ASUCI JUDICIAL BOARD

"The Judicial Board has final judicial authority for ASUCI, which extends to all cases arising under the governing documents of ASUCI, all official actions of ASUCI officials and staff, and any matters delegated to the Judicial Board by the Senate or Student Advocate General."

JUDICIAL RULING ON R54-132:
Engineering Senator Quarterly Requirement

ABUNDIS, M., delivered the opinion of the Board,

VICE CHIEF JUSTICE ABUNDIS delivered the opinion of the Board, in response to the passing of Senate legislation R54-132.

Despite the noble intentions Senate Legislation R54-132 reflects in its attempt to synchronize the actions of the Engineering Senators and the Engineering Student Council, it is prima facie an iteration of past Senate legislation R54-42, which was overturned due to its impositions of discriminatory onus on a subsection of the ASUCI Senate.

I

The operative clause of legislation R54-132 adds the attendance of "a minimum of one meeting with the Engineering Student Council Vice President of Relations per quarter…" or replacement actions in lieu of this practice to the duties for the Senator(s) for the school of Engineering. The permanent enshrinement of additional job duties to a particular Senate seat, like the addition of a requirement to attend meetings beyond those applicable to all Senators, as performed by legislation R54-132 is inherently against the spirit of equality granted to all Senate seats in the ASUCI Constitution and By-Laws as was interpreted in the Judicial Board ruling overturning Senate Legislation R54-42. As was stated in that ruling, "the adding of legal obligations to senate seats discriminately removes this fairness" inherent in the ASUCI Constitution and By-Laws and by extension the equality that is intended among the Senators, and for such reasons, may not stand in ASUCI legal code without being contradictory to the spirit of ASUCI founding documents.

The Judicial Board's opinion has not changed as to the constitutionality of imposing different requirements for different Senate seats and the present ruling is an affirmation of the precedent enshrined in the ruling *In Re R54-42* in its entirety.

* * *

We reiterate the findings of the Judicial Board ruling in R54-42, "If in the future the Senate so desired to increase the obligations of Senators, such action is legitimately within their prerogative, however any amendments must by universal in scope to abide by the ASUCI Constitution and By-Laws."

It is so ordered.