

Ombudsperson's Note – Complaint Submitted April 4/2005

To: KSA Ombudsperson

April 1, 2005

Submitted by: R.A.F. Party

Appeal of communication 14 with communication 46 used as example. Communication numbers refer to the numbering used on the online postings at yourksa.ca and also the e-mails sent out by the CRO, which are attached to this appeal.

Communication 46

Summary:

An allegation that Rigel Vincent and Tristan Thompson of the Progressive Party used unapproved campaign materials – a bagpipe – on the Langley campus between 1 and 2PM on 23 February. A further allegation that this would be using national origin in the campaign, contrary to regulation section X 5 4 (v) which has a specified penalty of disqualification. **Signed by Raju Dhami, Kiran Cheema, Sabrina Dhami, and Joey Atwal – 46**

CRO DECISION: The Progressive Party, of which Rigel Vincent and Tristan Thompson are members, admits in its submission to the use of the bagpipe. As such, **the complaint is sustained relating to the use of music in the campaign**

As per the ruling in communication 14 alleging a “minor” offence against RAF but with no material effect, it is absurd to think that the use of bagpipes concurs with the alleged RAF infraction. Bagpipes are extremely loud and attract a lot of attention. If this were not the case, the RAF would never have submitted a complaint about it to begin with. It is because there was a large material effect relating to the use of bagpipes that the RAF Party feels that even a “minor” warning for something that didn't even happen be given the same reply as the use of bagpipes that were loud and attention seeking, not to mention that their use was never approved. Below is the complaint sustained against RAF:

Communication 14

Summary:

An allegation that R.A.F. Party supporters were wearing R.A.F. Party T-shirts one metre inside of the Surrey KSA Office while asking about the availability of fitness centre passes. The people in question left when asked. **Signed by Ken McIntyre, Matt Vu, and Philip Sun – 14**

CRO DECISION: The **complaint is sustained against the R.A.F. Party slate**

We request that this alleged minor violation be struck down because of the complete lack of evidence. The complaint is based on complete heresy and with no record of any formal investigation by the CRO to actually look into the matter. No factual evidence,

Ombudsperson's Note – Complaint Submitted April 4/2005

whereas the Porgressive Party members using bagpipes at Langley campus admitted to not having the material approved. It is absurd that both of these scenarios received the exact same penalty, they were both characterized as “minor”. The RAF believes that this minor violation is part of a systematic scheme of bias on the part of the CRO.

After reading over the rulings by the CRO it is easy to see his bias in favor of the Progressive Party. This particular complaint, however, is only different because it received a minor warning, something that is based completely on “he said, she said”. This type of behavior is not acceptable. We ask the ombudsperson to investigate complaint 14 (especially in relation of complaint 46) and to see if any evidence is present at all. We hope that you will see that there is no evidence whatsoever and that this minor penalty against RAF be reprimanded. RAF Campaign manager Aaron Takhar my be contact via e-mail at rafparty@hotmail.com or by telephone at 604-537-1503

Thank You,

Sincerely,

RAF PARTY