

Formal complaint regarding the suspension of three CEC members

5 July 2026

To the Complaints team,

We are writing, as elected members of the Your Party Central Executive Committee (CEC), to raise a formal complaint regarding the suspension of Solma Ahmed, Mel Mullings and Naomi Wimborne-Idrissi from the planned CEC meeting on the 5 July. Moreover, we wish to raise concerns about how Your Party is governing itself in accordance with its own Constitution, Standing Orders and Code of Conduct. For the avoidance of doubt, we expect all of these matters to be investigated in full, impartially.

On 3 July 2026, the Chair (Jenn Forbes) and the Secretary (Dawn Aspinall) wrote to three elected members of the committee, Solma Ahmed, Mel Mullings, Naomi Wimborne-Idrissi, suspending them from attending the CEC meeting on the 5 July. We write to put on record the reasons we believe that this decision is misaligned with the rules the party has adopted. It is also at odds with the most basic principles of democracy and fairness. Disappointingly, its effect has been to exclude one of two Black CEC members, an Asian member and the only Jewish member of the CEC from a meeting that would discuss the party's anti-racism work – something many of us have been pushing for since March.

As the Party's highest elected body, the CEC should be held to the highest standards of governance. Members deserve confidence that the rules apply equally to everyone, are followed consistently, and are not applied selectively.

The reasoning provided for the suspension

The email states that the suspensions were made in accordance with *"the Chair's authority under the Central Executive Committee Standing Orders to regulate attendance at meetings where necessary"*. Yet, no such authority appears anywhere in the CEC Standing Orders.

Section 10 permits the Chair to *"regulate speaking order to ensure balanced participation and efficient conduct of business"*. That is speaking order within a meeting, not attendance at one.

Section 15 provides the only mechanism for removing a CEC member from a meeting: *"Any removal of CEC members from a meeting shall be determined by the Chair, after due warning, and requires a simple majority to take effect."* Yet, there was no warning or vote.

Section 17 requires an absolute majority of all CEC members, defined as 50%+1, to suspend any clause of the Standing Orders. Again, no such vote has taken place.

The Code of Conduct does not offer further clarity on this new claim around the Chair's authority. Section 10 reserves temporary suspension to *"the CEC"* as a body, not to two officers acting alone. Section 11 states: *"Members who are subject to investigation must be informed of the allegations against them and given an opportunity to respond."* The Chair and Secretary's email clearly demonstrates that Solma, Mel and Naomi are subject to investigation, however a sanction was imposed first and the opportunity to respond offered

only afterwards. The email itself concedes that *"no findings have been made and no conclusions have been reached"*, yet a decision was made to suspend them from a CEC meeting representing a change to their elected duties. So, we ask: Who decided on the suspensions? How was the decision made, and in accordance with what rules? The email does not identify a single clause of the Constitution, Standing Orders or Code of Conduct that any of the three members is alleged to have breached.

The Officer Roles and Responsibilities require the Chair to *"Ensure that decisions of the CEC are implemented"* and the Secretary to *"Ensure compliance with the constitution and standing orders"*. With these points in mind, can you clarify that these rules do, indeed, apply to everyone including the Chair and Secretary?

Unequal application

We are aware of complaints about other members of the committee. None were suspended from attending meetings while investigations into those complaints proceeded.

The email attempts to justify the suspensions on the basis that publicly available promotional material identified the three members as speakers/participants in an event organised by a group *"whose public messaging is openly critical of the Party and its leadership"*. By that same evidentiary standard, publicly available promotional material for Marxism Festival 2026, hosted by the Socialist Workers Party, lists the Parliamentary Leader as a headline speaker. The Socialist Workers Party falls within the list of proscribed groups under dual membership restrictions endorsed by the ruling majority of the party's own leadership. Its publications have also, at times, been openly critical of Your Party and its leadership.

So, could you please clarify why some CEC members were suspended for speaking or participating in a socialist group's conference, while another was allowed to speak at a proscribed socialist group's conference without sanction? Is there a new rule that CEC members can speak at conferences organised by proscribed socialist groups, but not unproscribed ones?

To be clear: we do not believe any member should be sanctioned for speaking or participating in events across the socialist movement. The Constitution itself states that *"robust democratic debate among members shall be central"*, and engagement across the left is ordinary political life. In fact, it is deeply concerning that a Black CEC member, who is an anti-racism and reparations campaigner, was suspended for giving a five minute solidarity speech. Her speech centred on the need for unity and anti-racist action. Another CEC member was suspended simply for listening to hear the perspectives of the socialists (including many Your Party members) in attendance. Even worse, in Naomi's case, she neither spoke at nor attended the conference.

A standard appears to have been invented and then applied to precisely three people.

Missing the anti-racism roundtable discussion

The timing of the suspension has prevented ethnically diverse CEC members from participating in a discussion on Your Party's planned anti-racism roundtable at the CEC meeting on Sunday 5th July. The suspension excluded one of two Black members, an Asian member and the only Jewish CEC member from that discussion. This raises further concern around the Party's commitment to anti-racism. One CEC member has repeatedly sent proposals and asked for anti-racism to be an agenda item over recent months, only to have these ignored. The party has also failed to investigate a formal complaint that one of its members directed an anti-Black racist slur at Candi Williams in a prolonged attack, while said member was campaigning for The Many during the CEC election. Despite racism being outlined as a matter of gross misconduct in the Complaints Pack, this complaint has remained uninvestigated for four months. Meanwhile, three ethnically diverse members were suspended within days, under no named rule.

Finally, we wish to remind the Chair and Secretary that the CEC Code of Conduct states that *"Members must treat all individuals with dignity and professionalism"*, with *Inclusivity* adopted as a core principle. We must highlight that all of the incidents stated above, and our treatment on the CEC since February, do not reflect this.

Given many CEC members have faced undemocratic expulsions and manoeuvring in the Labour Party, and know the damage this causes (including harming the integrity of the party), it is a shame that similar methods are being replicated.

As such, we must also raise formal concerns about both the Chair and Secretary's decision-making and potential abuse of power, especially given that the "authority" of the Chair referenced in the suspension email appears nowhere in the CEC Standing Orders.

Your Party was founded on the promise of a member-led, democratic party. With fascism growling at our door, we ask those leading the party to rescind the suspensions immediately, to stop purging socialists and excluding its own CEC members from discussions, and re-focus on uniting to deliver the fightback that workers in this country deserve.

The asks of our complaint

We believe that the matters outlined in this complaint breach numerous provisions of the party's own Complaints & Discipline procedures, including *"abuse of position or authority"* (s.2.4), *"procedural unfairness"* and *"failure to follow agreed rules or procedures"* (s.2.5).

On this basis, we call on the Complaints team to commence a full investigation and also respond on the following, in writing, by Wednesday 8 July at 10am.

1. Rescind the suspensions immediately and cancel the meetings scheduled for Monday 6 July.
2. Outline the numbered clause of the CEC Standing Orders under which the Chair has authority to *"regulate attendance at meetings where necessary"*. In addition, clarify the

numbered clause of the CEC Standing Orders which grants the Chair and Secretary alone powers to suspend elected members from a CEC meeting.

3. State which clause of the Code of Conduct or Constitution each member is alleged to have breached, which led to this decision, and disclose the evidence relied upon.
4. Confirm who made this decision, when it was made, and who was consulted.
5. Conduct a full investigation into the Chair's and Secretary's decision-making and role in this matter.
6. Explain why a sanction was imposed before the members were given any opportunity to respond.
7. Publish the criteria that determine whether a member under investigation is suspended from meetings, and account for why those criteria were applied to no other member under investigation.
8. Confirm why the same standard was not applied to every representative of this party, including the Parliamentary Leader, who has spoken at events hosted by organisations critical of Your Party.
9. Issue formal apologies to Mel, Naomi and Solma for the suspensions and for the inaccurate statements made about them, including the suggestion that Naomi participated in the Socialist Federation conference, which she did not attend.

We look forward to a full and prompt investigation and response on these matters, including the role of the Chair and Secretary. We would also like to remind the Complaints team that the Code of Conduct states, *"Investigations should be conducted fairly and impartially"* and the Complaints process outlines that no one named in an investigation can investigate, adjudicate or preside over meetings concerning it.

Thank you,

Candi Williams

Megan Clarke

Mel Mullings

Naomi Wimborne-Idrissi

Solma Ahmed

Sophie Wilson

Zarah Sultana

Appendix

Mel Mullings' solidarity speech at Socialist Federation Conference

Greetings everyone!

Testing, testing, 1, 2, can you hear me? Brilliant.

I am coming to you from Jamaica! And I really, really wanted to address you guys, so I'm really pleased that I was asked to do so in solidarity.

So, just for those who don't know – sorry about the ones who do! – I'm Mel Mullings. I'm a train driver for London Underground, I'm in the RMT trade union, I've been so for the last 25 years, and I'm on the CEC – and the London representative – for Your Party.

I wanted to address my activism, and just to ask you – do you remember a time when people... saw people calling for world peace, thinking it was all corny and fluffy. World peace! "World peace", and we don't really say it like that anymore, but we are in quite a desperate time. And I say "desperate time" because, if we really deep the times that we're in, our activism, you know, the fact that we're working class, we work every day, and we're busy trying to just be, you know, in our spaces – doing life.

Our activism, unfortunately for us – even though we have so much on our plate – it really needs to step up, right? So this is never a dig, this is just a rally call because people are dying all over the world. It's a really serious time. Socialists come together, and we have tried and tried to get our structures politically, make sure that we have a political home in all kinds of places. And it's been very, very difficult. But we have to keep trying. We have to keep defending our communities – because it's... you know, this is the time that we're in.

So, what I see, specifically now, I have just come from my AGM – the RMT union's AGM – so a week-long AGM with, you know, our General Secretary – some of you may know him – Eddie Dempsey. Now, I have been critical of him, and I'm specifically mentioning this because to me, he wasn't staunch enough in regards to his response to Reform and how that relates to us in the workplaces in the very beginning. Only now, when he's seen the quotes talking about they would sack us, for striking, now – all of a sudden – he's quite staunch on it.

So I went up with my audacious self after he did his General Secretary speech, and I asked him: "Will you be accepting or attending Reform conferences?" – and he said, "No, I don't think I will, but I'd like to debate them, Mel, I'd love to debate them." Why do you want to debate them? What's it... you know, what is that debate going to do, right? People: we need to stop taking agency away from people. People have made their choice, right? And we've got to concentrate on the work that we have got to do.

We need to know what our enemy's doing – yes – but would our general secretaries, you know – if we are in trade unions – go into those spaces and really challenge them, really? Knowing that they've got members in their own unions that are in there, that they're saying... "Oh, it's not that they're racist..." – and I'm not calling anyone a racist – I'm just saying: At the end of the day, stop taking away agency from people to

make a choice. A political choice is really an informed one, you know. You have to really be stupid to not know what Reform stands for.

We have to be global, we have to be internationalists – and I love everyone's support for Palestine, and I am a reparations campaigner myself (I've got one minute left!) – and I extend that global solidarity in the fact that it's important to me, I lobby Parliament, I go into those spaces; again, we don't teach government about genocide: We just call it out. We campaign against it, we make aware that our government is complicit in it.

And look what's happened to Keir Starmer now! And it shows, when we make our activism loud enough, people do topple. I know that they have billionaires on their side – but we do have the loudest voice – we just need to stick together to make it heard.

I'm just gonna leave you all with the last point, in regards to these spaces that we hold, right? We are here to defend each other, right? There is division in our... on the left – we know that – but we're here to stick together. It's the most important thing that we have. It's the most important thing that will get us moving. So, yes – argue with each other – but please: Don't disrespect each other, yeah? We can always have disagreements. Right? Don't disrespect each other, don't bully each other, just please: Let's cut that out. We've got so much work to do, right? So, you know, with all that's happening, all of the raids and all of the riots, and Tommy Robinson think he can take over central London whenever he feels like it? Come on, let's get with it, people, yeah?

Love you all, solidarity to all, and thank you so much for inviting me just to give this little address to you guys.

Solidarity!