

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

CRO Decision in the matter of Mohamed Sabeq and Muhammad Faizan

Friday, February 20, 2026

### **Summary of alleged or discerned breach**

- The complainant alleges that the respondent submitted fraudulent and retroactively fabricated evidence in active election complaint proceedings by providing video evidence showing SUB approval stamps on campaign posters that the complainant claims were not present during the voting period (February 17-19, 2026). The complainant possesses timestamped video evidence allegedly showing the respondent's posters without approval stamps during the voting period and argues that the stamp expiry date (February 26, 2026) indicates it was obtained after voting concluded. The complainant alleges this constitutes material misrepresentation and violates GSA Bylaw and Policy sections I.BYL.1.1, I.POL.6.1, I.POL.10.3, and I.POL.11.3.b.

### **Parties to the complaint or breach**

- Complainant: Muhammad Faizan
- Respondent: Mohamed Sabeq

### **Summary of decision-making process**

- As per I.POL.11.4.a, the CRO reached out to the respondent for a response.
  - The respondent categorically denied all allegations, stating that the complainant's video evidence is of insufficient quality to establish the absence of stamps. The frame-by-frame analysis of the complainant's own video shows faint markings on the back of posters consistent with stamp ink bleed-through. The stamp expiry date logic is flawed as Student Life Central (SLC) sets expiry dates based on their standard practices, not application dates. He further stated that the verification with SLC would confirm the stamp was obtained during the campaign period.
  - The respondent further argued that this complaint represents a pattern of serial vexatious complaints, noting that it was filed mere hours after the respondent withdrew his own complaints at the CRO's request in good faith on February 19, 2026.
  - Allegations of fraud, fabrication, and material misrepresentation are extraordinarily serious and require clear and convincing evidence. Ambiguous video footage that does not definitively establish the alleged facts is insufficient to meet this evidentiary standard.
- The CRO provided ERC with both the complaint and response.
  - The 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).

**Decided upon penalties and/or remedial actions**

- Upon consideration of all the evidence and arguments provided by both parties, and in light of the interpretation of the GSA Bylaw and Policy, the complaint is dismissed as unfounded pursuant to 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.