

Kenni Jocabet Diaz Lopez

Submission Date

May 22, 2026 11:35 AM

Name

Kenni Jocabet Diaz Lopez

SacLink Email Address

[REDACTED]

The Elections Complaint Committee improperly applied Article V(5), Section F, Article VI(6), Part I, and Article IX(9), Part D of the ASI Elections Code in Complaint #3 regarding coercion, harassment, intimidation, and improper campaign conduct during the election period. The Committee improperly minimized and discounted detailed witness testimony and written witness statements describing coercive and pressuring conduct connected to individuals assisting Harpreet Kaur Bahia's campaign and Sikh Student Association support efforts.

Article V(5), Section F prohibits harassment and improper campaign conduct, including verbal, written, and physical conduct that interferes with students during the election process. Article VI(6), Part I further protects students' right to vote freely and privately through secret ballot voting without intimidation, pressure, or coercion. Article IX(9), Part D permits complaints where a candidate is unfairly aided during an election.

The Elections Complaint Committee's written findings incompletely summarized and failed to fully analyze significant testimonial and documentary evidence presented during the hearing. Detailed written witness statements from Armando Perez and a verified anonymous Sacramento State student described direct personal experiences involving pressure, intimidation, interference with voting activity, and coercive campaign conduct connected to individuals assisting the Respondent's campaign. These statements included specific details regarding locations, interactions, conduct, and statements made during the election period. The anonymous student witness statement further described conduct directly implicating students' ability to vote freely and privately under Article VI(6), Part I, including individuals crowding around during voting, directing the witness how to vote, telling the witness which sections to skip, and an individual allegedly interacting directly with the witness's phone during the voting process. However, the Committee's written findings did not meaningfully analyze the implications of this testimony regarding secret ballot protections and voter coercion concerns under the Elections Code. Additionally, multiple witnesses testified regarding coordinated and repeated vote solicitation efforts connected to Sikh Student Association and Harpreet Kaur Bahia's campaign, including asking students to vote for both the organization and the Respondent during the election period. The written findings incompletely summarized this corroborating testimony and failed to fully evaluate the cumulative pattern of pressure-related conduct presented through multiple witness accounts.

The Elections Complaint Committee also appeared to place disproportionate emphasis on the absence of video or physical recordings despite the detailed and corroborating witness testimony presented during the hearing. Students do not reasonably anticipate experiencing coercive or intimidating interactions during ordinary movement across campus or while participating in elections, and therefore the absence of video recordings should not

witness statements and corroborating testimony.

The Committee additionally applied inconsistent evidentiary language by referencing both a “clear and convincing” standard and a “preponderance of evidence” standard in evaluating the complaint, creating uncertainty regarding the evidentiary standard actually applied in reaching the decision. Further, the composition of the Elections Complaint Committee changed during the hearing proceedings for Complaint #3, resulting in different Committee members participating in evaluation of testimony and evidence than those originally identified at the beginning of the Elections Complaint process. This raises concerns regarding continuity, consistency, and full evaluation of the evidence presented throughout the hearing process. For these reasons, the Elections Complaint Committee decision was affected by improper application of the ASI Elections Code, incomplete consideration and summarization of testimonial evidence, improper minimization of corroborated witness statements, inconsistent evidentiary reasoning, and procedural concerns regarding the hearing process and evaluation of evidence.

The following oral and written evidence supports this appeal regarding the Elections Complaint Committee decision in Complaint #3:

- The written decision issued by the Elections Complaint Committee on May 18, 2026, including the Committee’s summary of witness testimony, evidentiary findings, and conclusions regarding alleged coercion, harassment, intimidation, and improper campaign conduct connected to Harpreet Kaur Bahia’s campaign.
 - A detailed written witness statement submitted during the Elections Complaint Committee hearing from Armando Perez, describing:
 - An elevator interaction involving a campaign supporter stating, “I won’t press your floor button if you don’t vote for her”
 - Feeling uncomfortable and pressured during the interaction
 - Observations of multiple individuals associated with Sikh Student Association pressuring students for votes around campus during the election period
 - A detailed written statement submitted by a verified anonymous Sacramento State student describing:
 - A group approaching and surrounding the student while voting
 - Individuals directing the student how to vote and which sections to skip
 - Individuals watching over the student during the voting process
 - An individual allegedly interacting directly with the student’s phone during voting
 - Feeling anxious, pressured, claustrophobic, and uncomfortable during the interaction
 - Rebuttal testimony presented during the hearing clarifying:
 - That witness credibility should not be diminished solely because witnesses submitted written statements rather than appearing physically at the hearing
 - That Armando Perez was both a Sacramento State student and a witness to events, regardless of any endorsement activity
 - That the anonymous witness was verified through the ASI Executive Director as a legitimate Sacramento State student before the statement was accepted into the hearing record
 - The Elections Complaint Committee written findings reflecting that different Committee members participated in Complaint #3 proceedings than those originally listed at the beginning of the Elections Complaint process and earlier proceedings conducted that same day.
- Expected witnesses for the appeal may include:
- Kenni Jocabet Diaz Lopez
 - Aadil Bhat
 - Sandra Delgado Candido

The Appellant respectfully requests that the Appellate Council overturn and modify the Elections Complaint Committee’s decision in Complaint #3 and impose the remedy of disqualification of Harpreet Kaur Bahia under Article X.D of the ASI Elections Code due to the seriousness of the conduct presented and the unfair campaign benefit received through coercive, intimidating, and improper campaign behavior during the election period. The evidence presented during the Elections Complaint Committee hearing

intimidation, interference, and discomfort while attempting to participate in the ASI election process. Detailed witness statements described students being surrounded during voting, directed how to vote, told which sections to skip, watched while voting, pressured into supporting the Respondent, and subjected to conduct that made them feel anxious, claustrophobic, intimidated, overwhelmed, and uncomfortable. One witness further described an incident where an individual allegedly interacted directly with the student's phone during the voting process itself. Another witness described being told, "I won't press your floor button if you don't vote for her," during an elevator interaction connected to campaign supporters. This type of conduct is completely inconsistent with the purpose and protections of the ASI Elections Code, including Article V(5), Section F regarding harassment and Article VI(6), Part I protecting students' right to vote freely and privately through secret ballot elections. Students should never feel pressured, cornered, monitored, intimidated, or uncomfortable while exercising their right to vote in a student election.

The Appellant further requests that the Appellate Council consider the broader impact that failing to meaningfully address this conduct may have on student trust in the integrity, safety, and legitimacy of the ASI election process. Students who experience coercive or intimidating behavior during elections — particularly students who may already feel anxious, vulnerable, or uncomfortable in public settings — should be able to trust that their concerns will be taken seriously and that meaningful accountability will follow when violations occur. Allowing this type of conduct to occur without substantial consequence risks discouraging future Sacramento State students from participating freely and confidently in campus elections and undermines confidence in the fairness of the ASI electoral system itself. Accordingly, the Appellant respectfully requests that the Appellate Council modify the Elections Complaint Committee's decision and impose the remedy of disqualification of Harpreet Kaur Bahia under Article X.D of the ASI Elections Code. Alternatively, the Appellant requests any additional remedy authorized under Article X that the Appellate Council deems appropriate to preserve fairness, accountability, student safety, and confidence in the integrity of the ASI election process.