ASCSU Supreme Court Case No. 5402
Opinion of the Court

SUPREME COURT FOR THE ASSOCIATED STUDENTS OF COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY

March 11, 2025

CLARIFICATION ON WHEN A BILL THAT HAS BEEN PRESENTED TO SENATE CAN OFFICIALLY BE VOTED ON

CHIEF JUSTICE MORGAN WRIGHT delivered the opinion of the Court

A SENATOR FOR THE COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING, JARED McGLOTHLIN, requested an opinion regarding when the senate is allowed to officially vote on a bill that has already been presented to senate.

The following question was submitted for clarification

1. For the purposes of Article XI, Section 1101, Subsection E of the ASCSU Constitution "The first vote shall take place no sooner than one week after the initial presentation of the bill.", is a week defined as anytime on the 7th day following the initial presentation of the bill, or 168 hours after the initial presentation of the bill, or something entirely different?
2. Why?
3. Does this definition apply to all parts of the constitution, making the definition of "day" the lapsing of 24 hours?

The ASCSU Supreme Court has determined the following:

1. In a 6-0-1 vote, the Court has determined that a "week" as cited in Article XI, Section 1101, Subsection E of the ASCSU Constitution, is not defined. However, the Constitution occasionally specifies time periods in hours instead of days or weeks. Therefore, the Court concludes that the use of the word week in lieu of the corresponding amount of hours was intentional. It follows that Article XI, Section 1101, Subsection E is not referring to a specific amount of hours but rather simply any time on the 7th day following the initial presentation of the bill.

2. Article I, Section 106, Subsection A, Part (i) states, "The speaker of the Land Acknowledgement will be designated 48 hours in advance by the Chair of the meeting." Conversely, Article XI, Section 1101, Subsection E of the ASCSU Constitution states, "The first vote shall take place no sooner than one week after the initial presentation of

the bill." Because the Constitution occasionally specifies time periods in hours instead of days or weeks, the Court concludes that these differences are intentional. Therefore, the Court cannot further define "week" or "day" in terms of hours.

3. In a 4-1-2 vote, the Court has determined that the Constitution does not provide a definition of "day." Because of the differences in verbiage as regards to the use of hours as opposed to days or weeks, a definition cannot be applied to the entirety of the Constitution.