



Clubs
Oversight
Commission

**CARLETON UNIVERSITY STUDENTS' ASSOCIATION
CLUBS OVERSIGHT COMMISSION**

WRITTEN DECISION

CITATION: *in re Katryna Brady v. Carleton Law and Legal Society Complaint*
2025 COC

JUDGEMENT RENDERED: April 16, 2025

Panel: Elnaidany, Eman, Chair; Rohacek, Aiden; Ruhl, Noah; Sayed Ahmed,
Dana; Silveira, Michael; Easby, Sam; Khalil, Anna, Doduck, Jaac

PART I. Summary

Held: The membership removal of Katryna Brady was procedurally flawed and unjustified.

Also Held: The Carleton Law and Legal Society executive team exhibited unprofessional conduct and failed to uphold principles of fairness and inclusion in their actions.

Also Held: The VP Academic is ineligible to run for executive positions within the Carleton Law and Legal Society for the 2025-2026 academic year.

Also Held: The current President is ineligible to run for any executive positions within all CUSA Clubs for the academic year 2025-2026.

Also Held: Katryna Brady's removal as First-Year Representative is invalid, and she is entitled to either continue in the position or remain a general member, should she choose to do so.

Also Held: All executive members and directors are required to complete mandatory training provided by the EIC and AODA training. Any current executive members or directors who are running for executive positions within the Carleton Law and Legal Society for the 2025-2026 academic year must complete this mandatory training before nomination eligibility period.

PART II. Facts and Jurisdictional History

[1] **On January 15, 2025**, Katryna Brady was assigned a shift for the Clubs Expo. Upon arrival, she was confused about the club's location, as the group had moved from the conference rooms to Fen Lounge without properly informing members. When Katryna arrived at the original assigned location and could not find the group, she inquired in the club's group chat. The president then informed her of the location change, to which Katryna responded, "Bruh."

[2] Later that day, Katryna received an email from Phoebe Nana-Aubynn, the club's president, notifying her that she had been removed from her position as First-Year Representative, effective immediately. The email cited multiple complaints from executive members and ongoing behavioral concerns as the reason for removal.

[3] Following this, Katryna was removed from the club's group chat. After her removal, she received an anonymous screen recording of messages exchanged within the chat that were of significant concern to the Commission. These messages included instances of members making fun of Katryna's behavior, engaging in bullying, and displaying ableist attitudes.

[4] **On January 21, 2025**, VP Academic, Jirre, received a Snapchat message from a sender by the name 'Aarav' that included a racial slur. The message also mentioned Katryna, leading the club to assume a possible connection between her and the sender. Jirre informed the club of this incident through the club's Instagram group chat.

[5] Upon learning about the incident, Phoebe, the club president, decided that Katryna should be banned from all academic events for the remainder of the semester. **On January 22, 2025**, Phoebe followed through by sending Katryna an email formally notifying her of the ban.

[6] **On January 24, 2025**, Clubs Oversight Commission received a Membership Removal Request from VP Internal, Monet Leone, for Katryna Brady citing concerns about unprofessional behavior, lack of engagement, and misconduct at the Winter Clubs Expo.

[7] On **February 13, 2025**, the Membership Removal Committee, after reviewing the information provided, found that the reasons outlined in the membership removal request did not substantiate impeachment. Instead, the Committee recommended that the club engage in a structured resolution process, including a mediated discussion with the involved parties, a formal written warning if necessary, and clear expectations for future conduct. The Committee also advised seeking guidance from the Ombuds Office and the Department of Equity and Inclusive Communities (EIC) to ensure fairness and transparency moving forward.

[8] On **March 6, 2025**, Katryna Brady submitted a formal complaint against the Carleton Law and Legal Society. The complaint cited wrongful impeachment and included a screen recording of concerning messages exchanged in the group chat after her removal. The messages included comments such as:

- “This was anticlimactic, kinda hoped we get more of a show” – referencing her removal after she sent ‘Bye’ to the group chat.
- “I mean, me personally would’ve done this at a meeting because I needed her to go bright red”
- “That one was beyond special, beyond guidance tbh”
- “I was hoping to see her on edibles”
- “Y’all kill me”
- Numerous instances of “LMAO”
- “I’m just grateful we won’t have to hear an unironic wagwan from her again, it was always so painful”

[9] On **March 14, 2025**, The Student Groups Administrator requested a response from the Carleton Law and Legal Society executive team regarding the complaints and incidents mentioned above.

[10]After receiving responses from the following executives and directors:

- Phoebe Nana-Aubynn - President
- Monet Leone - VP Internal
- Darlin Tezen - VP Finance
- Deborah Osei-Owusu - VP Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion
- Beza Temesgen - VP Communications
- Caleb Raymond - VP Events
- Aryan Chandorkar - Director of Internal Affairs
- Riley Efraim - Director of Finance

The Clubs Oversight Commission initiated an investigation, reviewed all responses, and examined the complaint submitted by Katryna Brady. Additionally, upon their request, the

Commission met with Phoebe to provide more context on her written response.

PART III. Issues

[11] The issue(s) in this case are:

- Was the membership removal of Katryna Brady conducted in accordance with the established membership removal procedure by CLLS?
- Does the conduct and communication among executive members of the Carleton Law and Legal Society reflect a broader cultural issue within the club, particularly relating to professionalism, inclusion, and adherence to due process?

Per Curiam Opinion

The reasons of Elnaidany, Rohacek, Ruhl, Sayed Ahmed, Silveira, Easby, Khalil, Doduck; by
THE CHAIR

PART IV. Analysis

First Issue: Was the membership removal of Katryna Brady conducted in accordance with the established membership removal procedure by CLLS?

[12] Upon review, the Membership Removal Request submitted by the Carleton Law and Legal Society (CLLS) was found to be both misleading and incomplete. According to the timeline of events and testimony from both the respondents and the complainant, Katryna was removed from her position on January 15, 2025, and banned from all club events on January 22, 2025. However, the Membership Removal Request was not submitted until January 24, 2025, and crucially, it failed to disclose that Katryna had already been removed and banned. This omission of key facts raises concerns about the integrity of the submission and its adherence to procedural fairness. While the executive team cited Katryna's conduct at the Winter Clubs Expo and an earlier incident during the AGM on November 28, 2024, as justification for her removal, these behavioral concerns—even if valid—do not exempt the club from following its own constitutionally mandated procedures. It is clear that the removal decision was made internally by the executive team without engaging the broader membership or providing Katryna with a fair chance to be heard. Clubs are not permitted to bypass processes based on perceived urgency or discomfort with conflict resolution; adherence to fair and transparent governance is a fundamental requirement of all recognized student clubs.

[13] In addition to the above concerns, CLLS did not follow the procedures outlined in their own constitution regarding membership removal. According to the constitution, before any membership removal occurs, the executive must submit a request to the Membership Removal

Committee (MRC). Once the request is submitted, the executive is required to host a meeting with the general membership within 10 days to review the complaint. Both the member bringing the complaint and the accused member must be allowed to speak. A vote on impeachment should follow, where the accused individual is not allowed to vote, and a simple majority vote is required for impeachment to proceed. In Katryna's case, these procedural steps were not followed. The request was submitted after her removal, and no meeting or vote with the general membership occurred prior to the action taken. Furthermore, Katryna was not given an opportunity to speak in this process, which violates the principles of procedural fairness and transparency.

[14] The process surrounding Katryna's removal on January 15 remains unclear. Phoebe, the President, stated that an executive meeting was held after the Winter Club Expo, during which the decision to remove Katryna was made. The justification for her removal was based on two main incidents: her behavior during the Winter Expo and a separate event at the Annual General Meeting (AGM) on November 28, 2025. During the AGM, Katryna was visibly upset and repeatedly interrupted the Jeopardy game, expressing frustration about the questions and the competition, which created disruption during the event. Regarding her behavior during the Winter Club Expo, Katryna arrived late for her shift at the Society's booth, and it was noted that she spent time interacting with other booths instead of fulfilling her responsibilities. Upon arriving at the new booth location after the switch to Fenn Lounge, Katryna exhibited frustration and made comments that were perceived as unprofessional by the executive members present. Her behavior was seen as contributing to a negative atmosphere, which further raised concerns about her conduct in the executive role. Both incidents—her behavior at the AGM and the Winter Club Expo—led the executive team to decide on her removal, as her actions were viewed as detrimental to the professional and collaborative environment the Society aims to maintain.

[15] Furthermore, internal correspondence submitted to the Commission revealed that at least one executive—VP Academic—advised the president that any removal must follow the proper procedure. This demonstrates that the leadership was aware of the appropriate steps but consciously chose to act outside of them. This is particularly troubling, as it suggests a disregard for due process, even after being made aware of it.

Second Issue: Does the conduct and communication among executive members of the Carleton Law and Legal Society reflect a broader cultural issue within the club, particularly relating to professionalism, inclusion, and adherence to due process?

[16] Following Katryna's removal on January 15, 2025, she submitted a formal complaint which included a screen recording of messages from the Carleton Law and Legal Society (CLLS) executive and directors' group chat. Katryna received this screen recording anonymously. The messages exchanged among several executives and directors were deeply troubling, and included mockery, bullying, and exclusionary remarks directed at Katryna—targeting her behavior, personality, and identity. Some executives later attempted to explain the comments as jokes, stating that they were not meant to be interpreted as bullying. However, the content of the messages was clearly harmful and degrading. This cannot be dismissed as playful banter, especially as Katryna was unaware these conversations were taking place about her.

[17] These were not isolated or offhand remarks. The nature and tone of the conversation reflect a group dynamic in which bullying language was normalized and tolerated. What makes this particularly concerning is that these messages were exchanged in a group chat that included the entire executive and directors' team. The president was present for these exchanges and, at times, actively contributed to them. This created an environment where ableist and demeaning commentary was left unchallenged. While the president later stated that she attempted to temper the tone by saying things like "Please" or using crying and skull emojis to signal discomfort—rather than asserting her authority—the Commission finds this response insufficient. Moments of bullying require clear and immediate intervention, not passive or dismissive responses—especially since the harmful behavior continued. In addition, the president did not merely fail to stop the messages; in some instances, she contributed to them.

[18] The president, Phoebe, also shared in her response that she held a meeting on January 24, 2025, to address the inappropriate comments in the group chat, set expectations for the executive team, and promote respectful and inclusive conduct. While the intention to course-correct is acknowledged, it does not negate the fact that a harmful environment was permitted to develop under her leadership—and, in some cases, was reinforced by her own conduct. A post-facto attempt to encourage inclusion does not undo the harm that unfolded or the culture that was allowed to persist.

[19] Furthermore, when the executive submitted the Membership Removal Request to the Commission, they did not disclose the existence of these group chat messages or acknowledge the cultural dynamics at play. This omission of context—particularly when seeking an official sanction—raises serious concerns regarding transparency and good faith from the executive team.

[20] In light of all this, it is clear that Katryna Brady's removal was not only procedurally flawed, but also occurred within a broader leadership environment that tolerated exclusion, ridicule, and unprofessional behavior. These issues must be addressed both through accountability measures and a renewed focus on setting and upholding higher standards of fairness, respect, and inclusion for all CUSA clubs moving forward.

[21] Although many of the responses from executive members and directors included apologies and expressions of regret, the Commission emphasizes that meaningful accountability requires more than an apology. The absence of early intervention, the minimization of harm, and the omission of critical context in official communications point to broader systemic issues within the club's leadership. These must be addressed collectively—not only in response to this specific incident, but as part of a commitment to fostering a healthier, more respectful, and inclusive environment going forward.

PART V. Conclusion

[22] In light of the findings above and in alignment with the Clubs Oversight Commission's duty to uphold fairness, inclusion, and accountability, the Commission issues the following orders:

A. Eligibility for Future Executive Positions:

1. **Phoebe Nana-Aubynn, Current President of the Carleton Law and Legal Society:** **Phoebe is not eligible** to run for or hold an executive position within any CUSA-recognized club for the 2025–2026 academic year. This decision is based on the President's involvement in creating a culture of exclusion and not fully adhering to procedural fairness in the process of membership removal. While Phoebe did take steps to address the situation after the fact, the failure to act appropriately earlier, especially when given guidance on the correct process, raises concerns about her readiness to fulfill executive duties in the future. The Commission acknowledges her later efforts but believes that more thorough adherence to club processes and procedures is essential for leadership roles.
2. **Jirre Fowler, VP Academic of the Carleton Law and Legal Society:** Jirre is ineligible to run for or hold an executive position within the Carleton Law and Legal Society for the 2025–2026 academic year due to their involvement in sending inappropriate and damaging messages in the Instagram group chat. However, Jirre is eligible to run for executive positions in other CUSA-recognized clubs. This decision considers Jirre's role in advising the club on the appropriate membership removal procedures, which demonstrates some level of responsibility and effort to guide the club toward proper practices.
3. **Katryna Brady:** Katryna is to be reinstated as the First-Year Representative of the Carleton Law and Legal Society. Given the procedural flaws in her removal and the failure to adhere to proper membership removal protocols, her removal is deemed void. Katryna may either continue in her position or opt to remain a general member, depending on her preference. The Carleton Law and Legal Society must support her reintegration and facilitate her return to her responsibilities.

B. Future Club Requirements:

1. The executive team and directors of the Carleton Law and Legal Society must complete mandatory training that will be provided by the Equity and Inclusive Communities (EIC) department, as well as AODA training. This training is mandatory for all current executives and directors within the club. Any individual seeking to run for an executive position within the Carleton Law and Legal Society for the upcoming academic year must complete this training prior to being eligible for nomination.
2. The Commission strongly recommends that the Carleton Law and Legal Society engage with the Ombuds Office, CUSA Clubs Team, and the EIC department for continued guidance in addressing cultural challenges within the club. This ensures that the club is better prepared to prevent future issues, fostering a culture of inclusion, respect, and professionalism.

The Commission expects that the Carleton Law and Legal Society will take these findings seriously and act on them to foster an environment where all members feel respected, valued, and supported.