**PENGASSAN BRANCH CONFLICTS / NTL & NSL / PART 4 OF 6**

# FOUR ELECTED OFFICERS. ONE CLOSED GATE.

**What happens to representation when elected officers arrive at their own conference and cannot get in?**

On 21 July 2026, four members of the NTL/NSL Branch Executive Council arrived at the PENGASSAN Head Office Annex in Jahi, Abuja, expecting to participate in the Branch Delegates' Conference.

They were Comrade Abdulbasit Abubakar, Branch Secretary; Comrade Ahmad Usman, Industrial Relations Officer; Comrade Bashar Isah, Public Relations Officer; and Comrade Bisola Arinde, Auditor.

Their petition describes a locked entrance gate and security personnel refusing them access.

They said they identified themselves as elected BEC members and requested admission. They maintained that no written explanation or communicated constitutional justification was provided for keeping them outside.

**They had arrived with elected responsibilities. They said they were denied the opportunity to carry them out.**

The four maintained that none of them had been suspended, removed, sanctioned or formally deprived of the rights attached to their offices. No written disciplinary decision or directive restricting their participation had been communicated to them or to the branch, they said.

For a member following this account, the question is immediate: if an elected officer can be prevented from participating, what process protects that officer's rights - and the members represented by that office?

Being excluded from a conference means losing the opportunity to speak, vote, raise objections, observe proceedings and perform representative duties. The consequences extend beyond the person standing at the entrance.

**Members elect representatives so that their voices can reach the room where decisions are made.**

According to the petitioners, the conference proceeded without them.

Who instructed security to deny entry? What authority supported that instruction? Were the officers told of an accreditation requirement they had failed to meet? Was there a written decision they could challenge?

These questions require answers from those who organised the conference and controlled access. The supplied material does not include their explanation.

The absence of that explanation makes independent examination necessary. An instruction affecting participation should be traceable to a person, a rule and a process that can be scrutinised.

The four officers had previously supported a Congress election. They believed their exclusion formed part of a pattern of targeted treatment. That asserted connection must be tested against evidence; the seriousness of the complaint makes scrutiny essential.

**A union established to defend workers' voices must be able to explain how it protects those voices within its own meetings.**

Then came another allegation. While the four remained outside, another BEC officer was admitted.

If their executive status was the same, what explained the different treatment?

Save the Union proposes fair-hearing safeguards: notice of a complaint, an opportunity to respond, reasoned decisions and a credible appeal route. Participation should depend on clear, consistently applied rules.

Read what we propose. If you support a union where representation and fair treatment are protected, express your interest. Share the account and ask for answers to the decisions described here.

**TO BE CONTINUED / PART 5: One Officer Admitted. Four Kept Outside. Why?**

**Explore the proposed alternative | Express Your Interest**

**SAVE THE UNION**
**Our Dues. Our Say. Our Vote!**