

2026 ASI ELECTION COMPLAINT COMMITTEE DECISION

By JOSE M. BALLESTEROS, chair

Members Present:

JOSE M. BALLESTEROS, Vice President for Student Affairs designee (chair)
KIMBERLY CHISM, Faculty Senate designee
MANI SAI CHILAKALA, ASI Board Appointee
JULIETTE LOPEZ, ASI Board Appointee

Members Absent:

XITLALY BERNAL, student representative
ALEC HUNTER, student representative

May 18, 2026

Bahia, Harpreet Kaur vs Diaz Lopez, Kenni Jocabet

I. Statement of the complaint

Kenni Jocabet Diaz Lopez brought charges against Harpreet Kaur Bahia stating that their campaign was involved with coercion of voters. Specifically, the following policy of the ASCSUS Election Code:

Article V: Fair Campaigning and Publicity

F. Areas in Which Campaigning is Prohibited

b. Harassment, as defined within this section, is prohibited. This includes verbal, written (printed or electronic) and/or physical abuse by any candidate or Interested Student.

II. Summary of the testimonial and documentary evidence received at hearing in support of the complaint

Diaz Lopez presented the Committee with testimony stating that individuals associated with the Bahia campaign engaged in contact that pressured and interfered with voters, a violation of article V.f. of the ASCSUS Election Code. They testified that they personally saw individuals with the Bahia campaign approach students and pressure them to vote for the Bahia.

Diaz Lopez testified that there was an elevator incident that involved the Bahia campaign intimidating students and forcing them to vote for Bahia. Diaz Lopez was not present during the incident and two witness emails were entered as evidence.

III. Summary of the testimonial and documentary evidence received at the hearing in opposition or rebuttal to complaint

Bahia presented the Committee with his opening statement sharing that she did not encourage harassment of individuals to force them to vote for her campaign. They testified that their campaign did conduct “campaign outreach” and “their actions were not intimidating”. They claimed that the claims of rude behavior by her campaign were here say and that personal recollection shouldn’t be used as proof.

Bahia testified that they were not present for the elevator incident reported by Diaz Lopez and their witnesses. Bahia testified that there was no evidence that a student changed their vote to pressure received by her campaign and that students shouldn’t be perceived as campaigning on her behalf because of their Sikh identity.

IV. Summary of witness testimony

- a. Diaz Lopez presented email testimony from two witnesses: Armando Perez and Anonymous witness. Armando Perez wrote that they were in a parking structure elevator near The Well with Bahia and a campaign supporter. The supporter said “I won’t press your floor button if you don’t vote for her” and that they responded that they had already voted. They felt uncomfortable and pressured by the interaction and believed it crossed the line in to coercion. They also witnessed “multiple individuals from the Sikh Student Association actively pressuring students for votes around campus”. The anonymous witness e-mail included testimony that “6 individuals came up to us (2 guys and 2 girls)” and “said they were advocating for their friend in the election (Harpreet Kaur)”. They “didn’t mind the interruption, but as an introvert, I felt high claustrophobic and anxious” and “was ok until they started getting really ‘forceful’ in their agenda to get me to vote for their friend”. At some point, the witness scanned the QR code and stated that “at some point, one of the guys started voting on my phone”. They stated that they did not do the same with their male friend and that “as a girl who keeps to herself, I felt that was very odd, I felt pressured”.

Bahia provided a rebuttal to the witness statement that she was at the elevator incident, stating that she was not present. They testified that they did not intimidate voters and that there is no proof for the elevator incident. Bahia testified that any assistance given in voting was to get students to the ballot, which is publicly available.

- b. Bahia provided the Committee with four witnesses: Saban Ramirez, Omron Bahia, Jugraj Pandher and Maney. Ramirez testified that they had interactions with Bahia and that no one from her campaign forced anyone to vote for her. Omron Bahia testified that he was one of the males near the elevator incident and stated that they didn’t grab anyone’s phone and vote for them. Pandher testified that they were assisting the Bahia campaign and was told by the candidate to be polite to potential voters; they were not present at the elevator incident. Maney was at the table both days and stated that the people there were not rude to potential voters. Maney stated they were not at the elevator incident and that the campaign only helped potential voters scan the QR code.

Diaz Lopez provided a rebuttal to the claim by the Bahia witnesses that they did not pressure students to vote for Bahia. Diaz Lopez testified that students were told to go to a certain web page to vote and that the anonymous student stated that one of the Bahia supporters voted on their phone. They testified that someone who endorsed them was a witness, but was a student first, which is why they couldn’t be at the hearing that day.

In closing statements, Diaz Lopez stated that student must be able to vote without coercion and that Bahia violated article V.f. of the ASCSUS Election Code. The request was to disqualify Bahia as they want a fair election process.

In closing statements, Bahia stated that they also want fairness in election process. They stated that they do not condone harassment or coercion and that there was no evidence that it had occurred, only second-hand accounts. They stated they were not at the elevator incident and there was no clear and convincing evidence that would lead to disqualification.

V. Statement of the remedy requested

Disqualification under Article X. Remedies for Complaints, Section D

VI. Statement of the burden of proof the complaining party or parties was required to meet

Clear and convincing proof is required for the Committee to award the remedy of disqualifying a candidate. Clear and convincing evidence is defined as that which “leaves no substantial doubt as to the veracity of the claim.”

VII. Conclusion as to whether the complaining party met the applicable burden of proof

The Committee did not find the evidence presented by Kenni Jocabet Diaz Lopez to meet the burden of clear and convincing because she was unable to provide a preponderance of evidence to show that coercion of voters took place during the election period.

VIII. Summary and reasoning supporting the Committee’s conclusion

The Committee unanimously found that the burden of proof was not met by the complainant. Additional witnesses and/or evidence would have been needed to meet the required threshold.

IX. Statement of the relief

The Committee denies the statement of relief. However, we recommend there be clarity around the usage of campaign supporters, and the candidates responsibility for campaign supporters, in ASCSUS Elections in the ASCSUS Election Code and during candidate trainings.