**ELECTION APPEALS MASTER** 

IN RE: MIKE WEBB	
IV KL. WIKE WEDD	11 Elec. App. 16 (KC)
Protestor.	ORDER

This matter is an appeal from the Election Supervisor's decision 2011 EAD 85 issued January 26, 2011. The appeal was submitted by Mike Webb, member of Local Union 391 and candidate for delegate.

A hearing was held before me on February 3, 2011. The following persons were heard by way of teleconference: Jeffrey J. Ellison, Esq., for the Election Supervisor; Maureen Geraghty, Investigator for the Office of the Election Supervisor and Mike Webb.

The Election Supervisor has filed a procedural objection to the hearing of this appeal, citing Article XIII, Section 2(i) of the Election Rules, which explicitly requires that a copy of the appeal must be delivered by the appellant to "the Election Supervisor and to all other parties to the dispute." The distribution list attached to the Election Supervisor's decision lists 17 parties, including Claude Gray and Vernon Gammon, President and Secretary-Treasurer of Local 391, respectively. It also lists the Election Supervisor's appeals chief, Jeffrey Ellison, and two investigators for the Election Supervisor ("OES") involved in this case, J. Griffin Morgan and Maureen Geraghty.

Prior to the filing of Mr. Ellison's motion to dismiss, none of the five persons (or anyone else on the list) received a copy of Mr. Webb's written appeal, which constitutes his basis for his appeal.

Indeed, his written appeal, which was sent only to the Appeals Master,

specifically mentions Messrs. Gray and Gammon, and accuses an unidentified OES investigator

of having acted improperly in the case.

Mr. Webb by message dated February 2, 2011 to the Appeals Master concedes

that "the Rules were not perfectly fulfilled," but argues that the remedy is to preclude any

reference during the appeals hearing to his written appeals statement. This misses the point. An

appellant in protest proceedings must identify in writing in advance of the scheduling of hearing

the substance of his complaint about the record, conduct or analysis underlying the disposition of

a protest by the Election Supervisor under the Election Rules. To deviate from this prudent and

time honored requirement would render appeals hearings excessively imprecise, interminable

and ultimately unfair.

Accordingly, the Election Supervisor's motion to dismiss the appeal is granted.

SO ORDERED:

s/Kenneth Conboy

Kenneth Conboy

**Election Appeals Master** 

Dated: February 4, 2011

2