



Oxford University Pakistan Society

NUPSA ELECTORAL IRREGULARITIES AND FINANCIAL MISMANAGEMENT

13/04/2011

Frequently Asked Questions (FAQS)

Table of Contents

Section 1: Introduction (*Page 3*)

Section 2: Document Briefing (*Page 4*)

Section 3: Constitutional Amendments Procedure and Quorum (*Page 5-7*)

Section 4: Frequently Asked Questions on GC Meeting and Quorum (*Page 8*)

Section 5: Frequently Asked Questions on Amendments (*Page 9-15*)

Section 6: Frequently Asked Questions on OUPakSoc Allegations (*Page 16-20*)

Section 1: Introduction

It is with deepest regret that we have been forced to release another document to clarify further baseless allegations NUPSA has levelled upon our society. NUPSA had invited us to participate in the constitutional amendments process but pre-empting the sham of democracy and constitutional reform that we knew that NUPSA was going to instigate, we refrained from participating in the process. As expected, NUPSA has introduced constitutional amendments and electoral reforms which are a further attempt to strengthen the hold of the establishment in NUPSA's running and handpick its future representatives. Moreover, the voting powers of the General Council members have been severely curtailed while skewing the votes heavily in favour of the sitting NUPSA Executive. This again is a further attempt to not only maintain the current undemocratic and nepotism-based status quo but also to perpetuate it by giving it the veneer of constitutional legality.

As usual, NUPSA has come up with fluff-based and mumbo jumbo responses to the financial corruption within its ranks. In this case, we will now refrain from getting into a further back-and-forth argument and ask the public to judge the evidence presented by us earlier on its own merit. We ask you to look closely at the constitutional amendments and electoral 'reform' introduced by NUPSA and the attempts to further close the election procedure in favour of the current establishment's hand-picked maidens and men. With glaring loopholes in, among other things, the voting system and a whole new set of status quo-oriented constitutional reforms, NUPSA is well on its way to becoming a student-based 'King's Party'.

The question this begs of us is that is this the best that we Pakistani students in the UK can come up with? Is this the sham of 'democracy' that these self-styled student leaders going to run once they go back to Pakistan? And most importantly, are we (including us) going to sit quietly and let these self-styled guardians of student awakening and revolution get away with such blatant attempts at holding on to power and hoodwinking the public in the name of democracy and transparency?

As is the case in each and every corner of the world and at each juncture of history, **the onus to act rests upon you.**

Section 2: Document Briefing

Constitutional Amendments Procedure and Quorum

This section explains the severe procedural irregularities and the sham drama that the NUPSA Executive has staged to bring in “amendments” and “reform.” Clear and concise evidence is provided confirming that the quorum was again not met for the amendments meeting.

Frequently Asked Questions on GC Meeting and Quorum

Instead of continuing the endless procedure of writing explanations to mumbo jumbo statements made by NUPSA, we have decided to introduce a Frequently Asked Questions section which will clarify all your concerns and also to a certain degree pre-empt the gibberish responses or arguments raised by NUPSA in response to our evidence.

Frequently Asked Questions on Constitutional Amendments

This section raises some very serious and valid concerns about the amendments that were actually passed during the sham NUPSA Amendments GC Meeting. We suggest you carefully go through these and try to understand the gravity of the seriousness of the issues being raised here. The answers have been written by former and current OUPAKSOC Officers who have experience of internal NUPSA workings.

Frequently Asked Questions on OUPAKSOC Allegations

We have been asked several questions regarding the whole NUPSA financial embezzlement scandal as well as our role in revealing those documents. We have answered all of the relevant questions regarding this issue as well as pre-empted several questions which would arise after the NUPSA Response. We do wish to stress that our “Evidence against NUPSA” document is still fully valid and self-sustainable and this FAQ section simply serves as a further guide into understanding the subtle issues raised in the evidence document.

Section 3: Constitutional Amendments Procedure and Quorum

In light of the NUPSA response, we believe it is imperative upon us to reveal to the public exactly what kind of sham NUPSA orchestrated with their constitutional amendments procedure.

Failure to meet General Council Quorum:

NUPSA has once again failed to meet the proper procedure and quorum for holding a General Council Meeting/AGM to proceed with the constitutional amendments. NUPSA has also failed to declare publically the numbers or the strength of their General Council. First we wish to show the public exactly where the contradictions lie before explaining the irregularities in detail:

NUPSA "General Council strength" and "quorum" for the amendments AGM:

NUPSA Constitutional amendments 2011 Results			
Total votes		31	
Votes discarded		1	
Efective votes		30	
Quorum		16	

The 23 Pakistan Societies which are affiliated with NUPSA:

Universities that have Pakistan Society Affiliation to Nupsa:

- Imperial College Pakistan Society
- University College London (UCL) Pakistan Society
- King's College Pakistan Society
- Nottingham University Pakistan Society
- Leicester University Pakistan Society
- St George's Pakistan Society (University of London)
- Birmingham University Pakistan Society
- Sheffield University Pakistan Society
- Aston University Pakistan Society
- London South Bank University Pakistan Society
- Middlesex University Pakistan Society
- Brunel University
- Northumbria University Pakistan Society
- Keele University Pakistan Society
- Cardiff University Pakistan Society
- Manchester Metropolitan University Pakistan Society
- SOAS Pakistan Student Society
- Kingston University Pakistan Society
- University of Arts London Pakistan Society
- Pakistan Student Association Surrey University
- Southampton University Pakistan Society
- London School of Economics Pakistan Society
- Warwick University Pakistan Society

Excerpts taken from NUPSA's Constitution:

Section 2.01 (i) The Council will comprise of 2 Members each from the Committee of 'affiliated Pakistani Students' Society and representative bodies of Pakistanis in companies and (institutions (hereinafter referred to as "Affiliates"). Such members of the Union will be called 'Officers of the Union', (hereinafter referred to as "Officers").

The council may include a maximum of 3 representative external alumni. External alumni may be referred to alumni who are not part of their Pakistan Society or do not have a such a body or whose Pakistan Society is not an Affiliate.

The council may include a maximum of 3 representative external alumni. External alumni may be referred to alumni who are not part of their Pakistan Society or do not have a such a body or whose Pakistan Society is not an Affiliate.

1) Quorum for a Council Meeting will be 52% of the strength of the Council being in attendance.

Section 5.01 Each Executive will have one vote in the Council with the same e voting rights as all other members of the Council.

Skewing of Electoral and Amendment procedure:

Appendix 1

Societies that were invited to participate:

- LSE Pak Soc
- UCL Pak Soc
- Warwick Pak Soc
- Cardiff Pak Soc
- KCL Pak Soc
- Imperial Pak Soc
- Keele Pak Soc
- Kingston Pak Soc
- Sheffield Pak Soc
- Middlesex Pak Soc
- Manchester Metropolitan Pak Soc
- Southampton Pak Soc
- Brunel Pak Soc
- UAL Pak Soc
- Reading Pak Soc
- Northumbria University Pak Soc
- Nottingham Pak Soc
- SOAS Pak Soc
- Surrey Pak Soc
- SGUL Pak Soc
- NUPSA Executive (x7)
- NUPSA Pakistan (x3)

Skewing of elections due to bias of 10 votes

Nupsa Constitutional Amendments Officer

No provision in NUPSA Constitution which allows NUPSA Pak to vote in NUPSA UK AGM

It is clear that the NUPSA Executive has clearly hidden the real strength of their General Council in order to quickly proceed with this sham “amendments” drama to proceed with a under the table transfer of power procedure to the new committee. It can be clearly observed below that the proper quorum for these amendments was **NOT** met. Furthermore, there is no doubt that a similar sham will be orchestrated by NUPSA to stage elections for the new executive.

Irregularities in General Council count and quorum:

NUPSA Exec’s claim of General Council strength: 30

NUPSA Exec’s claim of minimum quorum requirement: 52% of 30 = 16

Votes casted: 20

Accurate version of General Council strength: (23 PakSocs x 2) + (7 from NUPSA UK) + (3 from NUPSA Pak) + (3 external alumni) + (3 external students) = 62

Minimum quorum requirement: 52 % of 62 = **32**

Votes cast: 20 (***Quorum not met***)

Section 4: Frequently Asked Questions on GC Meeting and Quorum

Q: Doesn't each affiliate society only have one vote in the General Council?

A: That is incorrect. Each affiliate society has two votes in the General Council as clearly stated in Section 2.01 b(i) of the NUPSA Constitution. The clause is very clear and concise and has not been left open for interpretation.

Q: But what if a society hasn't nominated an official NUPSA representative?

A: As clearly mentioned in the NUPSA Constitution, the strength of the General Council is based upon 2 members from each affiliate society. The number strength or quorum requirement for the General Council cannot be reduced on the basis that a society has not nominated a NUPSA representative. It is the responsibility of the NUPSA Executive to ensure they are aware of the names of both General Council members from a certain affiliate society.

Q: Who are the three external alumni and the three external students who are part of the NUPSA General Council?

A: The NUPSA Executive has quite conveniently refused to publically declare the names of all its General Council Members. Furthermore, there is no proper procedure in the NUPSA Constitution for appointment of these 6 individuals who can currently be hand-picked by the current NUPSA Executive.

Q: Why are NUPSA Pakistan members being allowed to vote for amendments in the NUPSA UK Constitution?

A: The NUPSA UK Executive may be in a better position to answer this. Our best guess is that they wish to skew the elections further in the favour of the current power holders. Given the 7 votes from the NUPSA UK Exec, the 3 votes from the NUPSA Pak Exec, the 6 votes from the hand-picked external council members, it would be almost impossible for any other party (other than those approved by the current power holders) to defeat the **16 votes** the current power holders have. Furthermore, there was no provision in the NUPSA UK Constitution which allowed NUPSA Pakistan executives to act as General Council members in NUPSA UK and have voting rights.

Q: But wasn't the NUPSA UK Exec supposed to be dissolved before the elections and amendments? Why did they vote then?

A: Refer to the previous answer.

Q: Why are paid NUPSA members not allowed to vote in the amendments or the upcoming executive elections?

A: That is the current policy of the NUPSA Executive. Normally, most societies (including OUPAKSOC) allow their paid members to vote for amendments or elections.

Q: So basically what your saying is that only literally 11 votes was all that was required to change the whole NUPSA Constitution in this AGM? Just 11 people can change everything?

A: That is infact what has happened as you can see from the documents NUPSA has provided. 11 was the number required to gain a simple majority. It does remain a disturbing fact that possibly 10 out of those 11 are NUPSA Executive members from the UK and Pakistan. Our stance has been that this is not the proper quorum and this is just a sham arranged by the current NUPSA Executive.

Section 5: Frequently Asked Questions on Constitutional Amendments

General Questions:

Q: How come 10 votes out of 20 have been given a simple majority of 52.6%? Shouldn't that be 50%?

A: We have no idea how the NUPSA Election Commission can count 10/20 as 52.6%. Our best guess is that the NUPSA Exec probably required a simple majority (or a two-third majority) for certain clauses they favoured and fudged the numbers. If you observe closely, almost all the percentages in every clause have been incorrectly calculated.

$10/20 \times 100\% = 50\%$

The council will be a guardian body that advises on issues with supreme legislative powers resting with the executive (union). Any decision making process shall be vested in the executive (Union) and the council acting as the advisory body.	20	1	52.6% (10)	8 (42.1%)	0% (1)	5.3% (1)	Referred
--	----	---	------------	-----------	--------	----------	----------

Q: What is the logic followed or the criteria set for declaring clauses as Implemented/Referred/Recommended/Rejected?

A: If you look at all the clauses and vote percentages carefully and try to observe any pattern or logic on which basis it was decided the clauses would be Implemented/Refererred etc, then you will find none. For all we are aware, these clauses have been Implemented, Recommended or Referred on the discretion of the NUPSA Executive themselves.

less than 2/3rd majority has been implemented

The president of NUPSA shall be a student who can watch and safeguard the interests of students.	20	1	63.2% (12)	36.8% (7)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	Implemented, recommended for approval with clarifications
--	----	---	------------	-----------	----------	----------	---

greater than 2/3rd majority has been "recommended"

The executive committee will be deemed illegal if they fail to call general council meeting twice a year.	20	1	73.7% (14)	21.1% (4)	5.3% (1)	0.0% (0)	Recommended for approval
---	----	---	------------	-----------	----------	----------	--------------------------

less than 50% has not been rejected

Guardian council formed of ex-Presidents/VPs (I.e. Advisors). 3-5 year turn around. Empowered to step in (not dismissal, rather, setting objectives with timelines/offering advice) if 75% in agreement, when help is summoned by President, or if allegation against President, then when help summoned by VP (with confidence of >51% of Exec).	20	1	36.8% (7)	52.6% (10)	0.0% (0)	10.5% (2)	Referred (contradictory to Elections No 6)
---	----	---	-----------	------------	----------	-----------	--

100% majority has not been implemented

Web officer and two publicity officers: Website maintenance, designing posters, facebook groups.	20	1	100% (19)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	recommended for approval
--	----	---	-----------	----------	----------	----------	--------------------------

Q: Why have only clauses within the Election Section (Article 4) been implemented and all the others have been recommended or referred even though the vote percentages are similar for all articles?

A: This is a very disturbing trend that **only clauses in the Election section (Article 4)** out of the whole amendments list have been **immediately Implemented**. This is clearly a suspicious development given that elections are barely a week away and all the other amendments have been referred/recommended. No society in the world implements suspicious amendments in the electoral procedure barely a week before elections.

Election (Article 4)							
Amendment	Total votes casted	Votes discarded	Yes	No	Abstain	Need further discussion in a council meeting	
In order to ensure that posts of President and Vice-President are held by competent individuals, these posts shall be open for general council members in order to ensure that the Union is led by competent individuals.	20	1	68.4% (13)	31.6% (6)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	Implemented, recommended for approval with clarifications
President and Vice president should have one year experience of the general council.	19	1	72.2% (13)	22.2% (4)	0.0% (0)	5.6% (1)	Implemented, Clarifications needed for approval
The president of NUPSA shall be a student who can watch and safeguard the interests of students.	20	1	63.2% (12)	36.8% (7)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	Implemented, recommended for approval with clarifications
No one with a tainted reputation allowed to stand (I.e. Lack of trust with evidence, corruption allegations, material dishonesty)	20	1	63.2% (12)	26.3% (5)	0.0% (0)	10.5% (2)	Recommended for approval
Elections must be supervised by two representatives from previous committee, one member of the General Council and at least one member of an independant body.	20	1	100.0% (19)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	Recommended for approval

Governance (Section 2.01)

The amendments passed which are under question:

Amendment
The council will be a guardian body that advices on issues with supreme legislative powers vesting with the executive (union). Any decision making process shall be vested in the executive (Union) and the council acting as the advisory body.
The executive (Union) with two thirds majority vote shall be empowered to censure and/or remove an officer from Office.
The executive (union) shall be empowered to make and enact policy. Once drafted, It will be sent to the council. The council may delay the policy for 2 weeks (15 days) after which it will be considered passed.

Q: How can the Executive have supreme legislative and policy-making powers? Doesn't that create a further imbalance in the power spectrum between the Executive and the General Council?

A: We believe this is a further attempt by the NUPSA Executive to ensure that the NUPSA Executive remains unaccountable to anyone and with this amendment, it is certain that the the Executive will now NOT EVEN BE accountable to the General Council, making the GC powerless.

Q: Shouldn't the power to remove an officer lie with the Council instead of just the Executive?

A: That is correct and is the procedure followed in most responsible societies. However, given the revelations made by OUPAKSOC officers within the NUPSA Executive, this amendment has been brought in by the NUPSA Executive to ensure that such actions do not take place in the future and that officers who raise a complaint against their fellow executive members are removed immediately by the rest of the Executive without an investigation by the General Council.

Election (Article 4)

The amendments passed which are under question:

Amendment	Amendment
In order to ensure that posts of President and Vice-President are held by competent individuals, these posts shall be open for general council members in order to ensure that the Union is led by competent individuals.	Nupsa executive should be dissolved as soon as the elections are announced and independant election commision should take charge.
President and Vice president should have one year experience of the general council.	Nupsa pakistan council members should be entitled to vote for the president.
The president of NUPSA shall be a student who can watch and safeguard the interests of students.	Bi-elections should be allowed in the event a post is vacated prematurely. The Exec is entitled to make an internal decision through a >51% vote. If the individual is not a previous member of the Exec, this will not count as a full term, thus no voting rights
No one with a tainted reputation allowed to stand (I.e. Lack of trust with evidence, corruption allegations, material dishonesty)	Each election must have candidates of British and National Pakistani origin; males and females; representation from more than 2 province of Pakistan. The final outcome is 100% dependent on the voting.
Elections must be supervised by two representatives from previous committee, one member of the General Council and at least one member of an independant body.	

Q: I have served in the Executive of a Pakistan Society which is not affiliated with NUPSA. I have most of the skills which I believe would be suitable to lead NUPSA. Why can I not stand for the post of President or Vice President in NUPSA?

A: As we mentioned before in our evidence document, the NUPSA Executive wishes to ensure that elections are a "closed" procedure where the rules have been made so that future committees are "hand-picked" by the current establishment. However, this condition

on standing for the position of the President/Vice-President is a clear violation and contradiction of Article IV (i):

“Elections of the Union shall be held in line with the true principles of democracy”

By putting conditions on the position of the President and Vice President, this clause (which clearly allows all competent individuals the right to stand for all NUPSA positions) is not being followed.

Q: I have just finished my degree and have been active in Pakistan Society circles in the UK for several years including NUPSA General Council experience. Why am I ineligible to stand for NUPSA President?

A: Refer to previous answer.

Q: If the clause regarding that “NUPSA President should be a student” has been **implemented immediately**, why has not the current NUPSA president (who is not a student) resigned immediately?

A: The NUPSA President would be in a better position to answer this. As mentioned before, all these amendments have been brought to maintain a “degree of control” over possible outside candidates who may attempt to stand for NUPSA President or other power positions. These amendments have been brought in to prevent outside parties to have a chance of winning elections.

Q: If no one with a tainted reputation can stand for any position, then surely no one from the current Executive (which is facing severe allegations) should stand for elections again?

A: There is no way highlighted in the NUPSA Constitution as to who decides who has a tainted reputation. Shall a court decide? A arbitrary panel? Or is it simply the NUPSA Executive who decides? Who judges the evidence? For example, in our case the NUPSA Executive clearly has refused to accept the OUPAKSOC allegations. Therefore, there is a big question mark as to who decides who is actually tainted or who isn't?

Q: Who chooses the independent body to be used for monitoring elections and whether it is actually competent?

A: Again, the amendment clause dealing with this issue is silent on this. We personally believe that the independent body should have the written approval of all the candidates for each Executive position.

Q: Why has the Executive been given the right to fill a post on an internal decision if a committee member fails to fulfil his/her term. Shouldn't this power lie with the General Council?

A: Again, we believe this is a further attempt to make the Executive more powerful and unaccountable.

Q: How can conditions of descent or provincial status be put on Executive positions for elections? Does this not go against the “true principles of democracy”?

A: Certain societies do have quotas in their Executive for certain minorities or sections of the public (like Women's position, graduates positions, etc) so we believe this clause with some minor additions is reasonable.

New Roles and Committees Article 5

The amendments passed which are under question:

Amendment

<p>NUPSA must address both the needs of students and alumni. A designated NUPSA Alumni Exec is required to set up and maintain the Alumni wing. Each professional organisation should have lead contacts which change on a yearly basis (in line with the NUPSA AGM). These lead contacts will be in charge of spreading NUPSA and getting more alumnis involved. The Alumni Exec can, with the permission of the Exec, engage teams to work on Alumni focused events.</p>
<p>Dissolve all position of advisors and instead allow the executive committee to call upon services of former members as consultants as and when required.</p>

Q: Why is a separate NUPSA Alumni Executive been opened now?

A: This remains, undoubtedly a very suspicious development given the concerns raised recently regarding the current power-holders maintaining power and influence over the incoming future Exec committee. Also, it is of much graver concern that certain high-ups in the current NUPSA Executive are alumni (including the current President and Vice President) so this remains a very disturbing development.

Q: Why are consultants being used by the NUPSA Executive now instead of advisors?

A: This is just a sham by the NUPSA Executive renaming the notorious "Board of Advisors" as the "Board of Consultants." The role will remain the same since the Board of Advisors has been often accused of interfering in NUPSA Executive decisions and not just acting as advisors.

Accountability (Article 8)

The amendments passed which are under question:

Amendment
Any affiliated society should be allowed to propose a motion to call for an inquiry into any matter or call for a hearing of any executive committee member, provided it is seconded by 5 other societies.
Disciplinary actions to be taken against individuals in breach of the general code of conduct.
Breach of confidence/trust within the executive shall enable the President to suspend the post until further investigation in to the matter. If found innocent, the officer shall be restored. Otherwise, action shall be taken accordingly.
Power to dismiss an individual on basis of breach of trust/corruption/highly disruptive/bias/lack of work lies with the President. If allegations against the President, the VP (with confidence of >75% of Exec and >75% guardian council)

Q: My society has a serious complaint against NUPSA regarding corruption in an event we jointly hosted. Why do I need to be seconded by 5 outside societies (which had no involvement in the issue, before an investigation is opened?)

A: It should be the right of any full affiliate member to raise a complaint against any executive member just as the procedure is in several other societies in the world. The ridiculous condition of having 5 seconds is simply a further attempt to prevent accountability of the NUPSA Executive.

Q: Why has the President been given supreme power to suspend posts or executive officials? What if the president is himself/herself involved in the breach?

A: Again, this clause has been designed to give the President supreme and undemocratic powers and to prevent accountability of the President. Clearly, the General Council only should have the final word on whether an executive member can be suspended or not.

Q: Why does power to dismiss an individual on the basis of breach of trust/corruption/etc lie ONLY with the President? Is this not a blatant violation of democratic procedures?

A: This is truly an absurd clause with the President being given truly undemocratic and unaccountable powers. The President is supposed to be a figurehead, not the supreme decision maker or dictator.

Q: What if the President and Vice President and some other members of the NUPSA Executive are involved in corruption together? How will these clauses then hold them all accountable if they are all in league with each other?

A: As we mentioned before, this is a truly absurd clause. With this clause in force, the NUPSA Executive is only accountable to the Executive itself. The condition of 75% approval needed within the Executive is also ridiculous given there is no provision to handle a situation where the majority of the Executive is involved in fraud/corruption.

External Body Dealings: Code of Conduct (Article 10)

The amendments passed which are under question:

Amendment
Dealings with the Pakistan High Commission are solely to the extent of a supportive representative of Pakistanis. As long as there is political affiliation with the PHC, funds will not be accepted from the PHC. The PHC can suggest sponsors etc. All dealings with the PHC will be conducted by the President OR President and VP alone, unless specific consent given by President for each individual meeting.
All NUPSA-related meetings or meetings with NUPSA-based connections must have consent of the President. All such meetings must be conducted by the President OR President and VP alone, unless specific consent given by President for each individual meeting.

Q: Why does only the President or the Vice President have the authority to deal with the PHC?

A: Again, this is a further attempt to prevent transparency, this time within the NUPSA Executive itself. All NUPSA Executive members should have the full right to deal with the PHC and all dealings should be made public.

Section 6: Frequently Asked Questions on OUPAKSOC Allegations

Q: Why is OUPAKSOC not giving out a full response this time to all the explanations given by NUPSA regarding the financial embezzlement charges?

A: We simply wish to state that we rest our case and as we mentioned before our "Evidence Against NUPSA" document is fully legally valid and self-standing and that this is the end of the matter for us. We wished to make the public and the General Council aware of the corruption and mismanagement within NUPSA and it is upto the public to decide if our arguments and evidence are valid or not. If you notice carefully, the NUPSA Executive has failed to answer any of the evidence charges directly (as we mentioned in our previous response) but provided the usual set of alternate mumbo-jumbo evidence to fudge the issue. We can write out a 100 page response to each and every mumbo-jumbo point raised by NUPSA but this has now become an obsolete exercise for us and this can continue for several months while our society has more important events to hold during the upcoming term.

Q: Why have you not as of yet revealed the name of the person within the NUPSA committee responsible for the corruption and embezzlement charges?

A: The Oxford University Pakistan Society has from day one stressed that this is a professional issue between two societies and not a personal issue. All names have been censored to protect the privacy of individuals who have as of yet not been convicted in any court of law. Our job has simply been to make the public aware of the mismanagement and embezzlement regarding public funds within NUPSA. It is upto the public and the NUPSA General Council to judge this issue and whether they wish to take any action against the concerned individual. Our stance has simply been that we cannot be a part of NUPSA as long as action is NOT taken and that is why we initiated our de-affiliation move.

Q: But surely NUPSA has now finally revealed all the receipts and letters from the banks and everything? Surely they have been redeemed and proven themselves innocent?

A: As we mentioned before, we invite you and legal experts to judge the validity and authenticity of our documents against those bureaucratic nonsensical ones presented by NUPSA in most of the cases. An example of a "bank confirmation letter" which NUPSA has presented is given below where you can tell how much information that letter actually tells you about NUPSA's finances. If you carefully scrutinise all of the evidence presented by NUPSA, you will realise that almost all of the documents only divert the main issue and do not directly answer the evidence which we presented in our previous document.

Account Summary	
Opening Balance	
Payments In	
Payments Out	
Closing Balance	

Statement for only one month revealed (Allegations were levelled in October 2010)

20 November to 19 December 2010

Account Name: National Union of Pakistani Students and Alumni

Details of breakdown not shown

Your Community Account details

Date	Payment type and details	Paid out	Paid in	Balance
19 Nov 10	BALANCE BROUGHT FORWARD			
22 Nov 10	CR PAYPAL TRANSFER			
25 Nov 10	BP [REDACTED]			
19 Dec 10	BALANCE CARRIED FORWARD			

No mention of balances

Credit Interest Rates		Debit Interest Rates	
balance	AER variable	balance	EAR variable
Credit interest	0.00 %	Debit interest	26.30 %

Q: If these receipts and letters have only been obtained and revealed now, then on what basis was the person accused of the corruption acquitted by the NUPSA Executive in their internal disciplinary hearing?

A: That is a very good question. Why were these documents not revealed when these allegations were levelled against the Executive? If these documents have only recently been obtained or composed (and that too after over a month), then on what basis was the person facing the disciplinary charges acquitted of all the corruption and mismanagement charges?

Q: Why has no audit report been published for NUPSA UK funds? Were those ones under scrutiny as well? Why are they still all Excel/Word made and not officially examined?

A: Again, NUPSA has done what it does best and that is to fudge the important issues and direct attention elsewhere. The bank confirmation letter from HSBC mentioned in previous answer is a fine example.

Q: But what about those email correspondences regarding corruption allegations which you revealed between the NUPSA Executives? And what about those internal disciplinary hearing minutes? Why hasn't NUPSA clarified any of those issues in their response?

A: We believe that those correspondences and hearing minutes are the strongest evidence of corruption and embezzlement within NUPSA and that there is simply no way that the NUPSA Executive can counter those documents where NUPSA Executives themselves are clearly admitting the charges. Therefore, NUPSA has instead chosen to divert attention from those damning documents and tried to focus the public's attention on other mumbo-jumbo excel sheets which they have presented.

Q: The person who was responsible for the procedural irregularities has been punished and demoted. What is your issue now?

A: Disciplinary hearings and procedures regarding an offense of this magnitude surely have to be declared to the General Council if not the public. Furthermore, when adjudicating on evidence and penalties, the views of the full Executive should have been taken into account. Both OUPAKSOC officers were completely ignored in their calls for penalising the concerned individual. An under-the-table deal was reached that let the person off the hook without a proper investigation and a proper penalty.

Q: Several members of the NUPSA Executive (including OUPAKSOC Officers) can be clearly seen in the correspondences you revealed raising their voices against the corrupt individual. Why have they suddenly backtracked on those statements now? Surely new evidence must have emerged that made them change their mind?

A: An argument which has arisen is that for the purpose of Unity within Pakistani students in the UK, we should sort out these differences internally and that a great society for unity such as NUPSA should not face such a huge public scandal. We have re-iterated our stance that honesty is a clear pre-requisite for Unity. This is not a matter of "forgiveness" or "differences", it is a matter of misuse and embezzlement of a large amount of public funds as well as severe irregularities in the constitutional and electoral procedures of an organisation of this size. We had negotiated for over 4 months with the NUPSA Executive in the hope that this issue could have been resolved amicably and failure of any action by the NUPSA Executive drove us to take this extreme step. As for the other NUPSA Executive members, we are undoubtedly disappointed that they did not support us in this endeavour but unfortunately they were perhaps more interested in protecting their position within NUPSA and to avoid a large public scandal rather than reveal the truth to the public. The

OUPAKSOC Officers have without hesitation sacrificed their positions and future within NUPSA to ensure transparency and justice and protection of public funds.

Q: I have heard from several people that these documents were revealed by OUPAKSOC due to an internal feud or power struggle between OUPAKSOC and NUPSA. Is there any truth in these rumours?

A: We ask you to appreciate or judge what benefit if any OUPAKSOC had to gain from publishing these documents. In fact, technically OUPAKSOC had the most to lose since OUPAKSOC is a founding member of NUPSA and has co-hosted NUPSA's flagship event PYLC for two years now. Our NUPSA officers, who were both eligible to stand for presidential positions in future elections, refused to be a part of this sham system and resigned immediately. Their sacrifice was simply for awareness of the public of the corruption and mismanagement within NUPSA. As for a power struggle, it should be appreciated that the purposes and functions of OUPAKSOC and NUPSA are different. OUPAKSOC remains primarily a society for the Pakistani students within the city of Oxford (although everyone from all over the UK is welcome to attend our events) while NUPSA is an umbrella organisation for Pakistani Societies in the United Kingdom. We were simply a part of NUPSA, not embroiled in a power struggle with them.

Q: Why did you only reveal the incriminating documents after PYLC 2011 was successfully hosted? This issue was raised back in October 2011? Why wait so long?

A: As we have mentioned before, OUPAKSOC left no stone unturned to ensure that this issue be resolved without a dispute and scandal and that the offending parties be punished and details of the hearing be made aware to the General Council. Evidence regarding these with dated correspondences (over four months) can be found in our "Evidence Against NUPSA" document. We are a strictly professional society and we had made a binding agreement on 1st November 2010 that we would indeed fulfil our commitment to host PYLC 2011. Indeed, our treasurer even cleared out all outstanding dues to the NUPSA Treasury even after we have levelled these allegations against the NUPSA Executive. We are considering this problem as strictly a professional issue between two organisations.

Q: But I thought the FCO was bound by the Freedom of Information 2000 Act? Why has NUPSA not decided to display the letter from the FCO, if it exists, confirming financial transparency.

A: The FCO is bound by the Freedom of Information 2000 and the Data Protection Act 1998 to meet all demands which request information regarding which bodies it funds. It is the NUPSA Executive's choice not to display this information to the public. It is upto the public to judge why they have chosen such. There is already a huge question mark as to why NUPSA had accepted FCO funds when it was fully aware that there were strings attached to the funding (especially given the FCO is the foreign policy making organisation for the UK) bringing into question NUPSA's claim that they are an independent and apolitical organisation, which has never and will never accept funding from controversial or political sources

Q: If you were so confident about evidence and allegations, why did you not attend the EGM hosted by NUPSA where all parties were given a chance to clear their stances?

A: We have mentioned before that OUPAKSOC was not given any formal invitation to attend the EGM. Furthermore, OUPAKSOC has been quite conveniently suspended by the NUPSA Executive from the General Council automatically. However, looking back in retrospect, OUPAKSOC attendance at the EGM would not have made such of a difference given that NUPSA has a fine record in hosting sham General Meetings where the majority (although not everyone) members attending are only their own handpicked stooges and there is a blatant failure to meet the quorum or to meet constitutional requirements. That was also the case with the EGM hosted by NUPSA in March if you take a closer look at the below mentioned infringements of the NUPSA Constitution in hosting the EGM.

**Quorum for March
EGM was not met**

2) Quorum for an EGM will be 67% of the strength of the Council being in attendance.

(iv) The Union may meet for an Emergency General Meeting (EGM) which may be called by an Officer. The Officer will require 67% of the vote of the Council to call the meeting. Such a vote may be cast online. Notice of an EGM will be at least seven days.

Only a three day warning was given to the General Council which resulted in several General Council members missing the meeting.

Q: But surely the NUPSA Executive was cleared of all charges by the General Council in their March EGM? Constitutional procedures were followed and the counter-evidence was presented to the General Council after they cleared NUPSA of all charges.

A: Please refer to the previous answer. We would further like to stress that by the time of the EGM, we had only revealed our final case against NUPSA and not the evidence. The evidence document, which contains the most incriminating documents was only revealed after the EGM.

Q: But then why did Cardiff and all these other Pakistani societies affiliate with NUPSA after their EGM. Surely, NUPSA must have redeemed itself?

A: We have been very clear in our stance that we have not launched any "Boycott NUPSA" movement. All Pakistani societies have the full right to determine their association with NUPSA. Our stance has simply been that we do not wish to be affiliated with an organisation which has failed to address the issue of corruption and mismanagement within its own rank.

Q: What about all the other allegations which NUPSA have cleared in their detailed response? Regarding the British Council funding and their claim that their Secretary (who was an OUPAKSOC Officer) did not arrange the Winter Council Meeting?

A: As we mentioned before, we invite you to honestly judge the evidence presented by NUPSA. All they have done is refer to Appendices which are only available by in-person appointments? Surely, if any counter-evidence existed they would have released it by now? I think that with this response it is honestly clear to the public that all NUPSA has ever presented is bureaucratic gibberish to confuse the public. We have repeatedly invited all parties including legal experts to test our evidence.

Q: A guidebook to NUPSA Elections is about to be released? Surely that would allow the election procedure to be more transparent?

A: We personally would expect the same level of “transparency” in that guidebook as we have seen in the amendments procedure. We hope that we have made the public more aware of the mumbo-jumbo gibberish that NUPSA usually present to divert and distract the public from relevant issues.

Q: Why did you choose to present a “Work in Progress” poster as evidence against NUPSA?

A: We would request you to have a closer look at that poster again. Is there really any room for further “progress” in the poster? That poster is fully completed and was sent to us to be publicised when the complaint was raised. It is truly shameful that the NUPSA Executive decided to call that finalised poster as a “Work in Progress.”

Q: NUPSA has claimed that the deadline for submitting the PYLC application as 6th November and not 1st November as you have claimed. How does that count as a breach of contract and backdoor communications?

A: We have presented SOLID evidence that the deadline was officially stated to be 1st November. We ask NUPSA to present any solid evidence (including email shots) to confirm that the deadline was indeed extended to 6th November. All they have done repeatedly throughout their response is refer to Appendices which are **only available by in-person appointments** and there is simply no viable reason why those documents have not been revealed to the public. We seriously doubt that any such appendices actually exist.