Decision of the Elections Commission
Elections Commissions vs. Sitara Nayudu
Submitted: Wednesday, April 21st, 2010 9:49 pm

Based on the information submitted, the Elections Commission has cleared Sitara Nayudu of any wrongdoing. In a complaint submitted by the Elections Commission, there were differences that were discovered between Ms. Nayudu's Financial Statement form and the attached receipts. Ms. Nayudu listed fliers and butcher paper as personal expenses on her form, but on the receipts, Shane Jagow's name was listed as the individual purchasing the items in question. The items amounted to $428.05. This violates two sections of the ASUCI Elections Code: Article XX, Section B, Clause 5 states, "Falsifying a Financial Statement as defined in Article XVII", and Article XVII, Section B, which states, "Each Executive Officer or Legislative Council candidate is restricted from accepting more than seventy five dollars ($75) per donor during any regular, special, and run-off Election".

During the Evidentiary Hearing, Ms. Nayudu was able to produce a bank statement from Mr. Jagow that proved Ms. Nayudu paid Mr. Jagow back $430, the cost of the items in question. The transaction receipt was dated 4/7/2010, well before the deadline to turn in the Financial Statement form. The Elections Commission has determined that although Ms. Nayudu made an error in filling out the Financial Statement form, no sanctions will be placed on Ms. Nayudu. The error was not significant to warrant any action.

_____
John Kim
Elections Commissioner

Complaint submitted as follows:
Upon further review of Sitara Nayudu's financial statement form, the Elections Commission have discovered discrepancies between the form and the attached receipts. In two of the receipts that have been attached to the Financial Statement form, the source of the payment has been attributed to Shane Jagow. The receipts were for the fliers and the t-shirts that were used in the campaign. The total amount of these purchases was calculated to be $428.05. In the section with the list of donors in Sitara's form, Shane is listed as donating $40 to Sitara's campaign. Because the amount paid by Shane exceeds the $75 maximum, and because this purchase is attributed to Sitara, Sitara has violated the Elections Code in the sections mentioned above.