

Supreme Court
Judgement No. S0052/2025
Date of Judgement: 4/11/25
Type of Proceeding: Impeachment
Type of Judgement: Impeachment
Parties Involved: Toast / State of Julia

1. Factual Background

On March 26th 2025 Former President Toast sent a Dm to Former Senator Dylan Cosmo during the case of his impeachment trial stating “Do you want a cabinet role [Next Line] Its a win for everyone, Charges Against you are dropped, you maintain a high standing in gov, What do you say?”. Dylan then informed his lawyer [4EyeJay] that this had happened. His lawyer then informed the court. He was then advised to go public with it and give the info to the Senate, who then voted for Toast to be impeached. That was the direct events day of.

Further facts would come to light during the trial. Of note would be Rac’s involvement in talking to Toast and giving him the idea to ask Cosmo to resign. This event took place the same day before Toast had sent a message to Cosmo. Rac had stated in regards to asking Cosmo to resign, “I requested so that in the event Dylan was considering resigning, he could do so before the Senate Special Election finished, so his seat could be directly appointed. [Next Line] I insisted that no coercion or pressure be put on Dylan.”

Furthermore more the intent and timing of Toast's actions were brought into question during the trial. Toast was working a shift at his job where he had stated that he was on a bathroom break and quickly sent it out. Toast had stated in many other ways that he was under real-life stressors as well.

Previous things up to this were objective facts that are known to be true. We as a court know that this ruling has had backlash, mostly from former President Toast. We understand that there may be reasons that you disagree with our ruling. That is ok, However, it is not ok to say that the court did this based on “vibes”. The Senate sent the case to us as they believed there was enough to go off of for a trial to be held. The system worked as it was meant to and did its job well. We ask you to read this ruling in full before making a choice.

There are many factors to this case that were argued so we are going to take this one at a time, starting from the 2 that are easier to have rulings. Rac gave Toast the idea. This objectively doesn't matter. Toast was still the one who sent the idea. While it could mean something for rac later on in regards to if he could be tried or found guilty of something is up for debate and not the point of this. But the fact of the matter is that this case is about toast and his actions alone.

The prosecution argued the fact that Toast was stressed and was not in a correct mental state. His actions were not intended to be a bribe. But to give Cosmo a way out. There are two factors to this, the First being that one's intentions can not be fully proven. There is only statements after the fact.

Additionally, questions to this motive can be easily raised. However, there is no contention that Toast wished to have Cosmo out of his seat as soon as possible, given the multiple attempts that Toast made to remove Cosmo from the Senate. While this factor and the race factor, as stated earlier in this case, would be factors to consider if this was a criminal trial only in regards to sentence mitigation, not fully getting rid of the crime. The outcome of this is binary, Toast would be guilty or not so those for the sake of this case do not matter. Additionally, as president, you are responsible for all your actions. You are the leader of the country, a role you took on voluntarily and (in theory) with the promotion of the people. You are to act as such and are responsible for all actions you take during that time. If you need to step back, that is ok, You can leave for an LOA or resign. But during your time as president, you are solely responsible.

Finally, on to the message itself. The contents of it ask Dylan to resign in return for a political favor. The defense tried to argue that Dylan never took the bribe and thus there was no effect. To take a quote from 4eye directly during the proceedings, “No consequence needed to occur, no benefit needed to be gained. The abuse is in the attempt — and in how it undermined the fairness of the process. A court cannot wait for manipulation to succeed before taking it seriously.” The court holds this to be true. The action itself is to be what is held under scrutiny. Not the intent behind the action unless it is directly related to the action in the form of an event leading up to it, such as in a self-defense case where someone must defend themselves after being provoked.

We as the court, are upholding the opinion of the Senate and the opinion of the prosecuting attorneys that offering someone positions in power in return for time to do something you want. Especially if it is to resign a seat in government for convenience or otherwise. The court is upholding that the act of offering someone a position of power in return for a favor counts as bribery and is punishable under all applicable laws, including impeachment. Offering someone a position of power based on merit will not apply to this at all.

2. Grounds for Judgement

The court finds that via the method of impeachment in the constitution, Toast's actions violated section 8 of the constitution with the undermining of the state.

3. Judgment

THE COURT HAS FOUND TOAST GUILTY VIA UNANIMOUS VOTE.

Effective immediately, Toast is no longer the acting president of Julia, and Jash will become the President.