



March 20, 2026

Via Email:

Micah Andrews

Kenyon Bonner, Vice President and Chief Student Affairs Officer

Julie Caruccio, Assistant Vice President for Strategic Initiatives

Benvin Lozada, Chair, Student Council Rules and Ethics Board

Michael Mitchell

Abigail Nickelson, Chair, University Board of Elections

Marsh Pattie, Associate Vice President of Student Affairs

Re: UBE Appeal of Micah Andrews

Dear Ms. Andrews, Vice President Bonner, Assistant Vice President Caruccio, Mr. Lozada, Mr. Mitchell, Ms. Nickelson, and Associate Vice President Pattie:

Micah Andrews has timely appealed the March 12, 2026, decision of the University Board of Elections (UBE)¹ certifying Michael Mitchell as the 2026-2027 Student Council (StudCo) President. She alleges that various improprieties in the election process may have unfairly influenced the outcome—decided by a mere 101 votes out of nearly 7000 cast.

As a preliminary matter, I note with great appreciation the prompt attention given to this matter by all parties involved. I am cognizant of the time-sensitive and high-pressure nature of this process, and I respect the effort that has gone into both Ms. Andrews' appeal and the UBE's thoughtful and timely response. I likewise appreciate the professional tone of the numerous exchanges among all of the parties, as well as what appear to be proactive attempts to address and resolve Ms. Andrews' concerns as they arose during the course of the election.

Turning to the merits, the Judicial Review Board (JRB) has jurisdiction to review “[a]ppealed decisions of . . . University bodies if an appeal to the JRB is incorporated within their operating procedures.” Article IV of the UBE Constitution provides that an “appellant may appeal the decision of a Hearing Panel to the University Judiciary Committee’s Judicial Review Board (JRB) within 24 hours of the Hearing Panel decision.” See Judicial Review Board Procedures for Appeals I(A)(3); Constitution of the University Board of Elections, Article IV. While a typical JRB appeal involves a three-person panel and unfolds over multiple weeks, the JRB rules contemplate that such procedures need only be followed “to the extent practicable.” *Id.*

¹She incorporates, by reference, the additional complaints that she and her running mate submitted to the UBE before the election closed.

Given the need for an expedited resolution and what appears at this stage to be an underdeveloped factual record, I find that in this instance, standard procedures are not practicable. Accordingly, I issue this preliminary decision in my capacity as JRB Chair and remand the matter to the UBE for further consideration, reserving the option to convene a full JRB panel if necessary.

In requesting that the matter be reviewed *de novo* by the UBE, based on the JRB's initial reading of the materials presented thus far, several issues warrant closer examination:

(1) The UBE's Failure to Address the Phone Call Between Vice Presidential Candidate Benjamin Lawrence and IFC President Alex Peskin

The JRB is concerned that the UBE did not explicitly reconcile an apparent contradiction between statements made by IFC President Alex Peskin in a recorded phone call and his later written responses.

In declining to endorse Ms. Andrews' running mate, Benjamin Lawrence, Mr. Peskin stated during a phone call with Mr. Lawrence: "the IFC did not sign up [unintelligible] to endorse through UBE . . . the only reason why I did [endorse] even StudCo [President] and Fourth Year Trustees was just because guys reached out to me to, like, let me know that I should sign up for their specific position. . . ." (Appellant Exhibit 4) This statement, if true and without additional context, could potentially implicate a violation of UBE rules.²

The UBE requested written interrogatories from the involved parties to shed further light on this matter, and in those responses, not surprisingly, the parties offered a more favorable account and denied all wrongdoing. Given its unscripted nature, the earlier call reasonably could have been viewed as more probative than the later, more formal written responses. But in issuing its decision, the UBE apparently gave greater weight to the written statements, notably never referencing the earlier call or the discrepancies contained therein.

The JRB's concerns are further heightened by the fact that the same two positions—curiously, the *only* two positions—were also endorsed by Madison House, another organization in which Mr. Peskin holds a leadership role.

On remand, the JRB directs the UBE to more thoroughly investigate these issues, including providing a clear explanation of how it weighed and reconciled the differing accounts of the IFC endorsement. The UBE should also examine the coincidence of these limited, parallel endorsements across the two organizations in which Mr. Peskin holds a leadership role. Given Mr. Peskin's assertions in his interrogatory that the IFC endorsement was made internally by "leadership," and that he was not involved in Madison House's endorsement process, identifying *who actually participated* in each process will be critical to developing—and then weighing—a complete factual record.

² The JRB was also curious about the timing and context of Mr. Lawrence's call to Mr. Peskin, in which he, too, seems to be seeking a direct endorsement from Mr. Peskin.

(2) Allegation of Undue Influence/Bribery by the IFC

The current record is factually insufficient to support either the UBE or Ms. Andrews' claims on this point.

First, the JRB takes issue with the UBE's initial assertion that bribery would have been "impossible" due to the anonymity of the voting process.³ The issue is not whether a promised benefit—such as a bar tab—could have been perfectly executed, but whether the promise itself could have influenced voters.

While it is clear UBE Rules are "binding upon all student candidates, individuals working on their behalf, [and] Endorsing Organizations,"⁴ the JRB does not, at this time, find sufficient evidence to conclude that a bar tab did constitute bribery or undue influence in this case.

Ms. Andrews provides various snippets of information⁵—including quotes from a text thread or GroupMe and what purports to be minutes from a fraternity chapter meeting—to support the narrative that Mr. Peskin, as IFC president, either facilitated or was aware of a widespread offer to essentially bribe fraternity members with a bar tab. But at this juncture it remains unclear to the JRB whether this was, in fact, a formal offer, or simply a sloppy rumor that circulated without the involvement, control, and knowledge of Mr. Peskin and/or the IFC as an Endorsing Organization. More facts—and more inquiry along these lines—are necessary to determine which of these scenarios is accurate.

(2) Use of the "All CIO Listserv" by the Vice President of Organizations

While the JRB's jurisdiction extends only to the rules of the UBE and not StudCo, the JRB agrees with Ms. Andrews that this issue also warrants further explanation.

Benvin Lozada, Chair of the StudCo Rules and Ethics Board, provided a thoughtful and detailed explanation of StudCo's handling of Ms. Andrews' concern that she had inequitable access to the University's 850+ CIOs, given Mr. Mitchell's access to a restricted email listserv as the sitting VPO. But related confusion in the record still seems to exist, stemming from two related pieces of correspondence: (1) an email UBE Vice Chair of Rules Ella Gilmore sent to Mr. Lawrence, in which she explained that Mr. Mitchell's use of the VPO listserv to advertise his campaign "does not violate any of our campaigning rules," and (2) a separate text message, in which Mr. Mitchell denied Ms. Andrews' request to use the same listserv to announce *her* campaign, explaining that he was "not allowed to send more campaign things to that listserv."

While it is entirely possible the UBE considered the StudCo memorandum and these discrepancies in its decision-making, this line of inquiry was not explicitly referenced in the UBE's March 12, 2026,

³ More specifically, the UBE explained, "Historically, candidates have made similar offers which are generally permissible as long as they do not explicitly require showing proof of voting for a specific candidate. To be specific, the bar tab doesn't violate section 2B as it does not constitute bribery. Furthermore, neither the IFC nor Mike Mitchell has access to specific chapter voting data, rendering the contingent bar tab impossible."

⁴ Were they not, the UBE Rules would potentially create a loophole that allows improper campaigning through third party proxies. *See* UBE Election Rules & Procedures, Article I (D).

⁵ These snippets include what could be a particularly troubling message from someone named Parker Glass, but his relationship to the IFC or Mr. Mitchell has not been explained.

decision. Accordingly, the JRB requests that the UBE engage in additional consideration or explanation on this point.

Conclusion

Given the importance of student self-governance—not to mention the importance of certifying student body elections in a timely manner—the JRB does not issue this remand lightly. Nor does the JRB suggest that nefarious actors were at play in attempting to swing this election. Nevertheless, the current record reflects myriad unresolved factual disputes and discrepancies—whether intentional or inadvertent, significant or minor—that require further examination, especially in an election decided by such a narrow margin.

Accordingly, the JRB requests that:

- (1) the parties further develop the factual record and their related arguments through Friday, March 27; and
- (2) the UBE reevaluate the matter *de novo*, carefully considering the expanded record, the JRB concerns articulated herein, and all applicable StudCo and UBE procedures and rules.

As the UBE itself acknowledged, it is “plausible” that the outcome of this election could have been affected by the irregularities raised in Ms. Andrews’ appeal. With only 101 votes separating the candidates—and with communications and endorsements that could have reached hundreds, if not thousands of students—this is not a margin that allows for such uncertainty. The legitimacy of student self-governance depends upon a shared confidence that elections are conducted fairly and reviewed rigorously and with transparency.

Sincerely,

Jill S. Rockwell
On Behalf of the Judicial Review Board