

IN THE SUPREME COURT	)	
	)	
Action No. 09 SSC 002	)	
	)	
Zach Dexter	)	
Finance Chair, Student Congress	)	
&	)	
Saang M. Lee	)	
Rules and Judiciary Vice-Chair, Student Congress	)	
PLAINTIFFS	)	ANSWER
	)	
Versus	)	
	)	
Joseph Levin-Manning	)	
Speaker, Student Congress	)	
DEFENDANT	)	
	)	

\*\*\*\*\*

1. The allegations contained in paragraph 1 of the Plaintiffs' Complaint are admitted.
2. The allegations contained in paragraph 2 of the Plaintiffs' Complaint are denied. Upon information and belief, Student Body President Jones vetoed SCB-91-064 on Tuesday, November 17, 2009. Thus, SCB-91-064 remains a proposed legislative act and the Plaintiffs' have not been adversely affected by SCB-91-064.
3. The allegations contained in paragraph 3 of the Plaintiffs' Complaint are admitted.
4. Relief:
  - a. The allegations contained in paragraph 4a of the Plaintiffs' Complaint are denied. SCB-91-064 was passed by Student Congress in an eighteen to sixteen vote.
  - b. It is admitted that the Clerk incorrectly informed the Speaker that there was a sixteen to fifteen vote on the bill. All other allegations contained in paragraph 4b of the Plaintiffs' Complaint are denied. There was a miscount on the first vote, so the Defendant called for a new vote to ensure accuracy in the vote count, at which time the Bill passed with eighteen Representatives voting in favor of the Bill and sixteen opposed. Two Representatives abstained.
  - c. The allegations contained in paragraph 4c of the Plaintiffs' Complaint are denied. Representatives abstaining from a vote are not counted as present when determining the number of votes required in order to pass a proposal by a simple

majority. They are only counted as present if a vote requires a two-thirds majority to pass.

- d. The allegations contained in paragraph 4d of the Plaintiffs' Complaint are denied. The revote was not taken because of a motion to reconsider. The revote was taken because there was a miscount on the first vote.
  - e. It is admitted that the Defendant deemed the election of Adam Jutha and Evan Ross invalid. All other allegations contained in paragraph 4e of the Plaintiffs' Complaint are denied. The election results were not certified until Sunday, November 8, thus the ninety-six hour statute of limitations had not elapsed.
5. The Defendant requests that the Student Supreme Court deny the demands for judgment, as listed in paragraph 5 of the Plaintiffs' Complaint.

Filed this the 18th day of November, 2009, at 5:00 p.m.

/s/ Joseph Levin-Manning  
DEFENDANT

Joseph Levin-Manning  
Speaker, Student Congress

/s/ Kristopher M. Gould  
COUNSEL FOR THE DEFENDANT

Kristopher Gould  
Student Solicitor General