

November 28, 2025

BY E-MAIL

TO: Bell local unions and subsidiaries

**SUBJECT: Arbitral decision
Grievances challenging the mandatory vaccination policy**

Dear colleagues,

As you know, the arbitration hearing concerning the grievances filed in respect of the mandatory vaccination policy at Bell and its subsidiaries concluded on July 18, 2025, following 20 days of hearings during which our lawyer, Me Catherine Massé-Lacoste, did a tremendous job.

The arbitral decision was rendered by Arbitrator Francine Lamy on November 24, 2025. The French¹ and English versions of the decision are attached hereto.

The arbitrator's conclusions can be found on the last two pages of her decision and read as follows:

DECLARES that Bell's mandatory vaccination policy and its application are generally reasonable up to its suspension in June 2022, with the exception of the circumstances listed below and subject to unresolved issues;

DISMISSES grievances 25-712-2021 filed by Andre George, Bell Canada and B8284-002-F filed by Natacha Duquette – Expertech, who complied with the policy;

DECLARES that unpaid leave is a reasonable administrative measure, except in special circumstances;

DECLARES that the employers acted unreasonably in placing unvaccinated employees assigned to work exclusively from home on unpaid leave;

¹ The French version is the official version.

DECLARES that the determination of exclusive telework arrangements must be made on a case-by-case basis;

UPHOLDS grievance 6001-2022-0005 filed by Ifrah Maca, Bell Canada;

UPHOLDS grievance 6000-2022-0007 filed by Julie Lebreux, Bell Canada;

UPHOLDS grievance 6003-2022-0013 filed by Alexandre Gauthier, Bell Canada

CANCELS the administrative measures imposed on these three employees;

ORDERS the employer to pay them for lost wages, with interest, and to recognize their rights and benefits under the applicable collective agreement;

DETERMINES that Alexandre Gauthier is entitled to damages to compensate for the moral prejudice caused by Bell Canada's unreasonable conduct towards him;

DISMISSES the main claims concerning the unreasonable nature of the mandatory vaccination policy and its application to Martin Poirier, Bell Canada, grievance 82-84-0019-O; Roosevelt Jr Riboul, Bell Canada, grievance 8284-0048-O; Werner Prochnau, Bell Canada, grievance 0098-2022-0162; Thimothé Bessette, Expertech, grievance X-75-019G; Rémi Nantel, Expertech, grievances X8284-26G, X8284-58G; Patrick Dubé-Bourgeault, Expertech, grievances X0745-008G, X0745-018G, Marco Roy, Expertech, grievance X75-009G; Alexandre Martin, Expertech, grievance X8284-030G, Sebastian Rodriguez, Expertech, grievance X8284-036G; Calvin Dutton, BST, grievance 2022-1996-175; Francis Paquin, Bell Canada, grievance 75-006O; Samuel Cook, BTS, grievance 93-333G; François-Xavier Martel, BTS, grievance 81-2022-0013; Mathieu Labelle, Expertech, grievance X8284-038G, Dustin Neff, BTS, grievance 2022-43-06, but **RESERVES JURISDICTION** on the unresolved issues mentioned below, to the extent that they are raised by these grievances;

DISMISSES the main claims concerning the unreasonable nature of the mandatory vaccination policy and its application to Cédric Dansereau, BTS, grievance E-77-382G, but **RESERVES JURISDICTION** on the issue of his temporary assignment to telework;

DISMISSES the main claims concerning the unreasonableness of the mandatory vaccination policy and its application to David Hervé, grievance 75-003-O, but **RESERVES JURISDICTION** on the issue of natural immunity;

RESERVES JURISDICTION on the 14-day waiting period after vaccination, natural immunity, requests for exemptions under the Canadian Human Rights Act, unresolved issues, damages, quantum, unheard grievances and any difficulties in applying this decision.

Our lawyers are assessing the decision, particularly the impact of the conclusions for grievances not mentioned therein.

It should be noted that more than 300 grievances were filed with respect to the policy and, in order to facilitate the hearing, the parties decided to split the grievances into categories and to present representative cases, with the result that not all of the grievances are cited in the arbitrator's conclusions.

Once our counsel's assessment is complete, a second letter will follow to clarify the scope of the findings and the next steps in the arbitration process and the grievances not mentioned in the findings.

Sincerely,



Jean-Stéphane Mayer
Assistant to the National
JSM/cv_SEPB343



Roch Leblanc
Telecommunications Director