

Thank you for considering my complaint about civil matters at state expense.

As a reminder, UC campuses justify law enforcement officer budget and head count by various factors. Although I am far from an expert in the area, I surmise the "need to protect the campus" and the number of protection orders for each campus are strongly correlated in officer head count.

When a faculty member leaves the University and a protection order is given to the faculty member, the officer head count increases by some amount. Thus, departing faculty or staff will increase the officer head count/budget accordingly.

The renewal policy by the administration attempts to assure that faculty have these homage protection orders renewed. It appears they are renewed as a normal policy rather than expire short-lived. This increases the officer counts yearly by the number of retirements or faculty departures leaving for other institutions.

While the term "protection order" is used in the State of California, it remains to be seen if private Universities in other states use this scheme (called a "restraining order" in other states) on former faculty. Harvard and other AAU Universities may use a similar scheme for former faculty. This is worth investigating.

Stanford and other private Universities may not have lawyers that are state funded. This means their time is being used for their Board of Trustees on University business they designate as needed; thus a UC template based on Stanford's policies has different funding sources and consequences. UCOP lawyers are State funded and therein lies a significant difference between what the lawyers should be doing with their time.

A renewal policy that does not remove dead faculty/staff is fraud. Deaths are likely not checked for so the claim this is "legal scheme" is really **fraud**.

Summary:

- 1) Dead man walking victim fraud
- 2) Officer headcount bumpup departure fraud
- 3) Dead/Suspend/Disbar lawyer renewal fraud
- 4) A judge told me "this is a legal order"