



## **Decision of the Chief Electoral Officer**

UOSU Elections Office

**Rendered:** 2026-03-04

**Reference :** 2026 BEO 01

**Respondent:** Elnaz Enayatpour



## **A. BACKGROUND**

1. A complaint was received regarding the respondent's reply to a Reddit post about Daniel Thorp, a candidate for president, obtaining a student list and emailing students.
2. The impugned post, included in Annex A, includes an introduction of the candidate and addresses the original post in the thread, stating that she "was so upset to hear that [her] opponent [...] even wanted to open a lawsuit", among other things.
3. It is alleged that this post violated section 7.1.10 of the Elections Code, which prohibits the publication of information "that is demonstrably false or maliciously misleading".

## **B. SUBMISSIONS**

4. The complainant argued that Daniel Thorp never filed a lawsuit to obtain a student list and that "a statement about a person's intent requires an evidentiary basis."
5. Further, they argued that that he never sought "sensitive information," mentioning that this term is established in Canadian privacy law and that names and emails are not sensitive information under that definition. To imply that Daniel Thorp accessed sensitive information, then, would violate section 7.1.10.
6. Lastly, they argued that asserting an opinion based on a false premise is misleading. In this case, this refers to the respondent saying that a lawsuit would be a "ridiculous waste of student fees"
7. The respondent, in an interview, raised the point that she is on leave during the election and that she is not aware of what is going on with the UOSU. She said



that her comments were based on what she saw in the Reddit post and that it she was upset to hear the information.

### **C. INVESTIGATION**

8. Daniel Thorp confirmed that he did not seek to sue the UOSU and that the only information he has access to is students' preferred names and student emails.
9. The Elections Office accepts this as true.

### **D. ANALYSIS**

10. This ruling presents an essential question for democratic institutions: what are candidates permitted and not permitted to say? In considering this question, the Elections Office must pay particular attention to the balance of the objectives of the *Elections Code* and the rights of candidates to express themselves to the electorate.
11. The Elections Office is not interested in policing speech and, particularly, speech about candidates' conduct, platform, or policies. We ensure that conduct remains within the bounds of the *Code*.

#### **Lawsuit**

12. The respondent posted that "I am so upset to hear that my opponent believed this [the student list] was an appropriate thing to request and even wanted to open a lawsuit".
13. While this may seem to support the complainant's argument, it is important to consider the context around this statement. The original post stated: "Daniel Thorp opened legal action against the student union to get access to the student list".
14. The respondent's statement should be understood in this context as an expression of concern. It is not that the respondent is claiming that Daniel



Thorp wanted to sue, but that she is “upset to hear” that he wanted to. The impugned reply is a response to the original post, not an assertion of whether Daniel Thorp wanted to sue. Therefore, it did not violate the *Code*.

### **Student List**

15. The respondent wrote her post: “We [UOSU] maintain confidentiality agreements on our student lists, especially because they can contain sensitive information.”
16. This comment is factual. It does exist within the context of a post that refers to obtaining the limited student list, but this comment is about the student list in general, and uOttawa does consider the information in the complete list to be sensitive. And while it may imply something that the complaint does not like, it is nonetheless within the bounds of the *Code*.

### **Misuse of Student Fees**

17. The quote from above continues: “I am upset to hear that my opponent believes this was an appropriate thing to request and even wanted to open a lawsuit which is a ridiculous use of our student fees.” (emphasis added)
18. The end of this statement is an opinion. It is a political judgement about the use of student fees—a conversation that is consistently relevant in elections.
19. The complainant argued to the Elections Office that this is misleading because it is based on a lawsuit that did not happen. Even if a lawsuit did not happen, candidates are allowed to state their opinions on lawsuits—and there is no assertion in the comment that there was lawsuit, as mentioned previously.
20. Candidates are more than welcome to disagree with or criticize the respondent’s opinion, but, as it stays within the bounds of the *Code*, the Elections Office will not play a role in censoring it.



**E. JUDGEMENT**

21. For the above reasons, the Elections Office finds that the respondent did not violate section 7.1.10 of the *Elections Code*.



## Annex A



**Known-Ear-9815** · 4d ago

Hi folks! My name is Elnaz Enayatpour and I'm running for President against Daniel Thorp. You can check out my campaign and message me to chat about my platform and elections on Instagram, @elnaz.seuo.uosu

I've also been the Operations Commissioner of the UOSU for the past year, where part of my job is the management and protection of student lists. We maintain confidentiality agreements on our student lists, especially because they can contain sensitive information. I am so upset to hear that my opponent believed this was an appropriate thing to request and even wanted to open a lawsuit which is a ridiculous use of our student fees.

If you are looking for a candidate who knows UOSU and it's rules, wants to improve it for students and maintain excellent services and programs with lower costs, and advocate against the likely tuition hikes we're going to see next year, I invite you to check out my campaign and get in touch.

Thanks!

 77   Reply  Award  Share ...