

In Statement 9 of Funder he said “*in response to a “practical joke” he played on Chair Bhuyan.*” (I had one thing in mind, he had another.)

Funder was not specific. Funder went on. Fleisch’s only practical joke was leaving a phone voice memo. Meanwhile Funder is cross examining Fleisch. But Fleisch never did the joke that Funder referred to; Fleisch assumed the joke was voicemail that he was talking about. Funder was referring not to the voice memo but to an event that never happened in real life. Thus, Fleisch was allowed to be confused by Funder thinking of one thing that never happened and Fleisch of the voicemail.

(The practical joke played on Dr Bhuyan was leaving a voice mail to promote or retire him. Laxmi went and downloaded his resignation. This was implied by the conversation. )

Funder said “I told Dr Fleisch that people did not take it as a joke “

I assumed he was talking about the voice mail. Funder was thinking of something that never happened that he implies I did personally.

Recall, Fleisch did not perform any acts of threats and did not do anything threatening.

Funder said “and what he intended to communicate..”

Fleisch responded about the stupidity of having accepted a resignation that was never tendered.

By assisting Professor Funder in his investigation Fleisch highlighted the fact the “practical joke” fired himself which was not the intention of the voice memo. It was a decision of the Administration.

Funder likely concluded Fleisch conducted a “practical joke” which violated a zero tolerance policy. All could now conclude Fleisch admitted fault concerning a practical joke which fit into the policy violation category.

Funder hung up on Fleisch before any rebuttal by Fleisch.