

Four Fraud complaints Brett D. Fleisch, Ph. D.

Background

An “homage” is given to faculty that are leaving the University. Each contributor writes a passage. In the one I have there is no common incident or complaint. Each is an independent anecdote and there is no connection between them except the faculty member's departure. Each has four testimonials called “homages”.

What is in an homage? Any story will do apparently. So, "We'll miss you Dr Hsu" is an homage one might encounter. Any story can get signed. There is flexibility because what is written may never be read by those officials signing the document. In one case, an administrator is rumored to have said that they don't read the testimonials to preserve the privacy of the faculty member. This is similar to a student saying they didn't read the textbook to preserve the privacy of the author. It's administrative stupidity. After one judge read the homages the judge asked “what's this all about?” The answer provided is: “it's for the University”. But really it's a civil matter. So the fraud is that it “is” for the University but really it is not (for law enforcement). Civil matters should not be prepared by University lawyers; it's not University business. However, Captain Lane's (or equivalent law enforcement official) signature means the lawyers are involved. An EVC or Assistant EVC(Executive Vice Chancellor or equivalent on each campus) signs off that the faculty member is not employed and his/her emeritus rights have been discarded by his signature.

Usually two staff and two faculty participate in an “homage”. This indicates the protection order (the end product) is designed for administrative needs. At this stage in the document, the purpose is for reclamation of space on campus after the faculty member leaves. Recall eventually the lawyers add their legal brilliance **without an investigation** based on speculation and their legal insights (or use of unreferenced notes from an administrator). In mine, I did not resign. So by adding their legal brilliance we notice they never check their facts. But it's not important to check facts because there are few of these documents that have been carefully investigated by the lawyers or officers.

The "homages" used when non-tenured faculty leave or tenured faculty resign are put in for staff awards later. They may be submitted with a complete resume of accomplishments. Before that, they then become an administrative tool to secure rights that otherwise the faculty would have. The staff may be dismissed (unbeknownst to them) later because of the fraud. In fact, I speculate if one were to conduct an investigation of staff across the University -- most were dismissed from “homages” which are a violation of faculty rights. The average MSO lasts very few years compared to Universities that do not conduct this fraud.

For years the staff may have told the faculty it's for a "staff award". The paperwork travels thru the bureaucracy. It is used to disparage a faculty members emeritus rights or secures a final decision on a non-tenured faculty member that becomes irrevocable. This is because the civil procedure used as part of the fraud will be seen as more important than academic regulations or employment law. The civil order is purportedly done for “campus safety”. The faculty are duped into signing the homages that have:

- no judicial watermarks,
- without a box for a name, and
- without an attestation line "under the penalty of perjury".

A campus law enforcement officer not only signs it at the end of the paperwork trail-- the signature can be used to affirm a law enforcement “need” for the protection order. In fact, the administrative -law enforcement "bait switch" is a concern of the fraud.

Recall this is a civil order the campus officer has no need to participate in. If there is a need for law enforcement use of protection orders one assumes that the officer is called on for an in-person incident. The later is a law enforcement protection order. The four testimonials (or appropriate number) are written by the officer themselves. This differs from an homage; homages are part of an administrative document. Again, this is administrative-law enforcement bait switch.

As the paperwork moves thru the bureaucracy it ends up on a commissioner's desk (a form of lay judge). The TPO count fraud assures judges sign the orders as explained in the proof at brettfleisch.com/Whosigns.pdf. The fact an officer usually brings it over helps.

The specifics of the fraud complaint are bait and switch "law-enforcement vs administrative needs" when given to faculty or the judge duped into signing. This makes an homage a form of irrevocable denial of rights for a rationale called a "need to protect the University". This is a form of fraud when administrators are stealing offices or academic rights. Finally, baiting a faculty member could mean a staff award so assume some creativity.

Some judges sign homages as a favor to the UC system. While favor is a strong word, no investigation or hearing may have ever have been conducted. This is appalling given the homage-protection orders are used to disparage the faculty member and secure rights that otherwise go thru the Charges Committee on campuses. The fraud of law enforcement need may be used as the rationale for the protection order when given to the judges. Otherwise, the judges would probably not sign these documents. As mentioned earlier, a counting fraud assists.

A faculty member on each campus (one or more) decides if your rights are abrogated by administrative decisionmaking. Please see www.brettfleisch.com/Synopsis.pdf for an example. In that example, the University fired me and called it a resignation. Then to confirm their own brilliance a "complaints manager" secures the fraud with a disparaging and unethical proof I resigned. Recall homages are used also on non-tenured faculty since they are not renewed; under employment law most have "no causes". Thus, the University needs an homage to protect the University from employment challenges or administrative challenges. The best resort is after resignation is to argue former faculty become innately "dangerous people". This assures the University will not lose an office for full-time use or challenge tenure denial.

Complaints

Brett "no cause" Fleisch registers the following complaints about being fired:

1) Please see the resignation fraud on my web site. See www.brettfleisch.com/Synopsis.pdf and Reference articles therein

2) Please see the protection order fraud described on my web site. The Description at

A description at: www.brettfleisch.com/short_packinglist2.pdf

Describes how the staff reclaims office space after faculty resign. Faculty participation is fraud as the faculty member thinks it's for "a staff award". The University has not investigated the civil fraud but in this case and in most it's evolved to a felony complaint for 18 USC 242, misuse complaint and fraud.

This administrative matter becomes a civil order through signatures obtain thru administrative means and then brought over by law enforcement officers that think the reason is for things other than their true purpose. This is a form of fraud.

Non-tenured faculty may also receive these civil complaints that are fraud. By claiming these homages are to protect the campus and for law enforcement these faculty can be is dismissed without causes. Using the homages in civil orders means simply that employment law challenges can be thwarted by saying the homages take precedence rather than employment law challenge. Safety of the University prevails and is used to firmly dismiss those --even those without employment causes(nontenured).

3) Please see the Judicial count fraud by the lawyers that wrote a protection order against me. Note one is now a judge but my complaint is valid because before becoming a judge the felony was conducted on me. Thus, the judicial record Governor Brown signed based upon for appointment should include felonies committed before the appointment to the judicial position and not accounted for. Thus, the position could be appointed based on a record of fraud for misuse of protection orders not accounted for.

The fraud proof is to increase the TPO count on the judges at:

www.brettfleisch.com/Whosigns.pdf

4) the UC lawyers hand out a “philosophy of UC protection orders” document which is another form of fraud. It is meant to explain how the University will not tolerate abusers and will enforce these orders till the end of time. I call it "abusive people will not be tolerated". Meanwhile they give it to judges and legal parties. This document does not apply and its fraud. Remember the staff use the protection order to reclaim office space and make administrative arguments. In short, the thief accuses the victim and the lawyers hand this out without investigation. The document is a form of abuse and fraud made to look official by the University. It doesn't apply to the legal case but it's a nice philosophy that doesn't apply. It's fraud. “Bait and switch” administrative-law enforcement needs is the concern here. Arguing for “protection of the University” is to make the administrative decisions irrevocable.

This document and information below are whistleblower complaints.

See also:

The Use of Flagrantly Poor Paperwork for Civil Orders (Protection Orders) in the State of California V 1.0 at

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1GhDKzAAgADuAi-0vySPrcq1U2J1tibQwMjLysElebKQ>

(This document origination date can be determined. No Fear Act complaints from Fleisch ongoing.)