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

THE PETITION: A DEMAND FOR ANSWERS.

Four elected officers took their complaint to the national leadership. Members deserve a documented resolution.

On 3 August 2026, Abdulbasit Abubakar, Ahmad Usman, Bashar Isah and Bisola Arinde submitted a petition to PENGASSAN's Central Working Committee through the General Secretary, according to the supplied account.

They described their exclusion from the 21 July NTL/NSL Branch Delegates' Conference as unconstitutional, discriminatory and arbitrary.

They sought substantive action: suspension of the implementation or ratification of conference decisions, preservation of evidence, an independent investigative panel and an opportunity to present oral and documentary evidence.

They asked for a determination of their constitutional complaint. If deliberate exclusion was established, they sought nullification of the conference and its outcomes, or reconvening under direct National Secretariat supervision with access for all duly elected BEC members.

They also requested a written response within seven days.

Their complaint placed decisions, instructions and constitutional rights before the national leadership for examination.

The material supplied for this series does not establish what response or subsequent action followed. It cannot establish that the petition was ignored or that the conference has been nullified. Those outcomes must be established through records.

What it does establish is the need to follow the questions through to a documented resolution.

Who had authority to choose the electoral method? What rules governed delegate selection? Were candidates and members given the information necessary to participate fairly?

Who authorised the alleged exclusion of the four officers? Why was another BEC officer reportedly admitted? Was the conference constituted in accordance with the applicable rules?

These are questions about how power is exercised over members' participation. They deserve answers members can understand and examine.

The petitioners should be heard. The Branch Chairperson, Comrade Amaoge Chukwudi, together with the organisers, security personnel and others involved should also have a fair opportunity to respond. An independent examination should establish the facts, explain the rules and recommend corrective action where necessary.

Across this conflict, the warning is clear: uncertainty over electoral authority, missing information and disputed access can destroy confidence in a process intended to represent members.

A union's credibility is tested in its treatment of the member who asks a difficult question, the officer who disagrees and the complainant seeking a fair remedy.

Members should not have to choose between belonging to a union and having a meaningful voice within it.

What would a better standard look like?

Save the Union proposes member voting, transparent accounts, practical welfare priorities, fair hearings and accountable leadership. These proposals should be assessed against real experiences such as the NTL/NSL conflict.

Will members know the rules before an election? Can they inspect how decisions are made? Can they challenge unfair treatment? Can leadership be held accountable?

Those are the tests we invite you to apply to the alternative we are building. A new name must be supported by better arrangements, clear safeguards and members willing to insist that those standards are upheld.

Read the proposals. Ask your questions. If you support this direction, express your interest.

Follow the WhatsApp Channel for further developments. Share this series with a comrade and invite them to examine both the conflict and the proposed alternative. Help others make an informed choice about the representation they want.

The series ends here. The questions still require answers. The choice of what members should expect comes next.

Explore the proposed alternative | Express Your Interest

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