

Commission on Elections

DATE: 16 OCTOBER 2022

PETITION: JOINT MOTION OF COED ALPAS AND CTHTM UP HEAR TO

MANUALLY RECOUNT FOR THE COLLEGE OF EDUCATION (COED) AND COLLEGE OF TOURISM, HOSPITALITY, AND TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT (CTHTM) STUDENT

COUNCIL CANDIDATES' VOTES

PETITIONERS: ROSELYN C. MARIANO AND ALVIN BALATBAT

Decision

A motion was filed before the Commissions to manually recount the votes casted for the college of Education and College of Tourism, Hospitality and Transportation Management. The canvassing of votes is a part of the mandate and responsibility of the Commission. To wit the Article VII Section 46 of the Election Code:

Section 46. Canvassing of Votes. – As soon as the voting is finished, the canvassing of votes shall commence immediately. The canvassing may be done online, or physically which shall promote the most efficient, fair, and just procedure. The Commission shall decide whether the canvassing of votes shall be broadcasted live only on its official social media platforms or shall be conducted in a private, online meeting, with the designated poll watchers of each political party or candidate only.

Article VII of the Election Code states,

Section 48. Material Defects in the Election Returns. – If it should clearly appear that some requisites in form or data had been omitted in the election returns, the board of canvassers shall call for all the candidate/s, political party, and/or coalition concerned by the most expeditious means, for the same board to affect the correction.



Commission on Elections

DECISION: THE COMMISSION **DENIES** THE JOINT MOTION OF COED ALPAS AND

CTHTM UP HEAR TO MANUALLY RECOUNT FOR THE COLLEGE OF EDUCATION (COED) AND COLLEGE OF TOURISM, HOSPITALITY, AND TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT (CTHTM) STUDENT COUNCIL

CANDIDATES' VOTES.

The commissioner from CCIS, issued this opinion, joined unanimously.

I. OPINION

The petitioner did not provide enough and substantial grounds with evidences which support her claim.

As the PUP SC COMELEC exercise its mandates and functions for this upcoming election, especially in canvassing the votes cast by the bona fide students of the University. The commission put into consideration the material condition of the candidates and yet, it is not enough reason to justify the claims made by the petitioners.

To conclude, as much as the PUP SC COMELEC wants to exercise the respective duties and responsibilities within our mandates, it will always be their truest intentions to serve the student body and aim for the collective success of everyone in the University, especially of the student body. Hence, to be pro-student and servant leaders as we all should be, the PUP SC COMELEC will continue to hear the voices which are needed to be heard and adjust as necessary.

VOX POPULI VOX DEI

II. INVOLVEMENT OF CTHTM

The petitioners, one from COED and the other is from CTHTM, filed a joint motion to the commission. They assume the premise existing to the COED is similar and might be applicable to the CTHTM too, which is not. Given all the alleged disparity in their college vote count, yet nothing has been produced on the stated petition, the CTHTM petitioners lack validity and evidence.

III. CANVASSING SYSTEM



Commission on Elections

The Board of Canvassers, headed by the Vice Chairperson, Gad Thomas Deuel Mendiola, has explained the system of canvassing process to all poll watchers and campaign official throughout the canvassing period, both in the physical and via Google Meet.

Verifying the student numbers from the raw ballot data by using a database of student numbers provided by the ICTO, wherein using conditional formatting, all duplicates would be highlighted green and were considered valid, and those with no highlights would be considered invalid. Some invalid ballots would be up for revalidation at the last day of canvassing and were marked with blue font color, whereas invalid ballots marked with red font color were considered totally invalid.

After verification, the board of canvassers separated the invalid ballots from the valid ones and proceeded with counting. For the Presidential and Vice-Presidential Candidates, the filter at the first row was used to filter out the responses between those who voted for a candidate or abstained. After filtering, the whole row was selected, and the number of responses for a specific candidate or abstentions were indicated at the lower right part of the excel status bar. For councilors for contested colleges, the ballots that have voted for more than six (6) candidates were separated and considered as invalid votes. The canvassing would proceed by using the shortcut "control key and F key" or "ctrl+f" to use the search feature. The canvassers typed in the surname/ full name of the councilor candidate and click "find all," which then would show the total number of responses that has that specific candidate selected.

The rejected ballots were subject to revalidation. It was thoroughly explained each day, to each poll watcher for each college during the canvassing. It is true that some errors were not seen if not manually done, but it was already noted that the error related to this (spaces at the beginning, middle, and end of the text were considered as extra characters thus not being automatically highlighted green) and were already considered beforehand. Errors appeared, yet they were easily managed. The online mode of elections is still new to the university and the Commission must adapt properly in the short time given to it for preparation. The Commission will stand firm with the results of the elections, given the accurate statistical data provided and will not proceed with a manual recount.

Given the late response of the offices required, and the further delays, in addition to 2nd year of online SCEs, it was to be expected that errors were to be present, to which the Commission adapted easily.



Commission on Elections

IV. STATISTICS OF VOTES

At 4:00 PM of OCTOBER 11, 2022, vote tally for LSC Presidential candidates were as follows:

- a. TARLAC, BEA (IND): 238 VOTES
- b. VALMEO, SENON (SMS): 292 VOTES
- c. ABSTAN: 30

At 4:00 PM of OCTOBER 11, 2022, further information about the VOTER and BALLOT STATISTICS were as follows:

- a. REGISTERED VOTERS: 2,294 b. SUMBITTED BALLOTS: 582
- c. VALID BALLOTS: 560 d. INVALID BALLOTS: 22

Adding votes for TARLAC, VALMEO, ABSTENTIONS, and REJECTED BALLOTS equates to 582, consistent with the amount of SUBMITTED BALLOTS for COED.

At 5:00 PM of OCTOBER 11, 2022, according to the PETITIONERS, states that a total of 20 INVALID BALLOTS were subject to REVALIDATION.

- a. The petitioners questioned as to where the other 2 INVALID BALLOTS from the previous total of 22 INVALID BALLOTS is.
 - i. The 2 INVALID BALLOTS that were not seen in REVALIDATION were colored RED upon VERIFICATION BEFORE THE CANVASSING FOR COED, thus was REMOVED AND NOT CONSIDERED. Furthermore, it was explained that all student numbers colored RED were to be automatically removed before the REVALIDATION started on the same day (13-10-2022). All campaign officials present agreed.

b. The petitioners stated that 14 INVALID BALLOTS were considered VALID after REVALIDATION.

i. There were in fact 13 INVALID BALLOTS. The other 7 INVALID BALLOTS were not revalidated. A total of 20 INVALID BALLOTS were considered for REVALIDATION. The 20 INVALID BALLOTS put up for REVALIDATION added to the 2 INVALID BALLOTS colored



Commission on Elections

RED equates to a total of 22 INVALID BALLOTS, consistent with the previous number of INVALID BALLOTS from OCTOBER 11, 2022.

c. The petitioners stated that around 10:30 PM of OCTOBER 13, 2022, there were 247 VOTES for TARLAC, 296 VOTES for VALMEO, 30 ABSTENTIONS, and 6 REJECTEC BALLOTS, a total of 279 BALLOTS.

- i. There was a total of 13 REVALIDATED VOTES, therefore, a final total of 7 REJECTED BALLOTS from the REVALIDATION.
- ii. There were 2 REJECTED BALLOTS from before the REVALIDATION not counted by the petitioners. These ballots were considered TOTALLY INVALID, thus was not considered for REVALIDATION.
- iii. 247 VOTES for TARLAC, 296 VOTES for VALMEO, 30 ABSTENTIONS, 7 REJECTED BALLOTS from the 20 BALLOTS considered for REVALIDATION, and 2 TOTALLY INVALID BALLOTS, which were not considered for REVALIDATION, equates to a total of 582 BALLOTS, consistent with the TOTAL BALLOTS CAST for COED.

SO, ORDERED.

SIGNATURE REDACTED

RJ O. SALAMERA

Chairperson, CPSPA Commissioner Student Council Commission on Elections

SIGNATURE REDACTED

GAD THOMAS DEUEL S. MENDIOLA Vice Chairperson, CAL Commissioner Student Council Commission on Elections

SIGNATURE REDACTED

MARY JOY B. DAGDAG Secretary-General, CS Commissioner Student Council Commission on Elections



Commission on Elections

SIGNATURE REDACTED

LORIELYN Y. BELMONTE

COC Commissioner

Student Council Commission on Elections

SIGNATURE REDACTED

CARLOS JUDE G. MAMINTA

CCIS Commissioner

Student Council Commission on Elections

SIGNATURE REDACTED

CARLOS JAIRO L. TIAGA

CE Commissioner

Student Council Commission on Elections

SIGNATURE REDACTED

ARVIE EIN P. AMOGUIS

CTHTM Commissioner

Student Council Commission on Elections

