

October 31, 2018

To: The URSU Board of Directors

From: Amber Smale, Chief Returning Officer

RE: 2018 URSU By Election Final Report

BACKGROUND

The URSU engaged the services of a Chief Returning Officer in late September 2018 to oversee the By Election held on October 17 and 18, 2019.

Prior to the engagement the URSU completed a Candidates Information and Nomination package along with the required public notices of the nomination period and available positions. The nomination period was October 1-5, with Nomination Day on October 5, 2018. Candidates were given until October 8, 2018 to withdraw from the Election or some positions if multiple were initially selected. There were 14 candidates in this By Election.

During this period, the Board of Directors removed two positions from eligibility. Both were Director roles for the Faculty of Science and the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research. These positions were not properly placed for Election as incumbents had not resigned nor were they recalled by the Board prior to advertisement. These positions may be included in the next URSU General Election.

The CRO held an all candidates meeting on October 5, 2018 which provided instruction to all candidates on their roles and responsibilities and what was/wasn't allowed during the campaigning period. This was an overview of the Election and Referendum Bylaw along with the Candidates Information and Nomination package. An all candidates' forum was held for all presidential candidates on October 10, 2018. This provided the candidates with an opportunity to present their platforms and answer any questions from students who were present.

The campaign period ran from October 9-16, 2018. Candidates were provided with clear instructions by the CRO about what they could/couldn't do during the no campaigning period and on Election Days.

The list of available positions and candidates who ran for each is attached as Appendix A.

DISCUSSION

Election Results and Complaints

There was a total of 14,492 students eligible to vote. Based on the President race numbers, a total of 1,312 voted which is a 9.1% voter turn out.

The official results were announced on October 19, 2018 with a caveat that the election of the President was unofficial pending the result of investigations underway related to various complaints received during the election period.

The Chief Returning Officer received a total of 19 complaints related to possible By Election violations. The complaints fell into the following categories:

- Media interviews prior to campaign period
- Placement of Posters
- Attendance at events on campus
- Intentional misrepresentation of facts
- Attempts to discredit candidates
- Interference with the administration of the Election and the voting process
- Use of intimidation tactics and threats against voters
- Use of electronic devices to facilitate, influence or coerce a members' vote
- Interference with a voter's freedom of choice and right to vote

All complaints were received in writing, some identified the individuals involved, had witnesses and provided audio recordings, video and photos of individuals and incidents.

The Elections Committee, made up of the CRO, Public Elections Officer, Marc Kelly and the Student Elections Officer, Shafeeka Sayyid met on October 22 and 23, 2018 to review the complaints and to interview two candidates running for Election, Sukhdeep Brar and Shawn Wiskar.

Attached as Appendix B and C is the official results of online voting and the summary of complaints and penalties applied for each infraction.

The Elections Committee will not be releasing the names of complainants or evidence provided as it may identify the complainant and there is concern for student safety in some instances. A copy of the final decision of the Elections Committee has been provide to the two candidates involved, along with the URSU and Campus Security.

The Elections Committee has disqualified Sukhdeep Brar from the Election. As per the Election and Referendum Bylaw the runner up is elected president.

The CRO is concerned with the nature of these incidents and that complainants had a fear of repercussions and for their personal safety for reporting violations, therefore the CRO further recommends that the URSU work with the Regina Police Service University Liaison Officer, Campus Security and the University of Regina to ensure students have a safe school environment and trust that they can report incidents in confidence to both URSU and the University of Regina.

The Elections Committee has issued penalties to two other students involved in the incidents and recommends the URSU Board of Directors and staff undergo Election training provided by the CRO prior to future elections.

Online Voting

The By Election was held via online voting with two polling stations established at Riddell Centre and The First Nations University of Canada. The polling stations were open from 9:00 am to 8:00 pm on October 17 and 18, 2019. Two laptops were set up at the stations for students without access to computers to vote.

The use of UR Self Serve is a flawed approach to online voting. The online voting system is essentially a survey which lacks the ability to limit which constituencies individuals can vote for, relying solely on the honour system and that students will abstain from voting for faculty positions for which they aren't registered. There is no way to prevent voters from voting for all positions.

There is also no way for the CRO to test the validity of the survey prior to the Election other than to complete the survey and ensure all the races are spelt correctly and have the right candidate names or run reports to show all races started at zero when the voting began. The system also relies on students reading and following instruction rather than simply marking their choice. This makes it impossible to assess spoiled or overvoted ballots.

Lastly, anyone with a Student ID and pin could access the online voting. For example, the CRO being a past student, no longer active has a valid student id and pin. The CRO was able to access the link on election days and vote like any other student, although that was not done.

The CRO recommends that the URSU move back to paper ballot voting, with only one day for voting. This will help to control the voting process and prevent the issues that arose from the complaints of the By Election.

Polling stations should be in quiet locations on campus to provide for privacy of the voters.

Election and Referendum Bylaw Improvements

There were a couple of things in the Bylaw that stood out as requiring attention.

Section 3.1.5 Nominations does not reference the Executive of Council positions although candidates are able to run for the Board of Directors, University Senate, University Council and Executive of Council. This should be corrected so it's clear for those interested in running in future elections.

Section 3.1.8 All Candidates Forum and Debate does not speak to the need for a meeting prior to the nomination period. Some of the inquiries received prior to the Nomination period were helping candidates to determine if they should run. An informational meeting advising potential candidates of what is available, the time commitment, role of Board members, how the nomination form should be completed, etc. may encourage people to run.

Section 3.1.10 Vote of Confidence isn't consistent among non-profit organizations, however most do not require a vote to confirm the individual running. By changing this section to the candidate being acclaimed this would simplify the online voting process if that is the preferred method and remove any concerns of over voting. Additionally, it may encourage others to run in future elections.

Section 3.1.12 Election Expenses requires clearer wording around what is eligible and not eligible for reimbursement. As it currently reads, it implies candidates may seek reimbursement from a defined pot of money for hiring volunteers when the intent was likely that there is a defined amount of money that candidate's may seek reimbursement from for election expenses.

3.1.13 Recounts only allows for a recount if there is a paper ballot. The URSU should ensure this is a legal clause. Online voting doesn't change the requirement to allow candidates to request a recount.

3.1.16 Slate behaviour addresses that candidates are prohibited from this type of behaviour however it doesn't prevent student-based organizations on campus from submitting a "slate" of candidates. This can be a risk to the URSU in that if a slate of individuals were elected it would likely result in biased decision making at the Board level or decision making in the interest of the student organization rather than the broader student membership. There are a couple of ways to curb this as follows:

- Establish candidate eligibility requirements that potential candidates may not be active members of student associations or organizations that receive funding from the URSU; and
- Establish public positions on the Board of Directors that are appointed by the Board. These individuals should be non-students who have experience serving on Boards and are in no way affiliated with the URSU or the University of Regina.

Respectfully Submitted,

Amber Smale

Amber Smale
Chief Returning Officer

APPENDIX "A"
2018 URSU By Election
Candidate List

President

Sukhdeep Brar
Matt Fedler
Rashad Haque
Colton Macdonald
Shawn Wiskar

Executive of Council

Colton Macdonald
Rashad Haque

Director – Faculty of Arts

Souravdeep Singh

Director – First Nations University of Canada

Keisha Desjarlais

Director – Francophone Students

Muhammad Khan

Director – LGBTQ Students

Jacq Brasseur

Director – Part Time Students

Radhika Bansal

Senate

Amit Kumar Bansal
Steve Byblow
Rashad Haque
Muhammad Khan
Colton Macdonald

University Council

Alfred Adenuga – Arts
Rashad Haque – Business
Lorene Entz – Graduate Studies and Research

APPENDIX "B"

Bylaw Election Official Results

President (Pending investigation by the URSU Elections Committee)

Sukhdeep Brar	475
Matt Fedler	174
Rashad Haque	51
Colton Macdonald	147
Shawn Wiskar	465
Abstain (36)	

Director Faculty of Arts

Souravdeep Singh	
Yes (98)	
No (44)	
Abstain (71)	

Director First Nations University of Canada

Keisha Desjarlais	
Yes (21)	
No (4)	
Abstain (1)	

Director Francophone Students

Muhammad Khan	
Yes (421)	
No (182)	
Abstain (317)	

Director LGBTQ Students

Jacq Brasseur	
Yes (503)	
No (146)	
Abstain (263)	

Director Part-time Students

Radhika Bansal	
Yes (58)	
No (18)	
Abstain (291)	

Senate

Amit Kumar Bansal	257
Steve Byblow	135
Rashad Haque	92
Muhammad Khan	73
Colton Macdonald	295

Arts University Council

Alfred Adenuga

Yes (88)

No (26)

Abstain (59)

Arts Executive of Council

Colton Macdonald

Yes (120)

No (25)

Abstain (281)

Business University Council

Rashad Haque

Yes (44)

No (30)

Abstain (131)

Business Executive Council

Rashad Haque

Yes (41)

No (28)

Abstain (171)

Graduate Studies and Research University Council

Lorene Entz

Yes (52)

No (5)

Abstain (13)

APPENDIX "C"

Summary of Complaints/Violations

Names of complainants and specific evidence received will not be released to protect the identity of individuals who came forward in confidence to the CRO and Elections Committee.

Complaint 18BY-01
October 8, 2018

SUMMARY OF COMPLAINT

Concerned that two other candidates conducted an interview with the Carillon that included their platform and felt this was active campaigning prior to the official campaign period.

FACTS

The CRO has determined the facts of the complaint to be as follows:

- a) An interview was done by the Carillon with two candidates seeking nomination one week prior to the By Election Nomination Period.
- b) The interview was conducted with Matt Fedler and Shawn Wiskar.
- c) The interview included the potential candidate's intentions of running for President and what their platform goals would include.
- d) The Candidates did not ask people to vote for them in the interview.

DECISION

The decision of the CRO is that this is not a violation of the Election and Referendum Bylaw. Announcing intentions to run in an Election is common practice along with providing some information on platform goals. Both candidates did not ask for support or votes during the interview and the Carillon, being a media outlet is not prohibited from seeking and publishing stories and interviews.

Complainant and Candidates advised of decision on October 9, 2018. Complaint Closed.

Complaint 18BY-02
October 9, 2018

SUMMARY OF COMPLAINT

Concerned with someone ruining his poster located in the classroom building on campus.

FACTS

The CRO has determined the facts of the complaint to be as follows:

- a) A poster of Candidate located in the campus building was ripped slightly on the left side.
- b) Tampering with a Candidates poster is a violation of the Election and Referendum Bylaw.

DECISION

Based on the lack of conclusive evidence the CRO is unable to decide who is at fault. Therefore, the complaint is closed.

The Complainant was advised on October 10, 2018 to tape this part of the poster and provide any update should he learn who may have done it. The CRO also made an announcement at the all Candidates Forum on October 11, 2018 reinforcing the need to respect all candidate's materials and postings.

Note: URSU advised the CRO on October 11, 2018 of security cameras throughout campus and that requests may be made to campus security to review the footage.

Complaint 18BY-03
October 11, 2018

SUMMARY OF COMPLAINT

Candidate reported he replaced his ripped poster located in the classroom building on campus and his face in the new poster has been marked up. Requested I check the security camera to find out who is doing this.

FACTS

The CRO has determined the facts of the complaint to be as follows:

- a) A poster of Candidate located in the classroom building was marked-up around his face.
- b) Tampering with a Candidates poster is a violation of the Election and Referendum Bylaw.
- c) The incident was reported to Campus Security.
- d) The Campus Security report advised the review of video footage resulted in nothing being found.

DECISION

Based on the lack of conclusive evidence the CRO is unable to decide who is at fault. Therefore, the complaint is closed.

The Complainant was advised on October 13, 2018 by Campus Security.

Complaint 18BY-04
October 11, 2018

SUMMARY OF COMPLAINT

Concerned with the placement of Candidate posters on non-URSU Bulletin Boards.

FACTS

The CRO has determined the facts of the complaint to be as follows:

- a) The Candidate made a request to the CRO on October 9, 2018 to put up posters in Luther and Campion College or other bulletin boards if he obtained approval from the owner of those boards.
- b) Campion and Luther College are eligible constituencies under the Election and Referendum Bylaw.
- c) Section 3.1.14 of the Election and Referendum Bylaw gives the CRO discretion to allow campaigning in URSU businesses and other premises.

DECISION

The decision of the CRO is that the placement of posters on this bulletin board is not a violation of the Election and Referendum Bylaw and that the placement of posters on non-URSU bulletin boards is approved.

The Complainant was advised on October 13, 2018 and granted same approval to place posters in other premises providing approval was obtained from those owners as well. Complaint Closed.

Complaint 18BY-05
October 11, 2018

SUMMARY OF COMPLAINT

Concerned that there is a clear breach or conflict of interest with regards to another candidate campaigning with his puppy. The premise of his campaign being The Owl, and the candidate holding an event with Puppies at the Owl on October 11, 2018.

FACTS

The CRO has determined the facts of the complaint to be as follows:

- a) The Pups and Pints Fundraiser at The Owl is not an election campaign event.
- b) An external organization that the candidate belongs to, organized the charity fundraiser for CCRexQ.
- c) The Candidate made a request to the CRO to volunteer for this event.
- d) The CRO approved the request with specific instructions that the candidate may not campaign, make speeches, talk about the election or wear clothing that encourages anyone to vote for him.

DECISION

The decision of the CRO is that attending events is not a violation of the Election and Referendum Bylaw and that candidates are not prevented from attending events or being visible during the campaigning period. They are prohibited from actively campaigning at these events if alcohol is being served.

The Complainant was advised on October 11, 2018. Complaint Closed.

Complaint 18BY-06
October 11, 2018

SUMMARY OF COMPLAINT

Concerned with the behaviour of a current URSU Executive Board Member resulting from the All Candidates Forum held on October 10, 2018 in which the Board member threatened to “expose a candidate in a public forum very soon”. The complainant perceived these comments as disturbing and threatening.

FACTS

The CRO has determined the facts of the complaint to be as follows:

- a) The Executive Board Member was in attendance.
- b) The Board member said things about exposing a candidate in a public forum more than once and attempted to bring up past Board decisions.
- c) The Board member would not follow the direction of the CRO to ask a question and spoke over the CRO more than once during the forum.
- d) The Board member was displaying aggressive behaviour toward the candidate and the CRO.

DECISION

The decision of the CRO is that the Executive Board Member is in violation of the Election and Referendum Bylaw in relation to the role of the Board in supporting the CRO in their duties and promoting the election however, the Bylaw doesn't assign an ability of the CRO to discipline board members in their current capacity, although the Bylaw can be applied to them as members of URSU.

The CRO reinforced with the Board their role as Elected Officials under various pieces of legislation along with their responsibility in providing a harassment free work environment on October 11, 2018.

Complainant advised on October 11, 2018 that the comments have been addressed. Complaint Closed.

Complaint 18BY-07
October 12, 2018

SUMMARY OF COMPLAINT

Reported a two-part concern of possible Election Bylaw breaches in relation to another candidate putting their posters on non-URSU bulletin boards and their attendance at the Pups and Pints event as being an election event that serves alcohol.

FACTS

The CRO has determined the facts of the complaint to be as follows:

- a) The Candidate made a request to the CRO on October 9, 2018 to put up posters in Luther and Campion College or other bulletin boards if he obtained approval from the owner of those boards.
- b) Campion and Luther College are eligible constituencies under the Election and Referendum Bylaw.
- c) Section 3.1.14 of the Election and Referendum Bylaw gives the CRO discretion to allow campaigning in URSU Businesses and other premises.
- d) The Pups and Pints Fundraiser at The Owl is not an election campaign event.
- e) An external organization that the candidate belongs to, organized the charity fundraiser for CCRexQ.
- f) The Candidate made a request to the CRO to volunteer for this event.
- g) The CRO approved the request with specific instructions that the candidate may not campaign, make speeches, talk about the election or wear clothing that encourages anyone to vote for him.

DECISION

The decision of the CRO is that neither actions are in violation of the Election and Referendum Bylaw and were approved by the CRO. Further, attending events is not a violation of the Election and Referendum Bylaw and candidates are not prevented from attending events or being visible during the campaigning period. They are prohibited from actively campaigning at these events if alcohol is being served.

The Complainant was advised on October 15, 2018 and given approval to post on other bulletin boards providing the owners of them approve as well. Complaint Closed.

Complaint 18BY-08
October 14,2018

SUMMARY OF COMPLAINT

Concerned that an URSU Employee is making calls to individuals involved with URSU claiming that the candidate is the reason for the previous president's resignation from his position.

FACTS

The CRO has determined the facts of the complaint to be as follows:

- a) The information provided by the Complainant is second-hand as he was not directly contacted by the URSU Employee.
- b) URSU took the appropriate steps to educate the employee on their role and behaviour during campaigning periods.

DECISION

The decision of the CRO is that the URSU Employee is in violation of the Election and Referendum Bylaw and that his actions interfere with the Election however this is an internal URSU staffing matter that was appropriately handled once brought to their attention.

Complainant advised of decision on October 15, 2018. Complaint Closed.

Complaint 18BY-09
October 15, 2018

SUMMARY OF COMPLAINT

Received an e-mail from one of the presidential candidates for the upcoming URSU By Election. The complainant feels his email does not meet the rules set out in the campaigning guidelines that all candidates are expected to follow during the campaign period.

FACTS

The CRO has determined the facts of the complaint to be as follows:

- a) The Candidate's e-mail to the Society complainant is not in violation of the Election and Referendum Bylaw.
- b) The Board member who became involved is not a member of the complainant organization.
- c) The Board members were previously advised of their responsibilities as a Board member during an election.
- d) The Board member continues to take steps to discredit the candidate which is in violation of the Election and Referendum Bylaw.

DECISION

The decision of the CRO is that this matter be referred to the Elections Committee to determine the appropriate action, if any, in relation to the Board members behaviour during this By Election.

DECISION OF ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

This complaint and subsequent reply of the Board member supports the conclusion that the Board member was continuing to advocate against a candidate after the CRO gave clear instructions previously to the Board on their role.

The Elections Committee recommends to the URSU Board of Directors that all Board Members be required to undergo mandatory election training from the CRO prior to future elections.

Complaint 18BY-10
October 16, 2018

SUMMARY OF COMPLAINT

Concerned with a Facebook post made by one of the candidates. Complainant feels this is blatant slanderous behaviour towards another candidate and could be considered a misrepresentation of facts.

FACTS

The CRO has determined the facts of the complaint to be as follows:

- a) The Candidate's Facebook post is in violation of the Election and Referendum Bylaw.
- b) The Candidate agreed to remove the post but left it up for almost two additional hours and removed only when advised by CRO of a deadline and the issuance of demerit points.

DECISION

The decision of the CRO is that this matter be referred to the Elections Committee to determine the appropriate amount of demerit points in relation to the candidate's infraction.

DECISION OF ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

The decision of the Elections Committee is that eight demerit points be applied for inappropriate campaign material.

Complaint 18BY-11
October 17, 2018

SUMMARY OF COMPLAINT

An URSU employee sent an e-mail to the CRO on behalf of three board members who wanted to file a complaint against one of the candidates. The Board members wanted the CRO to call them directly and claimed to have video proof of the candidate trying to convince students to vote for him.

FACTS

The CRO has determined the facts of the complaint to be as follows:

- a) The Candidate was working from 8:00 am to 3:00 pm on October 17, 2019.
- b) The Board Members did not follow up with a written submission or provide video.

DECISION

The decision of the CRO is that this matter be closed due to a lack of evidence and no video or written submission being made by the complainants.

Complaint 18BY-12
October 17, 2018

SUMMARY OF COMPLAINT

Concerned candidate who is standing for president is stopping all the students going into Riddell and even me asking us to vote for him and his friends are following up to make sure we voted for him. This has happened over two days and they are in the Library as well. One is a female who has confronted me and my friend more than once.

FACTS

The CRO has determined the facts of the complaint to be as follows:

- a) The Complainant has been approached more than once by supporters of the candidate advising her to vote for the candidate and making their presence known to her on campus.
- b) Complainant has identified one of the individuals approaching her to vote for the candidate.
- c) One of the audio recordings of a call from a private number advises the candidate directed them to call her.
- d) More than one complaint has been received in relation to friends of the candidate approaching people to vote for him.

DECISION

The decision of the CRO is that this matter be referred to the Election Committee to review the evidence and recordings and determine the appropriate action, if any into possible Election interference.

DECISION OF THE ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

The decision of the Elections Committee is that no demerit points will be issued given the inability to identify individuals in the audio, however the complainant has identified and provided a photo of the woman approaching her to vote for the candidate.

The woman who is a student at the U of R will be penalized with a loss of vote and eligibility to run as a candidate in future elections along with a monetary fine for attempting to interfere with the voting process.

Complaint 18BY-13
October 17, 2018

SUMMARY OF COMPLAINT

Complainant sent an e-mail to the CRO requesting to speak in person with the CRO about an Election incident but didn't want to file an official complaint.

FACTS

The CRO has determined the facts of the complaint to be as follows:

- a) The Complainant although he didn't want to file an official complaint was approached outside of Riddell Centre about who he was voting for.
- b) The CRO witnessed the men approaching people as they walk from the pathway into Riddell Centre.
- c) The CRO is unable to determine what was said to individuals that were approached.
- d) The group of men are known to the candidate as his personal Facebook page has a cover photo with the same group of men for which the CRO has identified four to be present in the group on campus.

DECISION

The decision of the CRO is that this matter be referred to the Election Committee to determine the appropriate action, if any, in relation to this Bylaw violation.

DECISION OF THE ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

While the candidate denied at the meeting with the Elections Committee on October 23, 2018 that this was his group of friends and that he didn't know the individuals involved when asked about his relationship with named individuals, his personal Facebook cover photo confirms he not only knows the individuals, he's friends with some of them.

The decision of the Elections Committee is that 20 demerit points will be applied to the candidate for failing to provide truthful answers to the Elections Committee when questioned and for the attempted interference with the administration of the Election and voting process of his friends who acted on his behalf.

Complaint 18BY-14
October 18, 2018

SUMMARY OF COMPLAINT

Concerned with posters of a candidate at Luther college, and the Education Building main floor club room. Believes candidate is taking help of "outsiders" to gain the votes from the East Indian community. Subsequent e-mails with complainant also advised of a reported incident among his friends and the "outsiders" referenced originally.

FACTS

The CRO has determined the facts of the complaint to be as follows:

- a) The placement of posters on other bulletin boards is not a violation of the Bylaw as the CRO approved previously.
- b) While candidates can use white boards for messages, specific instruction regarding the no campaigning period was given to all candidates about the messages they could have and only on social media.
- c) The three men in the photo provided have been identified. One is a non-student.
- d) Campus Security report and camera footage confirms complainant and his friend were seated and talking to each other when approached by these men.
- e) Both groups filed complaints against each other for profanity, inappropriate gestures and threats from a couple of incidents between them that day.
- f) There is no indication this is Election related aside from it being clear the two groups support opposing candidates.

DECISION

The decision of the CRO is that this matter be closed as there's no clear indication of this being Election related and the snapchat posts and placement of candidate posters aside from the Student Lounge which the CRO removed are not a violation of the Election and Referendum Bylaw.

Complaint 18BY-15
October 18, 2018

SUMMARY OF COMPLAINT

Concerned with the environment on campus on October 17th and believes it was because of some "outsiders" that were present. Witnessed those outsiders forcing some students to vote and we believe they are supporters of a candidate as we've seen their posts on social media.

FACTS

The CRO has determined the facts of the complaint to be as follows:

- a) The complainant was in an altercation with these individuals earlier that was reported to Campus Security.
- b) Two men in the video have been identified and one is a non-student.
- c) The men are speaking with two female students.
- d) One is showing one of the women something on her phone.
- e) Video isn't recorded beyond this point, making it unclear if one woman or both were voting or followed through with voting.

DECISION

The decision of the CRO is that this matter be referred to the Elections Committee to determine the appropriate action, if any for this potential violation.

DECISION OF THE ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

Due to the lack of commentary or clear view of the screens, the Elections Committee is unable to determine if the individuals were being forced, coerced, or helped with the voting process. It's the decision of the Elections Committee that this complaint be dismissed.

Complaint 18BY-17
October 21, 2018

SUMMARY OF COMPLAINT

Three complainants advised a candidate and his friends forced them to vote. These individuals attended the complainant's homes and made them vote or took their phones from them and voted for the candidate on their behalf. All three complainants advised they didn't want to vote for the candidate and asked that their votes be changed.

FACTS

The CRO has determined the facts of the complaint to be as follows:

- a) Three individuals provided an e-mail with their concerns however did not respond to additional questions from the CRO.

DECISION

The decision of the CRO is that this matter be referred to the Elections Committee to determine the appropriate action, if any, related to these concerns.

DECISION OF THE ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

As there was no identifying information provided, the Elections Committee is unable to assess the reliability of the statements. The lack of response to the CRO's inquiries terminated the investigation. This complaint is dismissed.

Complaint 18BY-18
October 22, 2018

SUMMARY OF COMPLAINT

Complainants sent an e-mail to the CRO requesting to file their complaint in person. They reported that a candidate and his friends assaulted him in the parking lot of a nightclub on Saturday, October 20, 2018. The complainant also reported that these individuals were going to people's homes and forcing them to vote for the candidate and the reason for the altercation was because he didn't support them.

FACTS

The CRO has determined the facts of the complaint to be as follows:

- a) A violent incident occurred at a nightclub at approximately 2:00 am, October 21, 2018.
- b) The victim received medical attention and filed an official Police report.
- c) Earlier reports to and from Campus Security indicated an altercation on campus between some of the same individuals during the Election.
- d) The CRO made a Freedom of Information request to the Regina Police that was denied. The CRO doesn't have the ability to obtain the video from the nightclub.
- e) There is conflicting information from the Complainant as to who attacked him, however this is a matter under Police investigation which is outside the By Election.
- f) The video of possible voting violations provided was translated into English and indicates interference in the voting process.
- g) Individuals in the video have been identified.

DECISION

The decision of the CRO is that this matter be referred to the Elections Committee to determine the appropriate action, if any, related to these violations.

DECISION OF ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

The incident at the night club is outside of the Election and being handled by the Regina Police Service.

While the candidate claims he wasn't aware of the incident of his friends asking for User ID's and taking devices from people to vote for him and further claimed he doesn't know the individuals identified other than one, the Elections Committee has already established the candidate was not being truthful about his friendships with those involved and confirmed his friendships with the known individuals via his personal Facebook account, therefore it's reasonable to conclude the candidate was aware of the incidents taking place and didn't take steps to stop the activities.

The decision of the Elections Committee is that the video does support the complaint of interference with the administration of the Election and voting process and that further individuals involved used electronic devices to facilitate, influence or coerce a members' vote and the candidate will be assessed a further 20 demerit points as discipline for the non-members who acted on his behalf along with other penalties including disqualification. Individuals who are students and identified as being involved will also be disciplined.

Complaint 18BY-19
October 22, 2018

SUMMARY OF COMPLAINT

Complainant wanted to remain anonymous however submitted to the SEO, a written letter outlining incident of unethical conduct where the complainant and many other students were asked and forced to vote for a candidate. The candidate's friends were asking for User ID's and passwords from students and were voting for him. Complainant was asked for User ID on October 17, 2018 at 4:00 pm by one of the candidate's friends to vote for him. The letter outlines that the complainant's phone was taken and they voted for the candidate.

FACTS

The CRO has determined the facts of the complaint to be as follows:

- a) The complaint doesn't specifically identify who the individuals were that approached them and/or who took their phone to vote.
- b) The Complainant won't identify the individuals involved.

DECISION

The decision of the CRO is that this matter be referred to the Elections Committee to determine the appropriate action, if any, related to these violations.

DECISION OF THE ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

While the complainant has been identified, the offending party has not therefore the Elections Committee is unable to assess any penalty on this complaint. The complaint is dismissed.