

Ruling #17 Summary

Candidate involvement with a third party and intentional misrepresentation of information.

Parties to the Ruling

- Lisa Glock, Presidential candidate
- Students for Justice in Palestine, third party
- Michael Griffiths, Presidential candidate and Complainant
- Sithara Naidoo, Deputy Returning Officer
- Jacob Verghese, Chief Returning Officer

Elections Office Jurisdiction

This ruling refers to campaign activity within the election. It falls under the jurisdiction of the rules established by the Elections Office in the Nomination Package.

Applicable Bylaws, Rules, and Regulations

Bylaw 320: Elections, Plebiscites, and Referenda

Section 11(1):

Each Candidate or side manager shall act reasonably and in good faith, and specifically shall

- ensure that each Volunteer engaging in Campaign activities on their behalf is aware of all bylaws, rules, regulations, and orders;
- ensure that each Volunteer is in compliance with all bylaws, rules, regulations, and orders while engaging in Campaign activities on their behalf; and
- report any contravention of a bylaw, rule, regulation, or order to the C.R.O. immediately.

Section 11(5):

A Candidate or side in a Students' Union election may distance themselves from a third party in the event the third party effectively conducts Campaign activities under the following conditions:

- the Candidate or side must demonstrate to the C.R.O. that the third party acted without the consent of the Candidate or side; and
- the Candidate or side must demonstrate to the C.R.O. that steps have been taken to distance themselves from the third party and to attempt to halt unauthorized Campaign Activity by that third party.

Section 11(6):

Should a Candidate or side demonstrate the conditions specified under Section 12(5) to the C.R.O.'s satisfaction, the Candidate or side would not be subject to punitive fines as a result of the third party's actions, but could still be subject to counterbalancing fines.

Section 17 (1):

Where a Candidate, Volunteer, or side has contravened a bylaw, rule, or regulation, regardless of the cause or the intent of the parties involved, and that contravention has provided an unfair advantage to a Candidate or side, the C.R.O. shall assign a penalty that

- (a) fully counter-balances any advantage gained; and
- (b) where the contravention was intentional, penalizes the Candidate, Campaign manager, or side manager who was or whose Volunteer was guilty of the contravention.

Section 17(2):

Penalties available to the C.R.O. shall include

- (a) a fine to be counted against the Candidate's or side's Campaign Expenses;
- (b) the confiscation or destruction of Campaign Materials; and
- (c) limits, restrictions, and prohibitions on any type of Campaign activities for any period of time up to the commencement of voting.

Section 17(3):

The C.R.O. shall draft a schedule of fines and penalties as an appendix to the rules and regulations concerning this bylaw.

Section 17(4):

A Candidate or side shall be disqualified where they are guilty of a contravention that

- (a) cannot be counterbalanced by a lesser penalty;
- (b) is malicious or substantially prejudicial to another Candidate or side; or
- (c) involves tampering with ballots, voting procedures, or counting procedures.

Section 17(5): The C.R.O. shall investigate and rule upon every contravention of this bylaw or any other bylaw, rule, or regulation related to the election, plebiscites, or referenda.

Findings

1. The Complainant, Michael Griffiths, filed a complaint at 1:51 on March 11, 2024 as supplementary evidence to the CRO's Ruling 6.
2. On March 6, 2024 at 10:07, while the Election Office was questioning Lisa Glock about her relationship with SJP, Glock expressed the findings outlined in ruling 6. In short, she affirmed her lack of intent in any proxy campaigning initiated by SJP. On the March 6 call, as well as a call on March 11 at 18:00 between Glock

and the Election Office, Glock expressed that she only came to the realization of problems regarding potential third-party bylaws on Tuesday, March 5 at 16:42 – when she messaged the Election Office about third-party, specifically SJP, concerns. However, the arguments and evidence provided to the Election Office since the March 6 call put Glock’s statements into question.

3. Griffiths alleges the following:
 - a. Contravention between Lisa Glock and the SJP occurred over a prolonged period.
 - b. Glock’s relationship with SJP’s election activities was in fact intentional.
 - c. Glock did not act in good faith in dealings with the Election Office.
4. The evidence presented by Griffiths is as followed:
 - a. Audio file from February 22, timestamped at 15:03. This date is relevant as it was 4 days before the campaign period started. This audio invalidates Glock’s statements that her relationship with SJP’s election activities does not seem intentional.
 - i. The audio confirms Glock’s relation to a “friend who is kind of in the SJP” and her knowledge that SJP is going ahead with a “whole Palestine thing during the race”.
 - ii. The audio shows Glock affirming that SJP intended to “target” incumbent candidates, which would include Griffiths’ campaign.
 - iii. This evidence is supported by a second audio file from an anonymous individual dated for February 22 sent to the Election Office by an individual, in which Glock confirms her understanding that SJP is “not a student group so the UASU can’t really control what they do”. Glock attests to a “mild concern” about SJP endorsements breaking election rules.
 - b. Vandalized campaign materials by groups associated with Glock, exemplified by:
 - i. Posters were covered by other posters and some posters were fully taken from where they were posted., specifically by the SJP picks posters and pamphlets. This is relevant to Glock because she posted an endorsement by Prometheus Voaklander (Research Lead for the SJP).
 - ii. Several posters were stamped over with a “Ceasefire now, free Palestine” stamp, which indicates a possible connection to SJP.
 - iii. Lawn sign was removed and found in the bushes`
 - c. Griffiths “faced a sharp rise in online backlash” after the SJP posted their election picks, as well as harsh and untrue labelling. (ie: Instagram comment “Hell nah last thing I want is a racist white man running for SU president disgusting”; the CRO overheard SJP members call Griffiths “Islamophobic” while they were tabling in CAB on March 5).
5. The evidence is further supported by an individual who wishes to remain anonymous and sent information to the Election Office in writing and on the phone:

- a. In an off-campus meeting on February 14, 2024 – 12 days before the campaign period started and two days before the candidates meeting – Glock informed this individual that she was meeting with SJP regarding helping her with her campaign. The individual attests that Glock specifically named Ali as one of her primary contacts at SJP. In this meeting, Glock also explained to the individual that SJP would be releasing “report cards” on candidates’ stances on Palestine and that SJP would be making recommendations for how students should vote.
 - b. Further confirmation on Glock’s behalf regarding SJP’s report card release was communicated in a voice memo to this individual on February 22. This is the same audio file referred to by Griffiths in his complaint.
 - c. On February 27, this individual received a screenshot from Glock of Ali’s close friends story on Instagram, “in which he denounced anyone who voted for Presidential candidate Michael Griffiths”.
 - d. SJP publicly released their “SJP Picks” on Instagram (@sjp.uofa) on February 27 in support of Glock and aggressively denouncing Griffiths. In reference to the February 14 meeting mentioned above, the Election Office has reason to believe that Glock was more involved in this activity than she made it seem. Furthermore, the individual attests that “. In a conversation with Glock, she told me that Griffiths would be the only candidate receiving a public denouncement from the SJP.” This further shows that Glock was most likely aware and contributing to the efforts of SJP to publicly shame and attack Griffiths’ character.
6. In the call with Glock on March 11, Glock upheld the same story as March 6. When the Election Office asked Glock if she was in communication about SJP activities with any other candidates. She attested that she had told other candidates that SJP was going to be making voting recommendations. When asked who she spoke to, she said that she shared that information with multiple candidates but was only able to state one specifically (VP External candidate Logan West). On March 11 and 12, the Election Office called all candidates in the General Election to inquire if Glock told them about the SJP Picks coming out. All individuals said no, except Logan West.
 7. Glock’s relationship with Ali, an active member of SJP is worth looking into:
 - a. The anonymous individual referenced in point 5 of this section shared that Glock referred to Ali as an “unofficial second campaign manager” many times in conversation over the course of the pre-campaign ad campaign periods. When asked about this campaign title, Glock said that she “might have called him [her] secondary campaign manager” but it was not meant seriously.
 - b. Glock posted a video in the days leading to voting addressing her stance on Palestine during the campaign period, which was reposted by SJP with their additional commentary directed towards Griffiths. The anonymous individual was informed by Glock that Ali had helped her with the video.

- c. The individual believes that Ali has a high-ranking position within SJP, as he was seen tabling for them in front of APIRG in HUB Mall. He was also the SJP member that Glock gave stickers to, as outlined in ruling 6.
 - i. Ali's relevance in SJP is further supported by statements from other individuals interviewed by the Election Office who wish to remain anonymous. These conversations were recorded, some in writing and some as audio files. Secondary information states that throughout the election season, "Ali took an election focussed role" and he was "previously active but didn't have as big of a role as the election period".
 - ii. The initial anonymous individual also expressed that "Glock's relationship with Ali was also publicly witnessed by many people on the evening of March 7th, after the election results, as he was in attendance with her at Dewey's despite not being on Glock's approved guest list." Another individual who wishes to remain anonymous attests that at Dewey's after the election results, Ali introduced himself to them as President of the SJP.
8. The initial anonymous individual also shared that they witnessed a call on March 5 at 19:02 between the Election Office and Glock on the topic of SJP's possible third-party involvement with Glock's campaign. The individual attests that Glock "lied" to the Election Office and "downplayed her involvement with SJP as she is affiliated with the group, was meeting with them multiple times a week, and was aware and contributing to a lot of their activities over the course of time before her nomination package was received, the pre-campaign period, and the campaign period itself."
9. In their statement, the individual concludes that "Ali, through SJP, essentially functioned as Glock's volunteer, and I believe Glock never got approval, nor expensed any of the campaign materials SJP and Ali used to campaign for her (including the signs at the SJP tabling, SJP pamphlets and several posts on the SJP account). I believe that Glock's involvement with the SJP tainted the integrity of her race, as well as the integrity of the entire election. I strongly believe that she was aware of the group's intention to slander and denounce Griffiths, which not only happened at the SJP tabling but also online, and I believe these actions contributed and led to the hostility and harassment Griffiths endured during the campaign."

Ruling

If Glock attested a "mild concern" about SJP endorsements breaking election rules since February 22, yet did not communicate any of this to the Election Office until March 6, there is a violation of bylaw 320.11.5ab. This withheld information also falls into bylaw 320.11.1c which requires candidates to report any contravention of a bylaw, rule, regulation, or order to the CRO immediately.

The Election Office concludes that Glock did not act in good faith towards her opponent (Griffiths) or the Election Office in multiple instances. This contravenes bylaw 320.11.1c.: The Election Office concludes that they were misled by Glock while investigating her about ruling 6. While working on ruling 6, Glock was firm in her stance that any activities that appear correlational between herself and SJP were unintentional. However, evidence was brought to the attention of the Election Office in Griffiths' complaint and anonymous complaints that prove that Glock lied. Furthermore, Glock's understanding of SJP's plans to "target" Griffiths' campaign as a third-party while not communicating it with neither Griffiths nor the Election office is in bad faith.

Penalty

In light of Bylaw 320.17.4abc, the penalty for Glock's bylaw contraventions, harm done to the fairness of the election, and intentional misrepresentation of information to the Election Office is a disqualification of the candidate.

Appeal

Rulings of the CRO may be [appealed to the DIE Board](#) by current undergraduate students, using the DIE Board Application Form, within 12 working hours of the ruling being posted. This ruling was posted at 8:00 AM on Wednesday, March 13th and the deadline for appeal is 11:00 AM on Thursday, March 14th.