

We disagree with the petitioner's arguments in full. The petitioner centers their arguments around a requirement for "formal" investigations in the Revised Employee Rights Bylaw. However, the Revised Employee Rights Bylaw clearly lays out the requirements for what must be done before disciplinary action and provides zero definition or requirement for what a "formal" investigation is. It is therefore unfathomable to conclude that such a requirement exists. The only mention of an investigation procedure is the clause that prevents employees from being placed under investigation for over ten days. The requirements for disciplinary action are listed in Section II.c, none of which mention a formal investigation. The intention of these procedures before disciplinary action is to ensure that employees are well aware of what they are accused of, may defend themselves from such accusations, and ensure that there is a set burden of proof for issuing disciplinary action. That's it. And in the directed verdict motion, the trial judge analyzed all these elements and correctly concluded that the defendant met all of the requirements to issue the disciplinary action. We ask the court to vote against hearing this appeal as it's completely frivolous and unfounded.