

2026 General Election and Election of the Associate Vice-President Labour

CRO Decision in the matter of Muhammad Faizan and Mohamed Sabeq

Friday, February 20, 2026

Summary of alleged or discerned breach

- The complainant alleges that the respondent breached GSA Election Bylaw and Policy by posting campaign materials in the AgFor without obtaining the required approval from the building authority (ECSA). The complainant alleges this constitutes a violation of GSA Elections Policy I.POL.6.1, I.POL.6.3 and non-compliance with ECSA posting policy requiring approval stamps for all posters displayed on AgFor bulletin boards. The complainant submitted video evidence showing campaign posters for the respondent displayed on bulletin boards in the AgFor Centre. The complainant alleges these posters lacked ECSA approval stamps, while the complainant's own posters at the same location displayed proper ECSA approval, demonstrating that the approval process was accessible and operational during the election period.

Parties to the complaint or breach

- Complainant: Mohamed Sabeq
- Respondent: Muhammad Faizan

Summary of decision-making process

- As per I.POL.11.4.a, the CRO reached out to the respondent for a response.
 - The respondent provided a detailed written response addressing the allegations regarding the AgFor Centre posters. The respondent states that the video evidence submitted by the complainant is discontinuous and edited, cutting between different locations within the AgFor building without clear disclosure. The respondent argues this renders the evidence unreliable for establishing that the ECSA approval notice applies to the specific bulletin board where the respondent's poster was displayed. The respondent states that the ECSA approval requirement notice was posted on a different bulletin board than the one on which his campaign poster was posted, and that the bulletin board where his poster appeared did not display any ECSA approval requirement notice at the time of posting.
 - The respondent argues that even if approval were required, the ECSA's own notice specifies only removal of unapproved posters as the consequence ("*Posters that are not approved by the ECSA prior to posting will be removed*"), not formal election sanctions or complaints.
 - The respondent asserts that this complaint was filed in bad faith as a strategic, retaliatory response to his earlier complaint about the complainant's posters lacking visible approval stamps, and that it was submitted during the final hours of voting.
- The CRO provided ERC with both the complaint and response.
 - CRO based on consultation with ERC members decided to dismiss the complaint.

Applicable GSA Bylaw and Policy and interpretations, other applicable policies/laws

- I.POL.11.3.d The CRO, DRO or Acting DRO can dismiss a complaint if it is unfounded, frivolous, or vexatious.
- I.POL.6.1 “The fundamental principle underlying GSA elections is that they are to be fair, respect the wishes of voters, and conducted in a manner that reflects the excellent, positive reputation of the GSA” (GSA Bylaw and Policy, Section I.BYL.1.1).
In this case, after review of the complaint, the respondent’s response, and the supporting evidence, it was determined that the complaint was unfounded and therefore subject to dismissal under I.POL.11.3.d.

Decided upon penalties and/or remedial actions

- This complaint is dismissed under the GSA Bylaw and Policy section I.POL.11.3.d.

Appeal process and time limit

- The appeal process is outlined in GSA Bylaw and Policy section I.POL.11.6.