After reading the case I'm inclined to decline it due to the Applicant not having standing under Bylaw 1500 to request an interpretation of Students' Union legislation (see bolded portions below). Mr. Foster is a law student running for the Council seat, but does not currently sit on Council. The provisions of Bylaw 2400(8) he is citing for interpretation are very broad and only tangentially related with respect to this issue. He would have to argue that they have been contravened. He also alludes to disputing CRO Ruling #7, but does not word his application in terms of appealing that ruling. Bylaw 1500 is silent on who may challenge CRO Rulings, but on a basic level one would have to be a related party to appeal it.

3 Scope of Cases

1. The scope of the Board shall be limited to actions and appeals brought before it that:
   a. initiate a complaint about a contravention of Students’ Union legislation;
   b. request an interpretation of Students’ Union legislation or;
   c. appeal rulings made by the Chief Returning Officer during the Students’ Union’s general elections.

4 Standing

1. The following have standing to initiate a complaint before the Board about the contravention of Students’ Union legislation:
   a. members of the Students’ Union, except Tribunes;
   b. any Students’ Union constituted body, except the Board; or Council.

2. The following have standing to request an interpretation of Students’ Union legislation from the Board:
   a. Council,
   b. members of Council, and
   the Chief Returning Officer of the Students’ Union.