

**SUPREME COURT OF THE STUDENT GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION  
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE**

RYAN LEIGEB, PETITIONER v. CAROLINE THOMAS, RESPONDENT

Argued March 28, 2022- Decided April 7, 2022

On Monday, March 7th at 11:12 AM, students attending the University of Louisville’s College of Business were sent an email from the Respondent, Caroline Thomas outlining her campaign race, her platforms, election information, and asking for support from her fellow students. Ryan Leigeb, the Petitioner, received this email as well, despite being her opposition in the race, and believing Ms. Thomas had procured this emailing list unethically or through in-kind contribution from a University department, entity, or affiliate, filed a Violation Notification Form with the Supreme Court on March 10, 2022. Mr. Leigeb alleged that Ms. Thomas had violated two clauses found in the election governing document, the Student Government Association General Election Rules (SGAGER). Mr. Leigeb claims that the Thomas campaign violated section 303.1b, “Except as otherwise provided in the SGAGER Chapter 303, no University department, entity, or affiliate shall make any monetary or in-kind contribution to any candidate or slate.” as well as the Residual Clause, Section 601.4, which states, “Each candidate is expected to conduct their own campaign with integrity and in a manner befitting a future leader of the University of Louisville Student Body. Notwithstanding whether the SGAGER or University policy specifically prohibits it, any act or omission unbecoming of a candidate shall subject the candidate to sanction under this SGAGER Section 601.4.” The Supreme Court found the claims to be meritorious, and after hearing the oral arguments made by both counsels, the Court has reached the following opinion.

*Held:* The Court has found that Ms. Thomas is not in violation of the SGAGER in either claim, as she worked within her knowledge to use a data scraping program to retrieve said emails, eliminating the validity of the claim that she received an in-kind contribution from any University department, entity, or affiliate.

Opinion of the Court

Mr. Leigeb and counsel argued that there was only one person in the College of Business that has the ability to send out mass emails to the College of Business students, and since Ms. Thomas had emailed the majority of Business School students, it was assumed that she must have received an in-kind contribution, focused primarily on her role as Student Success Ambassador. However, based on the evidence received from Ms. Thomas’ director stating, “There is no ability to download student emails in CardSmart. It does not include emails that were conducted via Outlook.” The Court concludes that Ms. Thomas did not access these emails from her position with the University. The Respondent served enough evidence to prove her data scraping program

had the capability to garner thousands of data points that would make a mass email possible to the majority of Business school students. Additionally, there is no existing rule within the Dean of Students that specifically bans mass emailing, and in the same breath, there are also minor stipulations regarding emailing in the SGAGER (see Section 203.2 of the SGAGER).

With respect to the alleged violation of the Residual Claim, the Court reminds the public about the importance of the Petitioner being responsible to prove beyond a reasonable doubt using evidence, to prove each of the claims made before the Court. While there may still be uncertainty as to how and who created the data scraping program utilized by Ms. Thomas, the Petitioner did not provide any evidence to support their claim that Ms. Thomas acted in any way that was disingenuous or lacking integrity, and the way in which Ms. Thomas conducted herself with respect to her data scraping program was befitting of a potential future leader of the University of Louisville. Because of the evidence provided and argued in the oral arguments, the Court has declined to provide any relief to the Respondent.

Gesser, J. delivered the opinion of the Court, in which Gupta, Bhutto, Frakes, and Atkins joined.