

FARAH MOURAD V. CHIEF ELECTORAL OFFICER (CEO)

FILED: 2025/01/21

HEARD: 2025/01/23

APPELLANT: F. Mourad

RESPONDENT: Chief Electoral Officer

PANEL: Elections Committee

B. Miron (Interim Chair)	Indigenous Students' Association	Present
T. Museundire	Social Sciences	Present
G. Chao	Telfer	Present
A. Hyppolite	Communications Commissioner	Present
A. Geneau	Social Sciences	Not Present

Decision written by B. Miron and unanimously concurred in by the committee.

A. Introduction

1. The appellant, F. Mourad, is a prospective candidate for the Board of Directors for the University of Ottawa Students' Union (UOSU) 2025 General Elections. F. Mourad currently sits on the Board of Directors for the University of Ottawa Students' Union as a Health Sciences Director.
2. On January 19th, 2025, F. Mourad submitted the paperwork to nominate themselves as a candidate in the 2025 UOSU General Elections. Upon review of F. Mourad's nomination form, the CEO declined F. Mourad's nomination due to failure to fill out the identifying information section of the form. Following this decision, F. Mourad appealed this decision to the Elections Committee.

B. Analysis

3. F. Mourad's initial communication to the Elections Committee detailed their reasoning for having failed to fill out the identifying information section of the nomination form. They expressed their willingness to immediately rectify the

situation should they be granted candidacy. They also noted in their written statement that they understood the regulations set out by the Elections Code.

4. The CEO provided their written statement. In this statement, the CEO expresses their reasoning for disqualifying F. Mourad, as they did not complete their nomination form. The CEO brought up sections 5.2.2 and 5.2.3 of the UOSU Elections Code as the reasoning for their decision. They state that F. Mourad's failure to complete their form contravenes the Elections Code. The CEO then stated that they understood that this may have been a mistake, but that the fact remains incidental.
5. The Elections Committee then reviewed both the UOSU Constitution and POL-GEN-04 and reviewed the case in tandem with the written statements provided by F. Mourad and the CEO. The Committee would specifically like to point out two sections. In POL-GEN-04, section 5.2.2 states:

“To be considered for official candidacy, the CEO must receive the following nomination package during the nomination period in the manner and form as prescribed by the CEO from time to time:

- I. a declaration form signed by the prospective candidate providing their identifying information as determined by the CEO and confirming that they are eligible to be a candidate and will abide by this Code and the Constitution of the UOSU;”

Furthermore, POL-GEN-04 section 5.2.3 states:

“If the nomination package is complete, legitimate, and accurate, the CEO shall approve the prospective candidate as an official candidate.”

6. Upon reviewing all relevant documents and information presented to the Committee, as well as reviewing the appeal with the sections of POL-GEN-04 above, the Committee ultimately decided to uphold the decision of the CEO.
7. The Committee agrees that F. Mourad's nomination form was incomplete and, to uphold a fair and just Elections, decided that this violated the Elections Code.
8. The CEO determined that F. Mourad did not meet the requirements to become an official candidate in the 2025 UOSU General Elections based on an incomplete nomination form. The Committee agrees with this decision.

C. Conclusion

10. For the reasons described above, the Committee determines that the original decision was reasonable and rules to uphold the decision of the Chief Electoral Officer to disqualify F. Mourad as a candidate for the 2025 UOSU General Elections.
11. Decisions of the Elections Committee are appealable to the Appeals Committee pursuant to s. 7.5.5 of the Elections Code. Pursuant to s. 7.5.6, appeals must be made in writing to the Ombudsperson.
12. Pursuant to s. 7.5 of the Elections Code, this appeal shall be public, and the appellant forfeits their right to anonymity (s.7.5.3). Relevant documentation, with consent of the appellant, shall be made public.

Appeal Denied