



TEXAS
ELECTION SUPERVISORY BOARD

2026 CAMPUS-WIDE ELECTIONS

Resolution 2026-003

Issued: February 26, 2026

Ingole v. Sheriff & Nayampally

Election Supervisory Board Resolution: 2026-003
In Res. Campaign Expenditure Records

Election Supervisory Board Member, Dawson Nunn, delivered the majority opinion of the board:

“In the matter of an Executive Alliance failing to reflect accurate campaign expenditure records.”

On Tuesday, February 24, 2026, at 5:29 P.M. CST, Daksh Ingole submitted a complaint (Complaint ID: 3) against the Executive Alliance, Jaylen Waithe, and Katarina Forster Raich, alleging that they violated **Title II, Chapter VI, Subchapter C, §6.14 Campus-Wide Election Code:**

*“**CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURE RECORDS.** Each candidate must keep accurate and up-to-date records of all campaign receipts and expenditures. A template for financial disclosures for use by all candidates will be developed by the Election Supervisory Board and provided to each group by the first day of filing.”*

Complaining party, Daksh Ingole, argued that Executive Alliance, Sarah Sheriff and Siyona Nayampally, failed to list all their expenses as required per Title II, Chapter VI, Subchapter C, §6.14 Campus-Wide Election Code. Ingole stated that the Sarah Sheriff and Siyona Nayampally Executive Alliance did not list their videography or high-quality drone footage in their Financial Disclosure #1, as they listed no expenses, totaling \$0.00. Ingole asserted the Sarah Sheriff and Siyona Nayampally Executive Alliance should have listed the Fair Market Value of the drone, videography, camera equipment and editing services in their Financial Disclosure #1

Sarah Sheriff and her counsel, Kaylie Ledbetter, argued that the Executive Alliance did not attempt to conceal any expenses, and that they simply listed \$0.00 asserting that they did not accrue, or receive any benefit prior to the release of the reels (which featured the videography / drone footage). They also provided an Instagram Direct Message that invited users to be a collaborator on their reels, dated February 16, at 5:31 P.M. CST, which was after the deadline of Financial Disclosure #1.

However, after questioning by the Board, Sarah Sheriff and her counsel stated that they will be adding the Fair Market Value of the videography services used in their campaign reels on their Financial Disclosure #2, since it has now accrued value. They further stated that they interpreted “expenses” mentioned in the Campus-Wide Election Code to be reportable once they are incurred. Sheriff’s Counsel estimated that such Fair Market Value reported on Financial Disclosure #2 could be \$100.00.

Based on these facts, the Election Supervisory Board has determined that the Sarah Sheriff and Siyona Nayampally Executive Alliance failed to keep an accurate and up-to-date record of their campaign receipts and expenditures.

The Election Supervisory Board finds the Sarah Sheriff and Siyona Nayampally Executive Alliance violated Title II, Chapter VI, Subchapter C, §6.14 Campus-Wide Election Code, and will be penalized.

Based on the violation, the Election Supervisory Board members present at the hearing have voted to issue a Class A violation, pursuant to Title II, Chapter IV, Subchapter B, §4.13 (a), resulting in a \$40.00 fine against the. This fine has been assessed in accordance with the Fine Matrix established in Advisory Opinion 2026-009.

In conclusion, The Election Supervisory Board submits its resolution on Thursday, February 26th, 2026, in an five-to-two majority of the board members who were present at the hearing.

AFFIRMATIVE VOTES:

Samuel J. Hecht – (Chairman)

Dawson Nunn

Lauren Pham

Michael De La Garza

Vivek Patel

DISSENTING VOTES:

Kaya Miller – (Secretary)

Isabella Herrera

★ 2026-003, *INGOLE V. SHERIFF & NAYAMPALLY*, IS RULED ★

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Pursuant to **Title II, Chapter IV, Subchapter C, §4.19 Campus-Wide Election Code:**

“APPEAL OF ESB DECISION. *Either party affected by a decision of the Election Supervisory Board may file an appeal with the entity with appellate jurisdiction within 24 hours after the adverse decision is announced. After the polls open, an appeal must be filed within 12 hours after the adverse decision.”*