but not the highest burden of proof of evidence beyond reasonable doubt.

Upon deliberation, the Judicial Council finds clear and convincing evidence in favor of the Petitioner.

On February 21, 2025, Senator Lala received privileged information — not available to the student body — regarding prospective candidates for President, Internal Vice President, and other positions. This occurred prior to the Candidacy Declaration Deadline on March 6, 2025. It is the responsibility of an ASUCSB Senator to “Be a non-partisan representative of all undergraduate students at the University” Article VI §(4)(M). Senator Lala failed to uphold the full extent of this responsibility.

The Judicial Council recommends to the AS Elections Board (Chaired by Ruby Hewitt) that a framework be created that outlines the candidacy period within the electoral process that specifies a pre-candidacy period during which the eligibility of identified individuals is evaluated before the deadline to declare candidacy. During this pre-candidacy period, there must be ethical electoral expectations and guidelines for individuals seeking candidacy. These guardrails should

be capable of supporting or holding pre-candidates accountable for interfering with the election process, with penalties up to the discretion of the Elections Board. The Judicial Council believes that this framework is essential to maintain the integrity of ASUCSB elections and will offer any guidance sought by the elections board, which is ultimately responsible for developing the framework and overseeing the election process.

Sincerely,

Hon. Krishna Thaker, *Judicial Council Chair*

Harriet Jackson, *Vice Chair*

Josie Penix, *Councilmember*

Mason Miller, *Councilmember*

Non-redacted

**Associated Students Judicial Council
University of California, Santa Barbara**

Case number: 002-2025

Petitioner: Attorney General Eric Carlson

Respondent: Senator Enri Lala

Judicial Council Chair Krishna Thaker and Council Members Harriet Jackson, Josie Penix, and Mason Miller writing for the majority:

As requested by the Petitioner and in consideration of the Respondent's privacy and the sensitive nature of the closed hearing, consider this decision a non-redacted version of the publicly distributed decision. The bold parts of this decision will not be a matter of public record. This non-redacted document is strictly confidential, not to be dispersed to any outside parties. The only parties with access to this non-redacted decision are the Respondent, the Petitioner, and the Judicial Council.

In the case *The Office of Attorney General vs. Senator Enri Lala* the Petitioner alleged that the Respondent willingly participated in electoral interference by convincing their opponents to drop out of their respective races for executive office. They subsequently attempted to use the legislative institution and privileged information to prevent candidates from running against them.

The AS UCSB Judicial Council received the petition for this matter on Wednesday, April 23, 2025, and held a closed hearing on this case at 1 PM on Friday, April 25, 2025. The hearing was closed by request of the Petitioner and consent of the Respondent to ensure statements made during it are not used as campaign materials against the candidate.

The ASUCSB Judicial Council adheres to a standardized burden of proof taken on by the Petitioner described as Clear and Convincing Evidence. Proof by clear and convincing evidence means that the petitioner must prove their case with evidence that leaves the Judicial Council with a firm conviction that it is highly probable that the factual contentions of the claim or defense are true. This burden of proof is higher than a burden of proof by a preponderance of the evidence, but not the highest burden of proof of evidence beyond reasonable doubt.

Upon deliberation, the Judicial Council finds by clear and convincing evidence in favor of the Petitioner.

On February 21, 2025, Senator Lala received privileged information — not available to the student body — regarding prospective candidates for President, Internal Vice President, and other positions. This occurred prior to the Candidacy Declaration Deadline on March 6, 2025. It is the responsibility of an ASUCSB Senator to “Be a non-partisan representative of all

undergraduate students at the University” Article VI §(4)(M). Senator Enri Lala failed to uphold the full extent of this responsibility. **In agreement with the Petitioner and concurring with Senator Lala’s proposal within his closing argument, the Judicial Council finds it appropriate to recommend that an apology from the Senator is released to relevant parties for his participation in the willful disenfranchisement of his peers.**

The Judicial Council recommends to the AS Elections Board (Chaired by Ruby Hewitt) that a framework be created that outlines the candidacy period within the electoral process that specifies a pre-candidacy period during which the eligibility of identified individuals is evaluated before the deadline to declare candidacy. During this pre-candidacy period, there must be ethical electoral expectations and guidelines for individuals seeking candidacy. These guardrails should be capable of supporting or holding pre-candidates accountable for interfering with the election process, with penalties up to the discretion of the Elections Board. The Judicial Council believes that this framework is essential to maintain the integrity of ASUCSB elections and will offer any guidance sought by the elections board, which is ultimately responsible for developing the framework and overseeing the election process.

Sincerely,

Hon. Krishna Thaker, Judicial Council Chair

Harriet Jackson, Vice Chair

Josie Penix, Councilmember

Mason Miller, Councilmember