

1. Plaintiff: Harry Edwards
2. Constituency: Member of the Student Body
3. Defendant: Matthew McKnight
4. Category of Election Violation:
 - a. First count of Falsification under VI S.G.C. §801(E)(5).
 - b. Second count of Falsification under VI S.G.C. §801(E)(5).
 - c. Harmful or Malicious Behavior under VI S.G.C. §801(E)(7).
5. Description of Violation: See below.
6. Evidence submitted as attachments.

I submit this complaint as a member of the student body in accordance with VI S.G.C. §400(A) and as a member of the Joe Nail for SBP campaign. This complaint contains three charges. The first is a charge of falsification relating to a false statement made by Mr. McKnight during a Board of Elections hearing on February 19th. The second and third allegations are very similar to charges I have previously made, but they must be reconsidered in light of the first charge of falsification.

I realize that this sounds like a double jeopardy situation. To an extent, I agree that this is double jeopardy. Yet there is no prohibition whatsoever against double jeopardy in the Student Code. Furthermore, the sole reason why these charges must be reconsidered is because the Defendant declined to submit evidence in advance of the hearing for my prior complaint. Had myself and the Board of Elections had the opportunity to review the evidence in advance of the hearing, Mr. McKnight's falsehoods would undoubtedly have been exposed during the hearing.

We hold Mr. McKnight responsible for the second and third violations on the basis that he is responsible for all actions carried out on behalf of his campaign by members of his campaign. He has already stated that Ms. Shriver was acting on behalf of his campaign when the complaint was first submitted (Evidence B). This complaint provides evidence that she was still a campaign member just two hours before re-filing the complaint. More than that, we provide evidence that she was involved in discussions with Mr. McKnight about whether or not to re-file the complaint.

First Count of Falsification

Mr. McKnight's line of defense in response to my February 17th complaint was entirely dependent upon the fact that Ms. Shriver was not a member of his campaign when she re-filed Shriver vs Nail. He was surprisingly quick to admit that she had falsified information within that complaint, but he argued that he did not deserve to be punished because she was no longer a member of his campaign when she re-filed the complaint. During the hearing, Mr. McKnight repeatedly and unequivocally stated, in verbal and written testimony, that Ms. Shriver left his campaign team on "February 6th around 2:30pm" (Evidence E). I believe that Mr. McKnight repeatedly and unequivocally stated that Ms. Shriver had had no involvement whatsoever with his campaign since February 6th. I believe that Mr. Rob Jarrell, senior campaign advisor for Mr. McKnight, made very similar statements. I will be able to provide direct quotes when the Board of Elections makes minutes and audio recordings publicly available.

Mr. McKnight's statements are directly disproven by Evidence E. This screenshot shows that Mr. McKnight sent a draft of an official campaign statement (Evidence F) to Mr. Jarrell and Ms. Shriver at 3:28pm on Tuesday February 7th. He asks them to send him their thoughts ASAP. Merely by sending this email to Ms. Shriver, Mr. McKnight involves her with his campaign.

Furthermore, the suggestion that Ms. Shriver left the campaign on "February 6th around 2:30pm" (Evidence E) is called into question. If she no longer had any sort of association with the campaign, then why was she one of just two people who were asked by Mr. McKnight to read an important campaign statement? It seems very likely that she was not only a member of the campaign on February 7th but was in fact one of the most senior members. We would add that leaving a groupme is not proof of leaving a campaign. If Ms. Shriver was being asked to consult on official campaign statements then to all intents and purposes, and indeed by the Student Code's broad definition (Title VI Section 101E), she was still involved in Mr. McKnight's campaign.

This is a material falsification because Ms. Shriver re-filed the complaint against Mr. Nail that very same day, on February 7th at 5:34pm (Evidence E), just two hours after she was asked by Mr. McKnight to provide her thoughts on an official campaign statement. It is very possible indeed that Mr. McKnight has avoided disqualification up to this point on the sole basis of falsifying the date and time at which Ms. Shriver truly ceased working for his campaign, if she has ceased at all.

Second Count of Falsification

Ms. Shriver has filed two separate complaints against Mr. Nail with the Board of Elections. The original complaint was filed on January 30th (Evidence C1) and a very similar complaint was filed on February 16th (Evidence C2). Each complaint contained the following passages:

"Beginning the afternoon of January 26th, I have confirmed at least eight instances of unsolicited emails from the "Joe for SBP" campaign."

"Thirdly, given the texts between Mr. Nail and Mr. McKnight, Ms. Tomar's claim that "we attempted to cancel the send but were unable to retract some emails" again raises questions. If, when the accidental emails were sent around 4 p.m. on January 26th, the Joe for SBP campaign "immediately" detected a mistake, why would Mr. Nail deny the mistake, via text, three hours later and instead infer wrongdoing by the McKnight campaign team?"

A hearing for the first complaint took place on February 2nd and in this hearing it was clearly established that no emails were sent out before 7pm. This was established in two ways. First, we pointed out that the timestamp on an email submitted as evidence by Ms. Shriver was in fact in PST rather than EST (Evidence A). We made this clear both during the hearing and in our official response to her complaint (Evidence D). Second, all supplementary email evidence submitted by Ms. Shriver had timestamps of 7:08pm or later. Members of the Board of Elections Kushner, Hoang, and Zhang can attest to these facts, and the fact that only one of them was a member at the time of the (illegitimate) hearing is entirely irrelevant. The point is that everyone in the room was well aware that there was no reason to believe that any emails were sent out before 7pm.

This falsehood was permissible, though careless, in Ms. Shriver's January 30th complaint. She may have genuinely believed that emails started going out at around 4pm, especially given the PST timestamp. However, repeating this falsehood in her February 16th complaint is a blatant case of falsification. As of February 16th she knew full well that the first email was sent at 7:08pm. She acknowledged this in the February 2nd hearing and in fact it was proven by evidence which she submitted to the Board of Elections herself. This means that her February 16th complaint contains unequivocally false information leading to an unequivocally false allegation against Mr. Nail.

Ms. Shriver attests at the conclusion of her February 16th complaint that "I, Katherine Shriver, do affirm that I have read in full the foregoing complaint and that the allegations contained therein are true to the best of my knowledge and belief" (Evidence C2). This is categorically false since she was well aware that no emails were "sent around 4pm on January 26th." This is not a case of misinterpreting semantics – this is a case of perjuring herself in an official and public document.

Harmful and Malicious Behavior

The most likely explanation for making an entirely false allegation against an opposing candidate, with full knowledge that it is an entirely false allegation, is that Ms. Shriver is committed to harming Mr. Nail's candidacy. The false allegation she makes is particularly damaging to Mr. Nail's candidacy because it accuses him of personal misconduct rather than merely holding him responsible for a campaign member's misconduct. It accuses him of lying to Mr. McKnight on the basis that emails started going out at 4pm, suggesting that he should have already been aware of the mistake when he arrived at the Virginia Tech basketball game around 7pm (Evidence C2).

Members of the Board of Elections will rightly read her complaint with the assumption that the allegations it contains have been made in good faith. It has every chance of biasing members of the Board against Mr. Nail if they assume that this allegation has any basis in fact. Furthermore, it could cause immense harm to Mr. Nail's candidacy to have to publicly defend himself against unequivocally and intentionally false allegations. Ms. Shriver knows full well that the text of her complaints inform reporting in the Daily Tar Heel and she knows full well that the student body may come to regard Mr. Nail as dishonest on the sole basis of her allegations. This is compounded by the fact that the student body is now well aware that she is serving as the Ethics Chair of Student Congress, which is a position which they may associate with integrity and moral authority.

Respectfully submitted,



Harry Edwards
602 MLK Jr. Blvd, Apt 429A
Chapel Hill, NC 27514
(919) 699-8295

I, Harry Edwards, do affirm that I have read in full the foregoing complaint and that the allegations contained therein are true to the best of my knowledge and belief.