



**Student Government
Association**

Elections Board Meeting Minutes

Date: 03.09.2026

I. Call to Order

- a. Meeting called to order at 2:14pm

II. Roll Call

Name	Position	Present/Absent	Required Attendance
Carlos Ricotti	Elections Commissioner	Yes	
Sebastian Herrera	Deputy Elections Commissioner	Yes	
Yanisel Capote	Elections Board Member	Yes	
Chantel Moises	Elections Board Member	Yes	
Luciana Carmona	Elections Board Member	Yes	
Jerilyn Davis	Guest	Yes	
Joshua Espinoza	Guest	Yes	
Sophia Krasheminnical	Guest	Yes	
August Osani	Guest	Yes	
Sammantha Hernandez	Guest	Yes	

III. Introduction of Violations

- a. Carlos Ricotti introduced the hearing procedures to the people present.

FIU**Student Government
Association****IV. Statement of Flier- Zacahry Stangl**

- a. I submitted a document because there are two counts that can be proven, we have one incident that has resulted in two crimes a violation of 6005.2 that no candidate can provide false information to the elections board, there are three things I have to prove the candidate must provide the information in a hearing, that information was false and that the candidate has to be aware that it was false. There is no definition of knowledge and false (definition provided) when he filled the information to the elections board, the information was false, when looking at the complaint on the panther connect form it states on February 11 refers to his Instagram post the one being later edited he acknowledges that he made the statements and that they have been misrepresented. The promise was made and proves without a doubt that he did in fact make that promise, he lied to you and covered his tracks covering up his evidence violating the ethics code in order to get the other party disqualified.

V. Statement of the Accused- German Mata

- a. The fourth claim doesn't make sense and I thought the statement was untrue and I stated my statement and just because you don't agree with me doesn't mean you can close me with perjury however he doesn't know that I changed my post to further my claim against him and has no proof of when I edited my post, he can't provide a witness to or post and is making assumption in order to make someone look guilty. When I changed my post, I still believed my post was true, since he can't prove 4/6 charges he against me you can't charge me for perjury even if the statement is misleading unless you can believe that I actually knew and believed to be false and a lie.

VI. Questioning the Flier

- a. You have to satisfy three things, one being that do you think the info was false and can you explain how he knowingly knew he was providing false information? He's alleging that we made a statement that isn't true about him. Where are we not alleging perjury at any time? What he is arguing isn't what the law is requiring because he stated that a promise hasn't been made making it false because you agreed that a promise was made and it wasn't false. He only changed one word in his post and to apposed. He led you guys to believe that he never made that statement, making it seem like that claim never happened or that he never made that promise. And by hiding that from you it proves that he lied to you
- b. You don't think it was an error? He just said that he wrote the whole thing on purpose and even if he didn't he signed it at the bottom, and he proved that he did write that



**Student Government
Association**

on purpose and said the promise wasn't made and there is proof that it was made making the statement false and misinformation was provided to the elections board violating 6005.2. There are

- c. The screenshot that was submitted has time stamps but there aren't exact dates of when the screenshots and there is no exact date on the other screenshots except the first one is there a date of when the post was made? I don't, however, it was taken at least before March 12 and that is when the change was made.
- d. Statute 8000. As a senator you can't cover up evidence, and he changes the post covering up that promise.
- e. And in the third statute he is trying to hide the fact that he spread false information by editing the post in order to protect that he is guilty of 6005.2.
- f. What is your definition covering up? Destroyes or hides information that was original he edited the post to say "en" to opposed and by changing a word he hid the information hiding a fact the editing of that one word completely changes the

VII. Questioning the Accused

- a. I want to hear your reason why the requirements for the violations weren't met. Every single allegation has mens rea, the statement that they are alleging is in the complaint and I do believe that it was true.
- b. What do you believe to be untrue? I believe that the promise was not true I ran on goals, do not promise, my mindset hasn't changed I still want to fight to try to end ice on campus.
- c. How do you explain the change in words if it's an error or hiding something? The day the post was made 20 minutes before the debate, and I came in a rush and made the post after I wanted to make the post clearer of where I stood with that issue. I don't believe I lied or obstructed information, I can't obstruct evidence because I never thought this case would happen.
- d. Clarify the Instagram account is yours? Yes, it is my account, and I run it and even though it is in another device in my house I made the edit.

VIII. Final Questioning

- a.

IX. Closing Statement of the Flier

- a. If you don't mean to kill somebody but you, do you still go to jail for the crime but for different reasons. Looking at statute 6005.2 going to the the false information he is



Student Government
Association

only saying one portion of the statement he said it's a misrepresentation of a fact, he referred to it as a fact "as a fact I didn't make a promise" not to mention that he is the only one that edits that account. His analogies were not relevant the mens rea isn't applicable because it just says if you violated the code you should be held liable whether you meant to or not.

X. Closing Statement of the Accused

- a. It is very important that the first account does have a means are you can't hold accountable for the first one because I believe it to be true. You can't be also held liable for changing a post that they can change at their discretion, and I didn't attempt to change the fact that I created the post and didn't go out of my way to delete and cover all my tracks of the crime because the crime never existed. According to the US Supreme Court if I believe something to be true you can't just hold me liable because you don't agree and just because I changed my post to make it look better doesn't mean I changed it to destruct evidence or hide information therefore making it there be no evidence that the evidence was obstructed.

XI. Elections Board Deliberations

- a. German didn't change to cover up the information for a reason and the screenshots don't show when the changes happened.
- b. There was no clear intention, it still means the same thing.
- c. He changed his post before the case was reported, making there be no clear intent that he changed it in order to cover up evidence.
- d. Vote on Violation of 6005.2
 - i. Carlos: no
 - ii. Sebastian: no
 - iii. Chantel: no
 - iv. Yanisel: no
- e. Vote on Violation of 8002
 - i. Carlos: no
 - ii. Sebastian: no
 - iii. Chantel: yes
 - iv. Yanisel: yes

XII. Meeting Adjournment

- a. Meeting adjourned at 3:23pm