DIE Board Respondent Application

Application to respond to an application for a hearing or appeal.

Please note that this information will all be public. While the UASU's practice is to redact email addresses and phone numbers from publicly posted DIE Board respondent applications, the information provided may be kept, used, and disclosed in keeping with the operations of the DIE Board, UASU Bylaws, and Alberta's Personal Information Protection Act.

If necessary, the Students' Union DIE Board Registrar may contact you to confirm that you are a student.

NOTE: Under the DIE Board Protocols, the DIE Board reserves the right to reject applications that it judges to be frivolous or vexatious.

Name Michael Griffiths

E-mail

Phone Number

I would like to respond to the following DIE Board Application:

(Provide the Case Number or briefly describe the Applicant and what the Applicant is claiming.)

2024-HA07

Anticipated Witnesses (if any):

Sithara Naidoo, Deputy Returning Officer

Signature

Attach File

Although not required, you may attach additional written submissions or supporting documents for the Board to consider, including any relevant facts, a copy of any Students' Union legislation or rules relevant to your arguments, and your position on the matters in issue. These submissions will help the Board understand the nature of your complaint or request for interpretation. The Board may rule against you if you do not provide sufficient reasons for your application.

mgungh

Please submit as a single document.

If you're unsure of how to combine multiple separate documents, you can save all documents as a PDF and use and use <u>PDF Merge</u>.

File upload

PDF

Response to first DIE Board A....pdf

Direct any questions to:

DIE Board Registrar

governance@su.ualberta.ca

SUB 6-24

The applicant has provided no evidence or listed no specific bylaws or rules they believe to be contravened. They have described how they feel the process is unjust and their feelings towards the ruling but have not demonstrated how bylaws have been contravened. Given that DIE Board's responsibility is to interpret and ensure bylaws are upheld, there are no grounds for DIE Board to interpret or rule on this case. Additionally, a more comprehensive appeal has been submitted on the same ruling, which actually details what bylaws need interpretation and provides comprehensive commentary. This submission of that additional appeal, and the lack of specifics provided in this one, make this appeal moot and impossible for the DIE Board to rule on.

For clarification regarding the claims made in the application:

- They claim it is unjust that the "loser may register a complaint against the winner and have the winner disqualified."
 - Regulation 320:16 states that complaints may be made within 2 business days of a contravention. My complaint was submitted within 2 business days of the results being posted, and within 2 business days of receiving the information that led to the complaint. Therefore, it is perfectly just for this complaint to be ruled on.
 - The elections office accepts complaints and rules on them. While I submitted a complaint, it is baseless to presume that I as "the loser" have the power to "get the winner disqualified."
- They claim there should be an investigation into the conflict of interest between the CRO and Michael Griffiths
 - o From the beginning of the election, precautions have been taken to avoid this perceived conflict of interest wherever possible. The DRO has taken the lead on all matters related to me and my race. When submitting the complaint, I specifically asked that the DRO be the one to deliver all rulings related to it to avoid a perceived conflict of interest.
 - o An investigation into a potential conflict of interest between the CRO and I is the business of CAC, and for DIE Board to rule on only when necessary.
 - These claims are frivolous, if they were genuine they would have been raised from the beginning of the election, not after and in relation to only this ruling 17.