

*Texas A&M University*

*Judicial*  *Court*

**Snow v. Election Commission**

**April 5, 2004, 9:00 p.m.**

**Majority Opinion**

The Judicial Court unanimously rejects the appeal by Nathan M. Snow in the case of *Snow v. Election Commission*. The Judicial Court feels that the Election Commission presented sufficient evidence to show that they fulfilled their obligation to inform candidates of their responsibilities.

Candidates are responsible for the information in the Candidate Meeting packet. According to the section, "The Mandatory Candidate Meeting" on page 11 of the Election Regulations, "All candidates are responsible for all information covered at the Mandatory Candidate Meeting without exception."

The Court believes that Mr. Snow never received the required e-mails of notification; the Election Commission has proven that the e-mails were sent. While it is the duty of the Election Commission to remind candidates of the final finance report due date, the candidate is still ultimately responsible for his or her knowledge of and adherence to the regulations

This decision is in accordance with the precedent set in the cases of *Boggs v. Election Commission* and *Steed v. Election Commission*.

Texas A&M University

Judicial Court



Daniel Jones  
Daniel Jones  
Chief Justice

Richard Graff  
Richard Graff  
Justice

Kevin Capps  
Kevin Capps  
Justice

Carlo Lomeli  
Carlo Lomeli  
Justice

Rebekah A. Kratochvil  
Rebekah Kratochvil  
Justice

Sarah E. Ropp  
Sarah Rapp  
Justice