

## **UMGSA Elections Committee Complaint Report**

By: Razia Sultana and Chantal Asselin

Carl Neumann filed an appeal on March 28<sup>th</sup>, 2019 and Skye Kushner filed a complaint on March 30<sup>th</sup>, 2019.

The specific ruling or action being appealed was that the elections CRO Ademola Adesola violated the UMGSA Code of Conduct and Election Policy by verbally assaulting Carl Neumann at the UMGSA Council Meeting held on March 27<sup>th</sup>, 2019 and for a thread of slandering and accusatory emails sent out by the CRO Ademola Adesola, an example of one of the emails can be found at the bottom of this report.

The UMGSA Code of Conduct clearly states that:

During his/her term of office, each Member:

- shall respect fellow Council Members; the authority of the Council and Council decisions once made;
- shall treat all Members equal, no matter their gender, ethnicity, creed, disability or sexual orientation;
- shall not assist any person or any organization in its dealings with the GSA when such intervention may result in real or apparent preferential treatment to that person or organization by the GSA;
- shall not make use of any confidential information obtained as a Member, in order to derive therefrom a benefit or advantage for himself/herself or that of any family member;.

Due to recent events, the CRO of the elections committee Ademola Adesola has violated the following points in the UMGSA Code of Conduct. As a result, we the elections committee hereby remove Ademola Adesola from the UMGSA Elections Committee and position as Chief Returning Officer effective immediately.

Hi All,

This mail becomes necessary in view of the blatant untruth that constitutes the mail Carl sent out recently to you all, with the heading “Notice of Privacy Violation and/or Spying”. Given what I have known about Carl in the last few weeks that I have been the CRO, I can confidently confirm that he lacks the courage to tell the truth. All of his claims to the effect that he got to know of some nebulous excess in the campaign budget of a candidate from me and that I and the said candidate confirmed exactly that to him should be taken as the glaring demonstration of Carl’s uncanny capacity to deliberately invent fantastic falsities in a bid to mask his infractions. One of such major infractions is that he abused his office and gained undue access to other candidate’s information. Indeed, he violated a candidate's privacy and spied on their record!

At no time did I discuss a candidate’s campaign expenses in the presence of another candidate.

How could I discuss in his presence a matter that was never at any point an issue for me? In other words, why would I discuss a non-existent infraction?

The question this matter raises is: Where did Carl get his information? In other words, how did he gain access to the candidate's documents – documents that only Ruth and I have access to? Could it be that he abused his office? Could it be that someone in that office assisted him to explore other candidates' records?

When I put the question to Carl last (Wednesday) sometime during the Council Meeting, his response revealed to me that he has made up his mind to plumb the depth of the absurd in an attempt to cover his tracks with respect to how he gained access to a candidate's records and thereafter make a spurious claim, all in the name of ensuring a candidate on his slate avoid the run-off election. Carl said to me that I told him that a candidate overshot his campaign expenses! Is that not extremely absurd, disturbing, and insulting? Does the UMGSA now has a president who, having been in that position for more than he should be, can freely abuse his office and compromise members' information with insider's assistance? I think he should be made to answer for it however the Appeal is determined.

But then, let us humour Carl and pretend that I gave him the information about what is not true. Why did he not file a complaint or an Appeal then? After all, according to him, I must have given him that information prior to the start of the three-day voting period? Why did he wait till there was a tie between his candidate and the candidate in question before he threw in an Appeal? For the avoidance of doubt, I did not give him any such information, for to do so would have amounted to a serious compromise of my position as the CRO!

That Carl would float this lie is not strange to me. It is consistent with his dubious, manipulative character. I say this because Carl was the only candidate in this Election who would urge me to reveal to him the results of the Election at the time contrary to the rule of the Election Policy Manual. Of course I rebuffed his inappropriate request and warned him to desist from such action (Who can really tell whether he had used some other means to access the results before they were finally released, for he was overwhelmingly desperate to see the results!). He was the same person who would write me (twice) during the campaign period that a candidate had breached the election rule. When I checked on those occasions, the information turned out to be made up. He was the same candidate as a member of the current executive council contesting for office who would not submit the key of his office to the office assistant the Friday before he was to go on leave of absence as required by the Election Policy Manual. He handed in that key to Ruth the week he was not supposed to be in that office. Of course, because it is Carl, he had a manufactured excuse to excuse his misdemeanour.

When I confronted him on that Wednesday of the Council Meeting, he said another shocking thing – that if I had given him demerits for those untoward conducts, they would not have affected his chances as an unopposed candidate for the office of president. That represents for me a person who has become too comfortable with inappropriateness.

For me, Carl's Appeal is baseless, ill-motivated, and time-wasting. In fact, as at Monday after I released the preliminary results of the Election, Eric wrote to me to inquire about when the run-

off would be and whether he could campaign. From what I gathered, both he and his co-contestants had reached out and congratulated each other. But later in the evening of that Monday Carl would file an Appeal that is baseless in its claim, thus rupturing the smooth orderliness of many weeks of electioneering. Anyone who doesn't know Carl would easily mistake his actions as informed by his sincere commitment to the Association. My experience of him in these past few weeks convinces me of his self-serving posturing. Such a character doesn't seem to me as one who has any respect for truth-speaking. They will lift no finger in defence of truth. What Carl self-servingly characterises as truth is toxic fib.

Ademola Adesola  
(CRO)