



# The Judicial Council of ASUCR

University of California, Riverside

[asucrjustice@ucr.edu](mailto:asucrjustice@ucr.edu)

## Meeting Minutes

Monday, November 7, 2016

6:10pm

ASUCR Senate Chambers

The Judicial Council convened with a call to order by general agreement at 6:10pm. A roll call was taken and **Justice Samanta Fuentes, Justice Jo Gbujama, Justice Hayden Jackson, Justice Casey Thielhart, Justice Matthew Whiles, and Justice Kathryn Yip** were present at roll call.

The Judicial Council skipped introductions, as they were done between the members before the meeting began.

**Justice Casey Thielhart** deviated from the agenda to discuss the situation with **Justice Samanta Fuentes** and the Executive Order by President Shafi Karim. He asked whether it concerned any of the members that **Justice Fuentes** is not a Justice. **Justice Jo Gbujama** brought up the fact that the Executive Order is expired, and though he feels the Executive Order was illegal in the first place, it is now expired and it is certainly not in effect. **Justice Thielhart** argued that an Executive Order removing a Justice does not “expire” because the action was taken already and does not revert at the end of the Executive Order. **Justice Hayden Jackson** pointed out that it is fairly clear that Executive Orders are supposed to expire if not solidified by the Senate, according to the Bylaws, and this includes action taken, and that a member of the Judicial Council cannot be removed by an Executive Order. **Justice Thielhart** argued that the Judicial Council should vote on it. There was general discussion. Several Justices brought up the fact that the Executive Order is expired and therefore no action really needed to be

taken urgently. There was general agreement that nothing needed to be done that evening, but that the Judicial Council was eager to hear a case about the scope and validity of Executive Orders.

The Judicial Council moved back to the listed order of business on the agenda, beginning with election of the Chief Justice and the Vice Chief Justice. **Justice Hayden Jackson** nominated **Justice Jo Gbujama** for the position of Chief Justice. **Justice Gbujama** accepted the nomination. With no other nominations, a closed ballot vote was taken. The vote was **6-0-0**.

**Chief Justice Jo Gbujama** nominated **Justice Hayden Jackson** for the position of Vice Chief Justice, and **Justice Jackson** accepted. **Justice Matthew Whiles** nominated **Justice Casey Thielhart** for the position of Vice Chief Justice. **Justice Thielhart** declined the nomination, stating that he does not want the position. With no other nominations, a closed ballot vote was taken. The vote was **5-0-1**.

The Judicial Council moved on to discuss the appointment of the General Advocate and the Secretary of the Court. **Vice Chief Justice Hayden Jackson** discussed that applications are ready in the Google Drive for inspection by the Justices, but that the previous year's Secretary of the Court was interested in the position and the Rules of Procedure allows for reappointment, if the Judicial Council would like to entertain it. **Justice Matthew Whiles, Justice Casey Thielhart, and Justice Kathryn Yip** voiced their opposition to the idea, so it was decided that applications would be released for both positions. **Vice Chief Justice Jackson** proposed a Wednesday deadline for comments from the Judicial Council, and **Justice Thielhart** added a Thursday release date and a Friday, November 18 deadline to the proposal. The Judicial Council was in general agreement.

**Vice Chief Justice Hayden Jackson** asked the Judicial Council to submit shirt sizes, see Ames to fill out website information and volunteer status paperwork, and to do FERPA training.

**Chief Justice Jo Gbujama** moved to go into closed session, and the motion was seconded by **Justice Casey Thielhart**. The motion carried with a vote of **6-0-0**.

At the end of the meeting, **Vice Chief Justice Hayden Jackson** moved to adjourn, and **Justice Matthew Whiles** seconded the motion. The motion carried with a vote of **6-0-0**, and the Judicial Council adjourned its meeting at 6:48pm.