

SGA Supreme Court 122-2

Tue, Nov 01, 2022 11:44AM 1:13:23

SUMMARY KEYWORDS

sga, martinez, senator, plaintiff, senate, question, french quarter, court, group, oxford american dictionary, chief justice, minutemen, omitted, senators, oscar, executive session, people, jordan, point, accused

SPEAKERS

Justice Aliyah Boyle, Chief Justice Crenshaw, Senator Martinez, Advisor Gitlin, Defendant Martinez, Plaintiff Jordan

- C** Chief Justice Crenshaw 00:00
Okay, are y'all gonna let people in?
- A** Advisor Gitlin 00:40
Mhm.
- C** Chief Justice Crenshaw 00:40
Is everyone who's supposed to be present present?
- P** Plaintiff Jordan 00:49
Uh, Aaron Jordan is here.
- C** Chief Justice Crenshaw 00:51
Okay, Oscar?
- D** Defendant Martinez 00:54
I am indeed here.

C

Chief Justice Crenshaw 00:56

Okay, um, I Dwayne Crenshaw, Chief Justice of the UNO SGA Supreme Court now call this meeting to order at 4:02pm October 31, 2022. I'll start by by saying those, what's on the docket for today. Okay, so HEARING OF ACTION, we did the CALL TO ORDER. RULES REVIEW; The Chief Justice or Presiding Justice (in absence of Chief Justice) shall review the rules. The rules state that, EVIDENCE; there should be ten (10) copies of all evidence, must be submitted to the SGA Clerk of Court no later than forty-eight (48) hours prior to the meeting. The Court shall rule on the relevancy of all evidence submitted. Testimony will be limited to the witness' personal knowledge of the facts of the case. Hearsay evidence is inadmissible. The Court recognizes the Interested Party Statement(s) as the only forum for witness testimony, other than that of the Plaintiff and Defendant. To HEARING; Absolutely no commentary or questions shall come from the gallery. The Chief Justice or Presiding Justice (In absence of Chief Justice) may eject anyone who violates the decorum of a Hearing or other official convening of the Court. And I will. Each Justice shall have the opportunity to question any party or witness at any time during the proceeding. The time limits of Plaintiff Statement, Plaintiff Closing Statements, Defendant Statement, and Defendant Closing Statement may be extended or shortened at the discretion of Chief Justice, or the Presiding Justice (in the absence of me). READING OF ACTION; The Chief Justice or Presiding Justice (in absence of Chief Justice) shall read the action. MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE; (this is optional). Any litigant may take, may make a motion for continuance at this time. However, said motion must be written in form (see: form C 003) and specifically state the reasons a continuance has been requested. A majority vote of Justices present shall be necessary to grant a continuance. The date for continuance shall be decided by the Court. PLAINTIFF STATEMENT; Fifteen (15) minutes is your time limit for the plaintiff. Defendant gets fifteen (15) minutes time limit. INTERESTED PARTY STATEMENT(S); are five minutes starting after the defendant has used up or forfeited their 15 minutes. RECESS; is optional. PLAINTIFF CLOSING STATEMENT; is after the recess, which is optional, or after interested parties have already used their five minutes, and you will get five minutes for the plaintiff closing statements. And then, we will have DEFENDANT CLOSING STATEMENT; which you get five minutes as well. And then you get a PLAINTIFF REBUTTAL; which is three minutes time limit. Then you get, QUESTIONING BY COURT; Justices may direct questions to any party. The Chief Justice or Presiding Justice (in the absence of the Chief Justice) may close the questioning period at his/her discretion. NEXT ACTION/ADJOURNMENT; at this point, should there be any other actions on the Docket the Court will return to step C, supra. Upon hearing all matters on the Docket, the Court will adjourn. And then, the, for final we have the EXECUTIVE SESSION; a closed executive session will be held amongst those Justices present at the Hearing and an SGA Advisor to render opinions in each action heard. We are being very strict about the time. We're not going to have anybody talking over each other. We're not going to have anybody extending the time. If you have a point, or if you want to make a case and you already used up your 15 minutes, that's too bad. We're staying on a timeframe and we will not go over and you will not talk over each other. Emphasis on not talking over each other and not going over the timeframe. If no one has any questions we can now begin.

P

Plaintiff Jordan 05:14

Oh I'm sorry, Mr. Chief, Chief Justice. I actually do. Yes. Well actually, I have a point. I would object to the message that was just sent by Senator Chloe Metzler that says hashtag standing with Oscar, she has not been recognized in this matter. And I believe that her written comment and text to the entire panel is inappropriate and violation of the SGA Court rules.

C Chief Justice Crenshaw 05:18
You have a question? Did she say it while we're in session?

P Plaintiff Jordan 05:45
I'm looking at it now.

C Chief Justice Crenshaw 05:50
So, she's in here saying it?

P Plaintiff Jordan 05:52
well, she just sent a text message to the members, to everyone in the Zoom meeting that says "#standing with Oscar." Senator Chloe Metzler has not been recognized by anyone in this court. So I believe that her, her comment at this point is a violation of the SGA Court rules that you just went over.

C Chief Justice Crenshaw 06:17
That is correct and Chloe Metzler will be ejected immediately.

P Plaintiff Jordan 06:24
Thank you.

C Chief Justice Crenshaw 06:31
Please disregard any any statements made prior to or during my opening remarks. If there are no other questions or no other statements, we can now begin. The Plaintiff gets 15 minutes, which is you Mr. Jordan, you get 15 minutes to say whatever you need to say. And Damaria start the time and I will go...

P Plaintiff Jordan 07:03
Okay. I'm sorry, Mr. Chief Chief Justice. I believe that the the proper order is to have the action read first.

C Chief Justice Crenshaw 07:34

Okay. Do you want me to read the entirety of the complaint?

P

Plaintiff Jordan 07:37

Yes, please.

C

Chief Justice Crenshaw 07:38

Okay. Um, okay. The Plaintiff brings this complaint seeking a request for Judicial Review for a impeachment regarding the conduct of SGA Senator, Oscar Martinez, pursuant to the Section 7.5.2 of the SGA Constitution. On August 31, 2022, the Plaintiff was placed on the agenda of the SGA Senate for consideration to be appointed to an open Senate seat {Exhibit A}. On August 31, 2022, after the Plaintiff gave a three minute speech, numerous SGA Senators had questions to ask the Plaintiff, as his speech had apparently generated much interest and controversy. The SGA Senate then voted to extend the questioning period for an additional three minutes. The very first question that was asked of the Plaintiff was by SGA Senator Oscar Martinez, which appears on page 49 of the meetings minutes {Exhibit B}. Senator Oscar Martinez asked the Plaintiff if he had ever been a part of any groups on or off campus, such as SWISE. The Plaintiff answered and said that he had not been a member of any on campus organization, but had volunteered in the past for an off campus group, which appears on page 50 of the meeting minutes {Exhibit C}. Senator Martinez had no follow up question or comments for the Plaintiff and seemed satisfied with the Plaintiff's answer. The Plaintiff then moved on to the answering another question from Senator Daniel Hunsaker. After two rounds of three minutes of questioning, then Senator Martinez had no follow up question or comments for the Plaintiff. The Plaintiff then left the room so that the SGA Senate could consider and discuss his appointment. On page 53 of the minutes {Exhibit D}, immediately, immediately after the Vice President for Legislative Affairs, Azizah Hinnawi, asked if anyone rises in support of the plaintiff appointment, Senator Martinez asked to go into an Executive Session. Senator Martinez stated during the Executive Session, which appears on page 54 of the meetings minutes {Exhibit E}, that the Plaintiff had "lied" or "omitted the truth" about belonging to an on-campus or off campus group, which Senator Martinez contends, "has not been painted in the best light." The petition is alleging that the violations that occurred where the plaintiff submit to the court that SGA Senator Martinez violated SGA constitution, section 7.1, subsection 7.1.2, which states, "Dereliction of duty, to persist in poor performance of their duty or malicious abuse of their authority." The Plaintiff submits to this Court that Senator Martinez engaged in a malicious abuse of his authority as a Senator by calling for an Executive Session so that he could make a derogatory remark about the Plaintiff and purposely misconstrue, mischaracterize and mistake the Plaintiffs answer to falsely accuse the Plaintiff of lying to the SGA Senate, when in fact he had not. These actions on the part of Senator Martinez also violated the SGA Rules and Procedures section 3.12, Subsection 3.12.3.2, which states that Senators are prohibited from, "making derogatory remarks about an individual" and subsection 3.12.3.3, which states that senators are prohibited from "knowingly misinterpreting any individual's intentions to the Senate or committee." It is clear that Senator Martinez abused his authority, made unwarranted derogatory remarks about the Plaintiff, and intentionally misrepresented the Plaintiff answer to the SGA Senate. For example, Senator Martinez question to the Plaintiff involved both on campus and off campus groups that the Plaintiff had belong to. The Plaintiff truthfully answered that he had not been a member of any campus groups. The Plaintiff answered about one off campus group that he had volunteered for however, it would have been impossible, for the

Plaintiff to list each and every off campus group he had to belong to over his entire lifetime. For instance, I will not continue reading that because this is a lot of hearsay, and that does not go in alignment with what we're currently doing. Okay. The Plaintiff is asking for remedies. The Plaintiff could petition this Court to find the SGA Senator Martinez violated the cited sections and subsections of SGA constitution and the SGA Rules and Procedures on August 31, 2022. The Plaintiff further petitioned this Court to grant an impeachment hearing of SGA Senator Oscar Martinez to proceed in the SGA Senate pursuant to section 7.5.2 of the SGA constitution. And I believe that is everything. So if you are ready you will now have 15 minutes for your statement. Damaria start the time.

P

Plaintiff Jordan 12:59

Okay, thank you. I'd like to, first of all say thank you for holding this hearing to the Mr. Chief Justice, the members of the SGA Court, the members of the SGA Senate who are in attendance and anyone else who decided to, to, to, to view this hearing online. First of all, there are some important dates that I should start off with and and you will see these dates unfolding over the next 15 minutes. Over the next 15 minutes you will hear me add on to what the Chief Justice has just read. That will leave no doubt in the minds of the Justices of this Court that Senator Martinez should be impeached for the misconduct that he did portray on August 31, 2020 in front of the SGA Senate. The first date is the summer of 2014. The second date is a summer of 2015. The next date is the summer of 2020. The next date is August 31, 2022. The next date is the September the 18th of 2022. And the last date is September 20th of 2022. During the COVID 19 lockdown in the summer of 2020. I enrolled for the first time at UNO and began taking online classes. I was a student previously at Tulane. Over the two years that I have attended UNO, I have never been accused of violating any of the UNO bylaws by any student or any instructor. In, on August 31, 2022 I was placed on the SGA Senate agenda for consideration for appointment to the SGA Senate. Unbeknownst to me at that time, Senator Martinez had conducted an on line search of me, which is not part of any of his job duties or, or, or description with the SGA Senate. He did this on his own his own personal curiosity. As the Chief Justice has just read, during the questioning period, Senator Martinez asked me a question about groups I belong to on campus or off campus, he did not ask a timeframe. Okay. So basically, this question would have spanned in my entire lifetime, in a technical, the technical way that it was asked if it if he would have instituted a timeframe on it, I could have answered it with more specificity. So after he asked this question, Senator Martinez, he accepted my answer. He did not have any follow up, which he had a right to. He did not have any other questions which he had a right to ask, but he did not do so. But we know from Senator Martinez's written answer, which was filed on September 20, 2022, that he'd already conducted an online search prior to August 31 2022. So he had in his possession on August 31, 2022, several news articles that he has included as evidence in his answer. These news articles go back to 2014. Once again, I was not a student at UNO In 2014, I was not enrolled in UNO, until the summer of 2020. Even though Senator Martinez had this info in hand, he chose not to ask me about it, he chose not to do a follow up, because his intention was to mistake my answer mischaracterize my answer and to abuse his authority by calling for an illegal Executive Session. To mistake me and my intention as to wanting to lie to the Senate or having lied to the Senate or, as he puts it having lied or omitted the truth to the Senate when in fact that had not occurred. Senator Martinez as a senator, he was the one he had the authority. He had the only a Senator in SGA, Senator would have had the authority to ask to go into an executive session. In a related case, which is Aaron J. Jordan versus the SGA Senate case #122-1. Dr. Golz had issued a finding in that case, which is a separate but similar case. That that the motion and and the going into an executive session by the Senate on August the 31st 2022, was in violation of

the Louisiana open meetings law. So what we have here is Senator Martinez willing to break the law, the Louisiana open meetings law, willing to call for an illegal Executive Session, willing not to follow up with information that he has in his hand at the time, so that he can malign and mistake my answer to the Senate. These are all things that Senator Martinez has done. And let's, let's move on now. In these news articles, as Senator Martinez has, he has included four of them in his answer. These are from August, I'm sorry, these are from the summer of 2014. In the summer of 2014, I had spoken to members of the media about a group I was wanting to establish called the French Quarter Minutemen. The aim of this group was to provide free escorts to service sector workers in the French Quarter who were beaten, who were being robbed, beaten, shot and stabbed in the French Quarter late at night because the New Orleans police is dysfunctional. Okay. And so this group were a group of legal gun owners, people who had a CCL license, a concealed carry license, volunteering time to escort these workers late at night back and forth from their job to their car or to their bus stop or to the streetcar stop. That is the French Quarter minutemen group. This is the group that Senator Martinez says was painted in such a negative light that is, that is such a threat that he has listed in his answer, that he could not call them by name in the senate meeting, for fear that somehow a defunct group that that stopped operating in 2014 would somehow cause harm to him or the members of the Senate in 2022. This couldn't be further from the truth. These were people who are legal law abiding gun owners. People who wanted to help. People who wanted to, to stop crime, people who wanted to deter violent crime, not people who wanted to engage in violent crime as Senator Martinez is seeking to once again mischaracterize to this Court, as he has mischaracterized already to the Senate. Now, Senator Martinez gonna have his own personal opinions as far as firearms go, that's fine. However, let's look at what Louisiana law says. In the same year, 2014, Louisiana voters passed an amendment that was part of the Louisiana constitution of 1974, which states that the right of an individual to own possess and carry a firearm in public is a constitutional right is a fundamental right, that will not be a that will not not not be impinged in our state. Okay. Now, in 2022, the Supreme Court, the US Supreme Court of the United States had a ruling that says that, according to the Second Amendment, individuals have a constitutional right to carry firearms in public. Okay, so if anyone is out of touch when it comes to the rights of citizens to exercise their Second Amendment right it is not me, it is Senator Martinez. He is totally out of out of step with Louisiana law. With US law, which says that an individual has these rights and this was the foundation of the French Quarter Minutemen group. It was not some radical group that wanted to harm people. It was just the opposite. But once again, as Senator Martinez had misstated to the Senate intentionally, he is now attempting to mistate to this court intentionally by saying that somehow this group is a threat. Also in 2014, in a totally unrelated matter, I was falsely accused of a crime, the crime of stalking, but it was dismissed by the district attorney's office. This occurred in the summer of 2015. Now, Senator Martinez has included articles from the summer 2014 in his answer that has me accused of stalking. However, he has purposely omitted articles from 2015, which has exonerated me from stalking. So let's just let's just examine this for a second. On August the 31st 2022, when Senator Martinez gave that statement to the Senate in Executive Session, he knew full well, in the summer 2014 I had been wrongfully accused of stalking. In the summer of 2015, I had been exonerated in court, by from from stalking, that there were several news agencies that published articles about my exoneration, such as Nola.com, The Times Picayune, The New Orleans Advocate, WVUE.com, and WDSU.com. So he ignored that evidence he ignored that proof to once again wrongfully malign my intention to the Senate. And in his answer, Senator Martinez has omitted any and all articles from the summer 2015, which exonerate me. I want everyone to understand that for a second. Anyone, any one of us can be wrongfully accused of a crime. We hear about people who sometimes spend years in prison and then or later exonerated from the crime that they were originally accused of. For me, it only took about several several months. I was wrongfully

accused, I was exonerated. Senator Martinez knew that on August 31 2022. The articles had been out there published by these major news outlets since the summer of 2015. Senator Martinez ignored all of them, never included one of them in his answer to this court, once again, to misrepresent, mistate, and maligned my rep. My reputation, not only to the Senate, but to this court. Now in the short time that I have left, the question is, Will Senator Martinez do this again in the future? Not if not, to me, maybe to one of you, maybe to a guest speaker, maybe to another senator, maybe to another appointee.

C Chief Justice Crenshaw 24:46

Mr. Jordan. You can't make hypotheticals like that. This is your time to speak on your, you know, your situation and your evidence. We can't use language like "they could do this to somebody else," that's defamation.

P Plaintiff Jordan 25:00

Okay. Well, I'll, I'll, I'll, I'll, finish by by by saying, saying saying this; It is quite telling in Senator Martinez answer this is his answer. Senator Martinez answer, where he asked that all future cases similar to this one not be brought against him by this court. In fact, he's asking for a type of immunity from these type of future cases in the future. Now, I don't think that this Court can grant him any kind of immunity. But it's it's quite telling that he's asking for something like immunity. I mean, what Senator if, if a senator is willing to be in SGA and follow the SGA constitution, what type of Senator needs immunity from future cases? And with that, I'll wrap up my arguments. Thank you.

C Chief Justice Crenshaw 25:55

So you yield your time?

P Plaintiff Jordan 25:56

Yes.

C Chief Justice Crenshaw 25:58

Okay. We've heard from the plaintiff, they have yeild the remainder of their time. Now we move on to the defendants statement, Oscar Martinez. You get 15 minutes. Whenever you are ready. Damaria start the time whenever Oscar starts.

S Senator Martinez 26:11

Yes, I'm here. So I'd like to bring to you attention in the fact that he didn't really acknowledge any of what was said earlier, he didn't acknowledge any of his complaints to me, but I am going to throw out there. Let's read through his complaint against me. Any groups on our own

campus such as sweis? You're right, I didn't give a timeframe. But my point was for you to talk about all your groups, especially groups that are failed and or defunct. I seem satisfied? Well, I seem satisfied, because I thought you would mention it. And I was actually kind of surprised that you didn't, because, you know, in the grand scheme of things, you'd think somebody would mention a defunct group that they were a part of that eventually resulted in further litigation. But you know, that's beside the point. That the point of headline or omitted the truth about belonging to an off campus group, which Senator Martinez contends, has not been painted in the best light. So none of that is wrong. You did omit the truth. And I said, lied and or omitted the truth. So let's be clear about that. dereliction of duty, persistent poor performance of their duty or the malicious abuse of their authority. So I didn't do that with one sentence. He's trying to highlight the fact that one sentence essentially is dereliction of duty versus some poor performance of their duty or malicious abuse of their authority. How is saying one sentence with malicious, abusive someone's authority? I would argue that one sentence cannot be a malicious abuse of authority. The fact that I didn't say anything after that really kind of contends to the fact that he thinks way deeper into this than what actually is present. So, abuse of his authority as a senator by calling for an executive session that he could make derogatory remarks about the plaintiff and purposely misconstrue, mischaracterize, and misstate the plaintiffs answer to falsely accused the plaintiff of lying to the SGA Senate, when in fact, he had not actually what was said was "lying or omitted the truth." So you did omit the truth, you were a part of more off campus groups, which you actually had admitted earlier today. So let's be clear about that. I called for an executive session for the purpose of making it so there were less people in the Senate room, and none of those people were Senators that were left out in the executive session. So let's be clear, only sitting senators can appoint other senators. So that's another reason why I call for an Executive Session, because in the grand scheme of things, there were too many people in that room, and I wanted less people. So making derogatory remarks about an individual. Okay, so how is that the plaintiff lied or omitted the truth belong to off campus groups, has not been painted in the best light? How was that derogatory, derogatory is not the definition of what I said. So let's be clear about that, knowingly misrepresenting an individual's intentions to the Senate or committee. So if you knew that that group was something that you were part of that wound up being defunct and led to further litigation eventually, against nova.com and those other websites, why would you not say it? Why would you not actually talk about the group that led to so much actual strife in your life? It actually is very telling that you would omit that. So I wanted the Senate to know. And furthermore, as far as the French Quarter minutemen goes, I have a CCL, vigilanteism is not a right. Why did they stop operating? We don't know because you never talked about it. Know that the charges were dropped. And actually, in my response, I said that they were dropped. Clearly seems like you didn't actually read my response. And "dropped" doesn't actually mean innocent or guilt, it meant that the case was not actually further pursued. So Misreading into something is something that is commonly done by the Plaintiff. So, actually, as far as the websites, it wasn't me that actually did the looking up. It was other Senators who pointed that out to me. And those other Senators were actually afraid to mention it. Were actually afraid to mention it. So let's be clear about that. Anyway, continuing on, so

P

Plaintiff Jordan 30:24

Objection, hearsay.

S

Senator Martinez 30:26

No, we're not going to play that game. Because

C Chief Justice Crenshaw 30:28
You're not allowed to speak right now.

P Plaintiff Jordan 30:31
Objection, hearsay.

S Senator Martinez 30:32
Jesus Christ, this is sweet. Thank you. I'd like to continue if, okay, anyway. So I had an agenda and falsely misrepresented to the SGA Senate, that he lied, actually, he actually did lie, and he said it in his response. So I want that to be clear that the Plaintiff did in fact lie or mislead the Senate. So that is literally what I contend. And he said, that is a dereliction of my duty. So let's be clear here. Everything that he said in his rebuttal as to why I should be impeached was actually true. So on that I'm going to yield the rest of my time the evidence speaks for itself and I will further content later on that it does.

C Chief Justice Crenshaw 31:21
Okay, Oscar Martinez you have yeild the rest of your time. We will now move into interested party statements. You get five minutes for any interested party. Who would like to speak on behalf of the situation? And Aaron Jordan, please mute yourself. Do we have any interested parties? Who would like to speak on behalf of the situation and on the case? Okay, if not, we will move into closing statements if no one would like to take a recess? No motion to recess? Okay, we will move on into the closing statements. The plaintiff will have five minutes time limit for closing statements. Damaria, start the time as soon as the plaintiff begins. And it's five minutes.

P Plaintiff Jordan 32:28
Okay, thank you, Mr. Chief Justice. Mr. Chief Justice, I would just like to point out for the for the record, that the testimony in Senator Martinez is closing, I'm Sorry, Senator Martinez's opening statement contain hearsay testimony on what other Senators had told him. I made an objection on the record and I was muted by the Mr. Chief Justice. According to the Supreme Court rules and procedures, Section 5., subsection 5.1.C., hearsay evidence is not admissible in this case. And so I object to the statements that Senator Martinez made in his opening statement about what other senators told him what other senators found online, and what other senators brought to his attention. I'd like to note that objection for the record and ask that it be stricken from the record in accordance with Section 5., subsection 5.1.C. Can I get a ruling on that, Mr. Chief Justice?

C Chief Justice Crenshaw 33:30

Denied.

P Plaintiff Jordan 33:33

Okay, moving on to closing argument. You know, it is really incredible that Senator Martinez is now willing to double down on a big lie. He's willing to double down: Not only on the lie that he gave to the Senate, not only to the lie that he gave to the Court, but now he's willing to double down again in front of this entire audience. And say that by his question, by this broad question that he asked about "any groups that you belong to over the course of your entire lifetime." And if you leave something out that all of a sudden, now according to him, the arbiter of truth, you are a liar. Or like he likes to say, "you omitted the truth," which is defamatory. Okay. Now, let's let's look at this for a second. When I was in high school, I was a member of the ROTC. Should I have included the ROTC in my number of off campus groups that I belong to? When I was in middle school, I attended a Bible study church, should I have included my middle school years through Bible study to satisfy Senator Martinez in this extreme quest for what he calls the truth? Of course not. No matter what answer that I gave, it would not be humanly possible for everyone or anyone, who is here in this meeting in this hearing, to give a list of every membership that they've ever belonged to off the top of their head, it is impossible. He knows it. And now what he's trying to do and what he has done is abuse his authority as a senator by illegally calling for an Executive Session to misstate my answer to the SGA Senate. In his answer, in Senator Martinez answer; what he gives is, he gives the argument that he did not malign or use derogatory language about me to the Senate, because based on the Oxford American Dictionary, lying and omitting the truth is not a derogatory term. Well, when Senator Martinez gave this information in his statement before the SGA Senate, he was not reading from the Oxford American Dictionary. He was talking off the top of his head and using the in the vernacular term that we all use. If you say if you call someone a liar, that is a derogatory term. If you call, if you say to someone omitted the truth, that is a derogatory term, Senator Martinez says, "oh, no, no, according to the Oxford American Dictionary, there's several meanings to it, I meant to in the nicest way possible." Well, I do not want to insult the intelligence of the members of this court or the audience by trying by trying to excuse my inappropriate action, like Senator Martinez is seeking to to do, by blaming it on the Oxford American Dictionary. This is absurd. So with that, I will yield the rest of my time. Thank you.

C Chief Justice Crenshaw 36:41

Okay, Aaron Jordan has yielded the rest of his remaining time, we will now move on to the defendants closing statement in which you will get five minutes time limit. Damaria start the time, as soon as Oscar starts, five minutes.

S Senator Martinez 36:58

So I would like to start the fact that he literally misled the Senate in something he knows about. And he keeps talking about the fact that he was a part of this group and he didn't mention it. And you know why? It's because he's embarrassed. It's because he's embarrassed about what happened. And those news articles essentially prove it. The reason this group is defunct is

because Aaron Jordan was the leader of this group. And it turned out bad because of the charges that were further laid against them afterwards. Anyway, he could have included those items when I asked him, but he chose not to, because he wanted to paint himself in the best light towards the Senate. One might argue that because he did that he was misleading the Senate, which is what I stated into seeing him in the best possible light and not seeing him as possibly fallible; which is something that he that he can't have, he can't allow that. So also, as he talks about the fact that my dictionary, that is the literal definition, and in a accordance with like, actual decorum, Yeah, I did mean that in the best way possible. And you keep talking about how you know better, and you know what I was talking about, sir, you can't know my intentions. You can't know my intention. And you're sitting here and you're laughing. But you know, that's fine. But you're purposely maligning my statements. And you know, that you are, and May May I also add that you were rejected from the Senate twice. One of which in which I didn't vote in. So let me also add that. Anyway, I yield the rest of my time.

C Chief Justice Crenshaw 38:31

Oscar Martinez has yield with the rest of his time. We will now move into questioning by Court. Justices may direct questions to any party. The Chief Justice or Presiding Justice (in the absence of the Chief Justice) may disclose, may close the questioning period at his or her discretion. Do any of the justices present want to ask either party any questions?

J Justice Aliyah Boyle 38:58

Oh, I'll ask a question. So for the plaintiff.

C Chief Justice Crenshaw 39:02

State who you are.

J Justice Aliyah Boyle 39:03

I'm justice Aliyah Boyle and I have a question for the plaintiff. As the Frenchman group was a keystone group that seems extremely important to things that you've been involved in. Why did you not mention it? Because to me, it seems that it is a very notable group that you've been through a lot with. So I guess my question is, why was it left out when you were questioned about it?

P Plaintiff Jordan 39:39

Okay, thank you for that question Ms. justice. Well, I would answer it like this. The questions that the Senate or the Senators would ask during this questioning round, the the appointee does not have any pre knowledge of what the questions are. They're coming, you know, random questions and the appointee is answering them right off the top of their head. As I stated previously, this all occurred in 2014. I was not a student at UNO until 2020. So the last thing when I went up for appointment to the SGA Senate I was thinking about was anything to

do with the French Quarter Minutemen or, you know, this group that that would give free safety escorts to people in the French Quarter, eight years ago. This happened eight years ago, just like, you know, the time that I spent in ROTC that happened 20 over over 25 years ago, the time I spent in Bible study that happened 30 years ago, you know, people cannot think of any group now. I will answer your question by saying saying this, Senator Martinez had every opportunity to follow up and ask a specific question about the French Quarter minutemen group. He chose not to. He chose not to ask anything specifically about the French Quarter minutemen group, even though we know now that he had these news articles from 2014 and 2015. But he chose not to. And my argument is the reason he chose not to ask me any specific question about the French Quarter minimum group is because he intended to mistake my intentions to the Senate and falsely accuse me of lying in the worst possible way, not the best possible way, according to the Oxford American Dictionary that he likes to quotes. Thank you.

J

Justice Aliyah Boyle 41:37

Thank you, Mr. Jordan. No further questions.

C

Chief Justice Crenshaw 41:41

Chief Justice Crenshaw, I have a question for the plaintiff, Aaron Jordan. Um, what in the language used in Senate made you to believe that they were asking you to list every club that you've ever been in, in your entirety of your life instead of clubs that pertain to your academic or recent career? Like I wanted, I'm trying to figure out what language would have you believed they wanted to know what you were doing 30 years ago?

P

Plaintiff Jordan 42:10

Well, Senator Martinez question did not give a timeframe did not give a time limit. Now, he didn't say for example, what groups on or off campus have you belong to since enrolling at UNO. He didn't ask, ask that. He didn't ask what groups on or off campus have you belong to over the past five years? Or what on or off campus groups have you belong to over the past 10 years? If you read Senator Martinez question, he just asked what groups have you belong to on or off campus? So that open ended question that open endedness can incorporate my entire lifetime. And, and that is where Senator Martinez was seeking to come back through an illegal executive session, and mistake and misrepresent my intentions toward the Senate.

C

Chief Justice Crenshaw 43:13

Chief Justice Crenshaw, I have another question. If you were accused of these horrible things, and you were, you know, acquitted, and it was swept off the, you know, off the table, then why not mention it? Because this student organization is an organization in which we are each representatives of the school. And if somebody could easily Google your name and something like this to pop up, why not bring it to the forefront? If it was already, you know, if it was already expunged, and no trouble, you know, would have come to you?

P

Plaintiff Jordan 43:49

Well, okay, I'm gonna have to clarify some points in the language that you have just used. First of all, I was not acquitted because matter never went to a trial. The district attorney's office determined that no crime had occurred. Okay. So that's the very first thing. Second thing is, there was no expungement made because no conviction ever happened. It's important to to to, to use the proper terms here, because the only way you can get an expungement is if you are convicted. I was never convicted. I was never went to trial. I was falsely accused of a crime that I did not commit. It was caught early on in this in the process. It took several months, the district attorney's office realized it and dropped the case. Now, as far as googling my name, if you Google my name, or anyone in this audience, Google's my name, you will see that the 2014 articles accused me of stalking. The 2015 articles exonerate me from stalking. The issue that I had in this case is the Senator Martinez cherrypicked. He ignored the 2015 articles that exonerated me, and only chose to present the 2014 articles that accused me. And that is a misrepresentation of material facts to the Senate and to this court. Then the other thing I'd like to point out is, this was not some horrible thing. There was not any one was injured, you know, and I know when you use that, that term, you're kind of using it in the everyday term that people use it. But there was there was nothing, no one was was was harmed. This was over some letters that I had wrote about a matter of public interest. And that's why the district attorney's office realized that early on and dropped the charges before he went any further. You made another point about Oh, okay. Yes. Okay. So, the stalking and the French Quarter Minutemen are two separate things. They have nothing to do with each other. Senator Martinez did not say in his statement, a thing about stalking. He has only included the accusation of stalking in his answer to this Court. Senator Mark Martinez only brought up about the French Quarter Minutemen group, there's been no legal case, there's been no legal action taken against the French Quarter Minutemen group ever, period. That's a fact. So, what Senator Martinez is seeking to do is to say that Aaron Jordan founded this group that believed that legal gun owners could give free escorts to members of the service sector late at night in the French Quarter. And somehow that's a bad thing. Now, I understand if he may have a personal reservation against firearms, I understand that. But as I had pointed out in my opening statement is that, according to the Louisiana constitution of 1974, and according to a recent Supreme Court, US Supreme Court case, is that we as citizens have a second amendment right to carry a firearm in public. And that's a fact. Now Senator Martinez doesn't like it. He doesn't agree with it. That is his opinion. But that is a fact. And that's not a horrible thing. And that's not a crime that is a constitutional right that we all have the citizens and that I was an advocate for.

C

Chief Justice Crenshaw 47:38

Do any other justices have any other questions? If not, then we will move into next action at this point there should be, next. We will now move into Next Action/Adjournment. At this point, should there be any actions on the docket, the court will return to step c Supra. Upon hearing all matters on the docket this court will adjourn. We will now move into Executive Session. This is a closed executive session. Will be held amongst the justices present at the hearing and an SGA Advisor to render opinions in each opinions heard. We will now meet and talk about the new evidence that we've been given.

S

Senator Martinez 48:39

And I want to know?

Am I free to leave?

C Chief Justice Crenshaw 48:41
Todd? Tiffany?

A Advisor Gitlin 48:45
Mr. Jordan and Mr. Martinez, we're going to put you in the waiting room. Everyone else is free to leave if there are any other at so that you can await the court's decision.

S Senator Martinez 49:00
I would ask the court that they placed me in a separate waiting room and not the same one


C Chief Justice Crenshaw 49:05
Granted

S Senator Martinez 49:07
Okay, thank you

A Advisor Gitlin 49:10
Everyone else you are free to leave Mr. Jordan and Mr. Martinez. We will place you in there shortly

C Chief Justice Crenshaw 49:17
It doesn't state whether or not non justices can like stay as we deliberate or is that not.

A Advisor Gitlin 49:40
This is a closed session. All witnesses you know everyone here. Please take your leave now. Or if you're interested in hearing, we can put you in the waiting room.

 49:55
I would like to be put in a waiting room.

C Chief Justice Crenshaw 49:56
Yeah,

i 49:57
me too.

C Chief Justice Crenshaw 50:01
We should just put everyone who isn't a justice in the waiting room. okay. Is the plaintiff and defendant present?

S Senator Martinez 1:11:13
I am.

P Plaintiff Jordan 1:11:16
Yes.

C Chief Justice Crenshaw 1:11:18
Okay. I wanted to start by saying Judicial Court has taken a lot of time, for this case and we have taken out time for our busy schedules. And I wanted to quickly comment on the lack of decorum that was shown towards the Judicial Branch in our job and in the way we function. It was not appreciated. And we have come to our deliberation. After careful consideration and deliberation, we've come to this decision to deny the plaintiffs request for an immediate impeachment of Senator Oscar Martinez, but we have also made the decision to censure Senator Oscar Martinez in response for lack of decorum.

S Senator Martinez 1:12:10
Understood. Can you, may I ask the court what that entails?

C Chief Justice Crenshaw 1:12:15
Censuring is basically a warning. You will have a mandatory meeting with the advisors. There is currently a system that has not been codified yet so this is the only other, the only other action that we could take besides impeaching you. It's essentially a comment and a, it essentially is calling you out for poor performance. Essentially that's basically what it is.

S Senator Martinez 1:12:49
Understood Thank you Justice

C Chief Justice Crenshaw 1:13:00
okay, if nothing else is to be said, we will now adjourn. I don't have a gavel so I can't bang it.

A Advisor Gitlin 1:13:19
I'm gonna stop recording now. Okay.