

February 24, 2017

RIC1110397 (and on the other hand Kata's expired felony) are being used to obstruct justice. Nonetheless, what the administrator on campus would say is "it's a personnel matter". The public defender says "it's not your case" and thus obstructs justice. Consequently I conclude the UC administrators may be using personnel matters to obstruct justice, often.

My complaint about cross-purposing should be examined. Cross-purposing affects the construction of the documents and thus the fraud is in construction of the protection order because there is no transparency in the disclosure, routing and construction.

Now, consider. The DAs are elected officials. Why would the DA not look at the protection orders for frivolous ones to dismiss? Possible Reason: UCOP lawyers wrote them. The UC system has political influence on elections of DAs and who they support. THEY, in effect, can influence obstruction of justice and which ones are legally removed. If a DA went on a rampage to stop the obstruction of justice that covers up the felony charges--do you think the UCOP protection orders used to deny emeritus rights -- being dismissed as frivolous would help a DA. Would a DA that dismisses frivolous UCOP protection orders signify any endorsement from UCOP?