

Ruling #7

March 2015 Executive and Board of Governors Election

Tampering with Ballots and Voting Procedures – Samer Sleiman, Candidate for Vice President
Operations & Finance

Parties to the Ruling

- Samer Sleiman, Candidate for Vice President Operations & Finance
- Jessica Nguyen, Chief Returning Officer

Applicable Bylaws, Rules, and Regulations

- Bylaw 2200 §26 (Requirements of All Candidates and Plebiscite/Referendum Sides)
- Bylaw 2200 §48 (Penalties Available)
- Bylaw 2200 §49 (Disqualification)
- Bylaw 2400 §4 (Right to Vote)
- Bylaw 2400 §7 (Ballots)
- Bylaw 2400 §12 (Requirements of the C.R.O.)

Facts

1. Samer Sleiman, candidate for Vice President Operations & Finance was present at the mandatory candidates' meeting on February 12 at 18:00. The Elections Regulations & Guidelines, as well as elections-related bylaws were discussed at this meeting. As per Bylaw 2200 §26, all candidates and volunteers are responsible of being aware of and complying with said rules.
2. The Chief Returning Officer made a ruling on March 6, under Ruling #6, disqualifying candidate Samer Sleiman on the grounds of a student complaint that gives the Chief Returning Officer reasonable belief that Mr. Sleiman violated Bylaw 2200 §49 (1c) which "involves tampering with ballots, voting procedures, or counting procedures." As per Bylaw 2200 §48 and §49, the Chief Returning Officer assigned the penalty of disqualification for this contravention to bylaw.
3. Ruling #6 was then appealed by candidate Samer Sleiman and subsequently heard by the DIE Board in a hearing on March 9. In DIE Board's ruling on March 11, the Chief Returning Officer's ruling of disqualification was not upheld by the panel.
4. The Chief Returning Officer has since spoken with two members of DIE Board and completely respects the decision made in DIE Board's ruling appealing the Chief Returning Officer's Ruling #6. DIE Board is the ultimate appellate authority on all decisions ruled on by the board and the Chief Returning Officer would like to clarify that this is not an appeal of a DIE Board ruling. The Chief Returning Officer has the utmost respect for DIE Board and the Students' Union's judicial processes. The Chief Returning Officer also has the obligation to uphold transparency and cannot withhold evidence in her possession from the electorate as a result. The Chief Returning Officer consulted with the DIE Board Chief Tribune, Sean Wallace, and Associate Chief Tribune, Sam Alzaman, on the best process moving forward before writing this ruling to prevent overstepping the power and authority of DIE Board while maintaining transparency and mitigating the potential accusations of this ruling appearing to be an appeal to Ruling #6 to undermine DIE Board's authority. The purpose of this ruling presents new evidence that the Chief Returning Officer was barred from presenting at the hearing on March 9 because it was not part of the original Ruling #6.

5. The Chief Returning Officer was in possession of this new evidence approximately 48 hours after Ruling #6 was released. The timeline is as follows between March 6 to 9:
 - a. Friday, March 6: Ruling #6 was released.
 - b. Sunday, March 8: The new evidence was in the Chief Returning Officer's possession.
 - c. Monday, March 9: The appeal hearing for Ruling #6 occurred.
6. The Chief Returning Officer contacted Rebecca Taylor, DIE Board Registrar, on Sunday, March 8 at 5:24 PM, asking what the process to submit new evidence was. The Chief Returning Officer's question to the Ms. Taylor was as follows: "Is there a formal process that I have to follow to submit these pieces of evidence, or may I just bring them to the hearing?" Ms. Taylor responded confirming that the Chief Returning Officer could either bring the new evidence to the hearing or attach the evidence to the hearing application.
7. Of these options, the Chief Returning Officer chose to bring the new evidence to the hearing on March 9 due to the small window of time to prepare the documents to upload to the website with the hearing application, but was barred from presenting the new evidence by DIE Board as it did not appear in the original Ruling #6. The Chief Returning Officer understands the reasoning behind DIE Board's decision to bar the new evidence and respected the wishes of the panel by not presenting it at the March 9 hearing.
8. The Chief Returning Officer has the authority to make the election results final through the process of submitting the final election results to the Speaker of Students' Council and the President of the Students' Union in writing, as per Bylaw 2400 §12 (1c). The finalization of results should also be accompanied by the Chief Returning Officer's belief and understanding that the results are representative of the electorate's will. The new evidence prevents the Chief Returning Officer from sending final results to the Speaker of Students' Council and the President of the Students' Union.
9. The unofficial results for all races were announced on March 6, with the exception of the results for the Vice President Operations & Finance race, which has been withheld from all parties, including the Elections Office.
10. The Chief Returning Officer's knowledge of this new evidence comes in two ways. Firstly, as per Bylaw 2200 §49 (5), the Chief Returning Officer shall be empowered to investigate and rule upon any contraventions to bylaw. The Chief Returning Officer launched an investigation after initial allegations were made against Mr. Sleiman tampering with ballots as per Ms. Anna Gwozdz's March 5 testimony in Ruling #6. As a result of this investigation, the Chief Returning Officer has several students testifying similar experiences to Ms. Gwozdz's initial email. Afterwards, an alleged victim with a similar story to Ms. Gwozdz came forward on Tuesday, March 10 after encountering Ms. Gwozdz's testimony from the hearing on Monday, March 9.
11. The investigation was launched by the Chief Returning Officer shortly after Ms. Gwozdz's initial email and concern was brought forward. **The Students' Union does everything in its power to respect and uphold that all students have the right to vote in a secret ballot and we are confident that the process in administering the voting system as well as in launching this investigation upholds the values of the Students' Union in regards to secret ballot voting procedures.** The process of launching the investigation is as follows:
 - a. On March 5, the initial complainant, Anna Gwozdz, came forward expressing her concern that Mr. Sleiman voted for her without her knowledge or consent under her CCID. She requested that the ballot allegedly cast under her name be cleared so she could make her intended vote.

- b. On the same day, the Chief Returning Officer forwarded the request to clear Ms. Gwozdz's ballot to Jay Ward of Whitematter, the company that runs the Students' Union's elections voting system. Before the ballot was cleared, the Chief Returning Officer asked Ms. Gwozdz's permission to export her particular ballot for the purposes of this investigation. Ms. Gwozdz consented to this and Whitematter then forwarded this single ballot to the Chief Returning Officer. The Chief Returning Officer would like to stress that this is the only ballot that was ever seen and it was done so under the permission of Ms. Gwozdz for the purposes of this investigation and to confirm that the vote cast did not meet her intentions.
 - c. Ms. Gwozdz was informed of the selections made on the ballot cast under her CCID and informed the Chief Returning Officer that she did not intend to vote in this particular manner.
 - d. Mr. Ward performed a search query on that specific ballot pattern to identify if Ms. Gwozdz's particular situation was unique. In plain terms, there were abnormally high numbers of this specific ballot pattern cast under specific IP addresses. Mr. Ward performed an SQL search to identify potentially affected voters without viewing ballots. Subsequent to this, with more time and in an effort to ensure greater privacy of individual ballots, a new method for comparing ballots was developed that allows for comparing ballots without knowing what the voting pattern is. (Specifically, Whitematter began hashing ballots - a form of encryption - and using the hashes for comparing different ballots.)
 - e. Mr. Ward found from his investigation that 32 other votes were cast using a particular IP address which belongs to a Telus cell phone. These votes followed a fairly linear time line and only on one day.
 - i. "(1) I did not save the time from the authentication table to add to this data. I was concerned that this was a NATed IP and was used by multiple devices which could muddy the waters some so I ran a query to show how many votes were cast under each IP in that very broad subnet. It showed 32 votes cast for the IP in question with the next highest being 3.
 - ii. (2) The ballot in question only had 3 marks in it, 3 first place rankings in 3 different races. I wrote a query to fingerprint all ballots cast exactly like that. As of 16:56 on March 5th there were 42 votes identical to the one I was asked to remove. As well, 10 (of 32 total) of those votes were cast from the IP address in question. During this investigation I found several other questionable IP's with 7 (out of 16 total) and 5 (out of 13 total) identical votes, both belonging to Rogers and appearing to be mobile devices. There were two other devices that had had >1 of those ballots cast, again both from Rogers IP's. I have not included the full query nor the results in this report to keep data private."
12. Upon finding this information, the Chief Returning Officer determined an investigation was needed to determine the extent of the contravention and to create an appropriate ruling since since voting would end later that day. When a ballot is cast, the CCID it is cast on and the ballot cast are not connected. There is a process to connect the two and we ultimately pulled the affected CCIDs to ask those individuals if they intended to vote in the pattern indicated. If they said no, we flagged it as a compromised ballot. Ballots of voters were not directly accessed, except for Ms. Gwozdz's.
13. On March 8, the Chief Returning Officer sent the following email to the affected ballots:

"Subject: URGENT - RESPONSE REQUIRED - Students' Union Election Audit

Good afternoon [STUDENT],

My name is Jessica Nguyen and I manage the Elections Office at the University of Alberta Students' Union.

We are in the process of completing an audit of the ballots cast for a complaint launched regarding a candidate allegedly voting under a student's CCID without her permission. The candidate in question has been disqualified from the Students' Union elections and an appeal of that decision is being made on Monday in the Students' Union's court. Here's the ruling and information on the case, if you would like more details: http://su.ualberta.ca/media/uploads/901/20150306_CRO_Ruling6_SamerS.pdf.

I have information that the ballot cast under your CCID may have been affected and would like to ask you a few questions regarding your voting process in the elections and your assistance will greatly help the Students' Union in maintaining the spirit of fairness in the elections.

1. Did you personally vote (i.e. did you see the ballot and choose the candidates that you voted for) in the Students' Union elections on March 4 or 5?
2. Did candidate Samer Sleiman (or a volunteer of his) assist you in the voting process?
3. If candidate Samer Sleiman (or a volunteer of his) helped you in the voting process, what occurred in your interactions with Mr. Sleiman (or his volunteer)? Please include dates, times, and details of the interaction to the best of your ability.

I trust that you understand that this complaint, left unresolved, jeopardizes the faith that students may have in our Students' Union and sincerely hope that you will assist us in resolving this issue expediently.

The hearing for this appeal will take place tomorrow (Monday) at noon and as a result, I would like to request that you respond to this email in an urgent manner so that we can complete our investigation. If you have been affected by this situation, we would welcome your presence at the hearing tomorrow at noon to testify and I am meeting with all witnesses tomorrow at 11:00 AM for a debrief.

Please contact me via email or [780-245-3898](tel:780-245-3898) should you have any questions. I will be available all day. I would also like to stress that your anonymity will be respected, if you wish.

On behalf of the Students' Union, I would like to thank you very much for your participation and cooperation in upholding the spirit of the Students' Union elections.

Cheers,

Jessica Nguyen
Chief Returning Officer
University of Alberta Students' Union"

14. The challenge that arises with electronic voting is there would be no way to investigate similar problems if good audit trails are not built into the system. The Chief Returning Officer strongly believes that the Students' Union's audit trail has done a good job in protecting voter privacy.
15. As a result of the audit, the concerning evidence follows. All personal identification (names, email addresses), greetings, and salutations have been redacted to respect the wishes of anonymity for those testifying and to keep the ruling as concise as possible.

a. Student #1:

- i. *"hi there, yes i had voted for Samer Sleiman he simply handed me his phone to do so. we had a 30 sec conversation in which he told me about his position. it was on march 4, about 2:30 pm. He told me that if i would like to vote to which i replied "sure" so he gave me his phone and i entered in my ccid info. shortly after he left saying he would take care of the rest. I completely understand how serious this is. he simply gave me his phone and told me to enter my ccid info which i did then he walked away. i simply had a glance at the ballot then he said he would take care of the rest. i was not exactly sure who would i vote because i didn't get a chance to look other's profiles. i felt really awkward afterwards. what are the consequences that i could have to face or the candidate that o have supposedly voted for? no i did not get a chance to log out afterwards which is what t i was really worried about. just because he could access my bear tracks or eclass if hadn't logged out. but i did not know who to report this incidence to. i had not voted for anyone else but him so yes that is completely absurd. i felt obliged to do so but i understand and i will be careful in the future."*

b. Student #2:

- i. *"Candidate Samer Sleiman approached us on March 4th when we were having lunch in CAB lower floor asking have we voted yet and do we want to do this now. I consented and he gave me his phone letting me fill in my CCID and password to go to the vote page. I wasn't familiar with the page and wasn't sure how to vote so I showed the phone back to candidate Samer. I remembered him taking back his phone and swiftly clicking on his screen. I am not 100% sure what happened. I logged into his phone and I am not sure what he did with that then. Didn't log out myself because he was holding the phone. I didn't intend to vote for others. But I would have voted for candidate Samer for VPA if there had not been such incident since he gave quite a speech before multiple lectures I attended... Sorry that was VP finance"*

c. Student #3:

- i. *"1. Initially, I voted for Samer Sleiman, since I met him in the hallway on Wednesday, March 4th, 2015, at 2:00pm in the Tory Building. He told me about the election process, so out of my mind, I gave in. He opened up his iphone, asked me to enter my CCID and password onto his iphone. I wish I had not done this (i.e. think in vigorous detail before acting), but at that time, I was out of my mind, so I did enter those, and I logged in onto his iphone, but he filled out the rest of the election information for his own self-interest. To me, he has violated the use of personal information, since voting must be done privately. I wish I had not entered my CCID and password onto his iphone, but at that time, I was very busy, nervous, and stressful with coursework, exam grade, etc., so I was being quite dumb, and I entered my CCID and password onto his iphone without*

detailed thinking, and afterwards, he filled out the rest of the election information for his own self-interest. Therefore, it is very nice you guys disqualified him, thank you very much.

- ii. *2. Yes, based on what I said above, he assisted me in vigorous detail about voting, acting in his own self-interest and selfish ways, hoping for himself to be elected, to which I believe is the huge violation under the personal use of information, especially he asked me to enter my CCID and password onto his iphone, and he filled out everything afterward. I know I shouldn't have done this, but at that time, I was under huge stress, nervous, and tension with my coursework, exam grade, etc., so I entered my CCID and password onto his iphone without detailed thinking, and I had let him to fill out the rest of the election information afterwards. But now, I wished I should NOT have voted him. I wish I had clicked back the link, but of course, given I had already elected him, there was no way for me to change back of NOT selecting him. Thank you very much for disqualifying him. I don't think Sleiman deserves to be in the election process either.*
- iii. *3. The date of the interaction was Wednesday, March 4th, 2015 at 2:00pm, in the Tory Building, when I bumped into him in the hallway. Again, I was under huge nervous, stress, and tension about my upcoming exams, GPA, and course work. Therefore, given his request, I did without thinking, entered my CCID and password onto his iphone without detailed thinking. I wish I would NOT have done this (i.e. NOT select Sleiman). After thinking in greater detail on that day, I wish I would have clicked back the link, but of course, that wasn't possible due to the nature of the system and the information technology. In other words, I wished I had NOT select him at all. Based on what I said above, I don't think Sleiman deserves to be in the voting process either, thank you very much for disqualifying him, since I believe this is what should've happened. That is, Sleiman has betrayed the trust of the Student's Union election, and he deserves to be disqualified... However, given what I said above, now you know it is due to my huge stress of my current workload and my nervousness about my upcoming exam, my exam grades, and coursework that I did something without thinking: (i.e., I entered my CCID and password onto Sleiman's iphone, and I had let him to fill out the rest of the election information for his own self-interest), to which I now believe is a huge violation of the personal use of information... To tell you the truth; not too long after I dumbly gave in to Sleiman on that day, I had hoped I can change it back (i.e. to NOT select Sleiman), but of course, it was already too late, and the system would not allow me to reverse the selection either. Therefore, by taking such issue so vigorously, like what we are doing now, all our words get heard during the hearing, and of course, given Sleiman had already been disqualified, my goal is accomplished as well. Thank you very much for taking the issue so vigorously, I am quite pleased."*
- d. Student #4:
 - i. *"I did vote with the help of Mr. Sleiman. He approached me on the 5th around noon in cab and I told him I would vote for him. He lent me his phone and I typed in my ccid and he took care of the rest. I did not press the buttons myself or see*

the ballot, I also did not log out. I'm not sure if anyone else was voted for on my behalf but it is possible. I did not intend to vote for anyone else."

e. Student #5:

- i. *"1. I did not personally/directly submit my vote. 2. Samer assisted me in voting. His phone was used to submit my ballot. 3. Samer approached me and my friend on Thursday around 1:30pm in CCIS. He asked if we had voted yet. I said no. He asked if we would like to and showed us his phone in which he had the page open. I said sure as I hadn't gotten around to it yet. I asked him what his platform was, what he will do for us. He talked about it briefly and I then logged in, using his phone, and started to complete the ballot. At this point I was going to vote for him for the VP operations and finance position as I liked many of the things he spoke about for his platform. As I was just putting in my vote for Navneet for president he took back his phone, saying "no no no.." I asked him "oh you don't have to fill it all out to submit it?" and he said no. I was okay with him voting for me BUT I specifically asked him to select these two individuals: Fahim (vp academic) and Samina (apirg). He agreed that he will do this for me. After this we said goodbye and me and my friend walked away. Later on I tried to log back on but it said that I had already submitted my vote. I assumed he voted for himself and the other two people I had asked him to vote for when I was signed in in his phone. I did not sign myself out from his phone."*

f. Student #6:

- i. *"I am happy to provide a statement regarding Samer Sleiman's actions on Wednesday, March 4th the day of the Student Union Elections. Simply put, I was sitting in cab awaiting the arrival of 3 friends of mine when Samer came up to me and asked me if I was going to be voting in the election. I was very sick and merely wanted to be left alone so I told him just that and asked if I would have to go anywhere to vote. His reply was that it could simply be done online, and volunteered his phone. After I punched in my CCID, I assumed that I would have to read the rest of it however Samer took back his phone and walked away. Having never voted in the Elections and having seen other candidates approach people around me I thought nothing of it. I was irritated that I was not allowed to see the rest of the ballot but put it out of my mind until I was informed by Jessica Nguyen that this was not allowed at all. In any case, if it helps at all, I can testify that I was in fact jilted out of being able to vote properly."*

g. Student #7:

- i. *"I did meet with Samer twice. The first time, I was alone (in Chem east) and he approached me and we discussed issues that the University could improve on and I felt he was a nice guy and that he heard my concerns. On the day of voting, I was walking in CCIS and he stopped me and asked if I had voted. I said no. He asked if I would vote now and I said I would later. He said, "Here just do it now" and passed me his iPhone. I really should have been more aggressive and said no but I logged on his iPhone with my CCID and password and then he selected his own name (or I possibly selected his name - I can't remember!) and asked if I wanted to log off or if he could log off for me. I felt skeptical but let him log off for me. I felt in this situation he was too aggressive and should have let me vote on my own time. However I didn't think that it was against the voting conduct for him*

to be aggressive. This all occurred on the last day of voting - I think March 5th. I have class at noon tomorrow. I could see you at 11:30 if you want but I'm not sure if this email is all the information that you need. Please let me know as I was upset but how I was treated by Samar."

h. Student #8:

i. *"I'm glad that Student Union has responded to such behaviour of candidate voting under other students' CCID without permission. Like you described in the email, I was "assisted" to vote for Samer Sleiman while I was not very conscious of what my CCID was used for. The situation was that I just finished my class and was walking outside the building, Samer Sleiman and an assistant of him walked right towards me and asked if they could use my CCID to do something for SU election(I was very exhausted and therefore not very aware of what he meant). So I answered "yes" since I thought it's nothing bad if I can make some contribution to the election and I logged in my account on his phone. He said he's grateful and promised he would log out after finishing using it. I started to realize that my CCID might have been utilized to vote for himself later on but it was too late to regret."*

i. Student #9:

i. *"Samer Sleiman did approach me on Thursday March 5 around 10:30 I think talking about his campaign. He asked me if I would be willing to take a minute to vote. I agreed to this and logged in to my account on his phone in order to vote he then proceeded to do everything else himself and I didn't see what he did. I have never voted for the elections before so I never thought anything of it. A little later I was approached by a volunteer of another candidate running for a different department and I agreed to vote but was unable to re-log in to do so."*

16. The Chief Returning Officer received an email from a student on March 10 regarding the same situation, but the email was not initiated by the Elections Office's audit, but rather in response to the now public allegations made against Mr. Sleiman. Personal information has been redacted to respect the student's wishes.

a. Student #10:

i. *"I am writing this email because I am also a victim in the Sleiman vote tampering case. I have been approached by one of the Sleiman's election team members (I have his name, but not sure if it is wise to mention it here) on 5th March, 2015 (Thursday) at 3: 15pm at HUB. The guy came to me and asked me if I could give him 8 seconds to listen about Sleiman's election vision. I said "sure". He then gave a brief summary about Sleiman's work and asked if I could vote for him. I said I need to read and consider other candidates' work before I made the decision. After that, he asked me if I know how to vote on phone. I said "no". Then, he asked me to go to the SU webpage and enter the CCID and password. When we are on the SU vote page, he suddenly clicked 3 buttons on my phone and then left. After he left, I saw what he clicked on my phone was the three candidates who proposed for VP (OpsFi). I saw he entered "Sammer Sleiman" in the first priority button and the other 2 candidates in the remaining buttons. I was totally shocked and felt offended. I should have sent this email earlier, it took me so much courage to stand up and talk about this again after 4 days. I hope this*

information will help the SU and DIE board to make a better judgement towards the case.”

- The student proceeded to inform the Chief Returning Officer of the name of the volunteer in question, but to protect the student's identity, it is within the student's wishes that it not be included in this testimony. The Chief Returning Officer is aware that the volunteer in question is a supporter of Mr. Sleiman's campaign and candidacy.

Ruling

1. As per Bylaw 2200 §26, all candidates and volunteers are responsible of being aware of and complying with elections-related rules. Samer Sleiman, candidate for Vice President Operations & Finance was present at the mandatory candidates' meeting on February 12 at 18:00. The Elections Regulations & Guidelines, as well as elections-related bylaws were discussed at this meeting.
2. As per Bylaw 2200 §48, the Chief Returning Officer has the authority to assign penalties given that an advantage was gained in the act contravening bylaw and that where the contravention was intentional, a penalty shall be assessed. The Chief Returning Officer believes that a contravention to bylaw was made, that the contravention was both advantageous and intentional, and thus, a penalty should be assessed.
3. As per Bylaw 2200 §49, the Chief Returning Officer shall be empowered to investigate and rule on any contravention to bylaw. The Chief Returning Officer has acted on this section in bylaw and as a result has found grounds to enforce Bylaw 2200 §49 (1), which involves disqualification under the grounds that a contravention “cannot be counter-balanced by a lesser penalty”, that “is malicious or substantially prejudicial to another candidate or slate”, or that “involves tampering with ballots, voting procedures, or counting procedures.” The Chief Returning Officer has grounds to believe that all of the above apply in this situation.
4. As per Bylaw 2400 §7, “Where a voter's intention is clear, that voter's ballot shall be counted.” With the new evidence, the Chief Returning Officer does not believe that the intention of the students that testified in the evidence provided in this ruling were reflected and as a result, the Chief Returning Officer believes that this is a tainted election. The Chief Returning Officer believes that in particular, this may affect the outcome of the Vice President Academic race, given the small margin of votes acquired to break the 50% threshold required to win an election in the second round of voting. All unofficial results are attached to this ruling.
5. As per Bylaw 2400 §12 (1c), the Chief Returning Officer will “notify the Speaker of Students' Council and the President of the Students' Union of the final results in writing”. The finalization of results should also be accompanied by the Chief Returning Officer's belief and understanding that the results are representative of the electorate's will. The new evidence prevents the Chief Returning Officer from sending final results to the Speaker of Students' Council and the President of the Students' Union. Pending DIE Board's approval, modification, or rejection of this method of moving forward, the Chief Returning Officer seeks DIE Board's recommendation and direction on finalizing potentially tampered election results as there are no governing bylaws directly related to this situation for the Chief Returning Officer to follow and enforce.

Penalty

1. Candidate Samer Sleiman will be disqualified from the race of Vice President Operations & Finance.

So decided: Thursday, March 12 @ 12:00. Time limit for appeal: Friday, March 13 @ 16:00.

Please direct any inquiries towards:

Jessica Nguyen
Chief Returning Officer
University of Alberta Students' Union
jessica.nguyen@su.ualberta.ca

For the purposes of this ruling, these are the unofficial results for the 2015 Students' Union Executive and Undergraduate Board of Governors election.

Processing votes for race: President

Candidates in this race: Navneet Khinda, Frank Daniels, Omnibot, None of the Above – President

Beginning round 1

There were 5970 votes cast this round.

Number of votes required to declare a winner this round: 2986

Navneet Khinda received: 3735 first place votes. 63%

Frank Daniels received: 545 first place votes. 9%

Omnibot received: 1118 first place votes. 19%

None of the Above - President received: 572 first place votes. 10%

The winner is Navneet Khinda

Processing votes for race: VP Academic

Candidates in this race: Shakiba Azimi, Fahim Rahman, None of the Above - VPA

Beginning round 1

There were 6104 votes cast this round.

Number of votes required to declare a winner this round: 3053

Shakiba Azimi received: 2668 first place votes. 44%

Fahim Rahman received: 2595 first place votes. 43%

None of the Above - VPA received: 841 first place votes. 14%

No winner found.

None of the Above - VPA will be eliminated.

Beginning round 2

There were 5600 votes cast this round.

Number of votes required to declare a winner this round: 2801

Shakiba Azimi received: 2836 first place votes. 51%

Fahim Rahman received: 2764 first place votes. 49%

The winner is Shakiba Azimi

Processing votes for race: VP Student Life

Candidates in this race: Vivian Kwan, Param Singh, None of the Above – VPSL

Beginning round 1

There were 5867 votes cast this round.

Number of votes required to declare a winner this round: 2934

Vivian Kwan received: 3508 first place votes. 60%

Param Singh received: 1301 first place votes. 22%

None of the Above - VPSL received: 1058 first place votes. 18%

The winner is Vivian Kwan

Processing votes for race: VP External

Candidates in this race: Blue Knox, Dylan Hanwell, None of the Above – VPE

Beginning round 1

There were 5992 votes cast this round.

Number of votes required to declare a winner this round: 2997

Blue Knox received: 2534 first place votes. 42%

Dylan Hanwell received: 2898 first place votes. 48%

None of the Above - VPE received: 560 first place votes. 9%

No winner found.

None of the Above - VPE will be eliminated.

Beginning round 2

There were 5672 votes cast this round.

Number of votes required to declare a winner this round: 2837

Blue Knox received: 2649 first place votes. 47%

Dylan Hanwell received: 3023 first place votes. 53%

The winner is Dylan Hanwell

Processing votes for race: Board of Governors Representative

Candidates in this race: Azhar Khan, None of the Above - BOG

Beginning round 1

There were 5875 votes cast this round.

Number of votes required to declare a winner this round: 2938

Azhar Khan received: 4226 first place votes. 72%

None of the Above - BOG received: 1649 first place votes. 28%

The winner is Azhar Khan

Processing votes for referendum: The Landing Referendum Question

Total ballots: 6557

Spoiled or Unmarked ballots: 708 11%

Yes votes: 3871 59%

No votes: 1978 30%

Processing votes for referendum: Cold Beverage Agreement Plebiscite Question

Total ballots: 6557

Spoiled or Unmarked ballots: 537 8%

Yes votes: 4358 66%

No votes: 1662 25%