PENGASSAN BRANCH CONFLICTS / NTL & NSL / PART 5 OF 6

ONE OFFICER ADMITTED. FOUR KEPT OUTSIDE. WHY?

Equal executive status should invite a clear explanation when access is different.

Four elected BEC officers said they were denied entry to the NTL/NSL Branch Delegates' Conference. In the same petition, they said Financial Secretary Bwaltam Musa was admitted while they remained outside.

That reported difference is central to their complaint.

If entry was restricted for a general reason, how was that reason applied? Did the admitted officer meet an accreditation requirement the four had not met? Was there a specific instruction concerning the petitioners?

What was the rule, and was it applied equally?

The supplied account does not contain the organisers' answers. Those answers, together with the accreditation and admission records, are needed to establish what happened and why.

The four officers connected the incident to their earlier support for a Congress election. They said they had first been excluded from preparations and then denied entry to the conference itself.

That is their allegation of targeted treatment. Its significance should be understood without assuming that the sequence alone proves motive.

If the allegation is established, the implications reach every member who may one day disagree with a decision. Members need confidence that expressing a different view will not cost them equal access to union processes.

Their constitutional argument relied principally on Section 8.3.3 of the PENGASSAN Constitution, which they quoted as including all BEC members in the Branch Delegates' Conference.

On their interpretation, participation was attached to their elected offices. It was an entitlement governed by the Constitution.

They also maintained that no suspension, hearing or written restriction had preceded the denial of entry. Their petition invoked Rule 34.5 and Schedule 2 in support of their fair-hearing argument.

The full provisions and their application require examination before a definitive constitutional conclusion can be reached. The officers' challenge nevertheless raises an

urgent practical concern: what protected their participation before the conference proceeded?

A right that cannot be exercised when it matters needs an effective remedy.

The petitioners argued that excluding qualified BEC officers compromised the conference's composition and its outcomes, including accreditation, nominations and voting.

An independent investigation should examine the delegate list, accreditation records, admission instructions and accounts from everyone involved. It should explain whether there was a legitimate, consistently applied basis for the difference in treatment.

An election's credibility depends on the fairness of the process that produces it. Members deserve to know whether all qualified participants had an equal opportunity to take part.

On 3 August 2026, the four officers formally asked the national leadership to investigate.

Save the Union proposes equal treatment, accessible rules and an impartial route for resolving complaints. Assess those safeguards. If they reflect the union you want, express your interest and encourage a comrade to consider them.

The question is bigger than four officers: what standard should protect every member?

TO BE CONTINUED / PART 6: The Petition: A Demand for Answers.

Explore the proposed alternative | Express Your Interest

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