

Amy : I do not know Amy very well but she does not follow instructions. Her story about me “did not happen” so its not clear what she reported. There would not be a need for a protection order without her frivolous behavior. She started to pout when I wouldnt provide my target practice targets to her. I told her no. She insisted. I told her no and she looked like she was going to cry. I complained they could be mistaken and should not be used. I was surprised to find them in the protection order.

In a document by David Funder there was a set of statements about events that needs clarification. First, I arrived at the Department and Amy told me that the administration had accepted my resignation. This resignation was never tendered by me and I had promptly told administrators that the resignation should be undone and in another email I told Laxmi that in fact he should work on promoting me to Full Professor instead of downloading resignations. Both were sent within the interval explained in the UCOP documents on resignations and their retraction. The retraction was authorized and I never tendered a resignation. Nor did the involuntary resignation get authorized, in any way, by me.

Amy's statement that the resignation had been accepted was inconsistent with revocation policies for resignations. No resignation had been authorized and whoever terminated my appointment did so by their own decisionmaking and consequently my revocation of the action should have help clarify the resignation should be undone. Since, I did not tender the resignation, it is not clear how such a resignation was accepted. I told Amy that Laxmi must be playing a practical joke. I stated I didnt know Laxmi played practical jokes. So that was odd in my book.

I sat down with Amy and suggested we come up with a practical joke because he fired me. As I was concocting it with her, I stopped myself and told her that it was a bad idea (in other words), that we should not play that joke because it could be considered threatening. Thus, I told Amy to make sure that she did not pursue this matter further and to forget about it. It was a bad idea. What happened in the first paragraph happened in addition. I do not know what events actually happened after I gave her materials she requested but I stated that the materials ***should not be used***. Upon reflection, well after the fact, I realized ***she goaded me out of the materials***. I would assume that she would have thrown the materials away.

I do not know of any events after told her that she should not pursue this. For example, I do not know if she practiced some threatening behavior and blamed it on me. I did not threaten anyone. I told her *at the time* that the reason we would not do it is that it might be considered threatening. I told her the matter should be dropped.

Later, I retrieved documents associated with RIC1110397 that suggested that ***she did not follow the instructions*** and she went around and did EXACTLY THE OPPOSITE. She in fact may have violated the zero tolerance policy at the University and blamed it on me according to her own statements to the Court. There should be little tolerance for this fraud and unethical behavior. More to the point, this was premeditated and I have concerns that she may have conducted this behavior on Randall Hyde as well.

Brett D. Fleisch, Ph.D.