

Synopsis:

In 2011, my Department Chair fired me (or a misguided staff member) without cause and claimed I resigned. I promptly complained and the committee on Privilege and Tenure responded there would otherwise be a prompt reinstatement. Nonetheless, Privilege and Tenure was short-circuited by a Professor in charge of complaints who fired me a second time, a form of "rubber stamper".

To claim my emeritus office the University used a "protection order". Use of these for this administrative purpose, under law, is *frivolous*. The denial of emeritus rights denies the right without consent and ends up requiring legal redress by the faculty member. Moreover, the resignation paperwork(see exhibits) shows events sequenced in a manner to deny my revocation of the resignation I never tendered. The exhibit shows using an obsolete date, in the past, (denying present dated revocations as late). Later staff attempted to move the date forward to the present date of email notifications of events. Unfortunately, later without a power of attorney to change the outdated document. This produced an irrevocable document whereas normally 48-72 hours would be allowed to revoke it had the date of email notification been used.

To summarize, I was fired without cause, through administrative incompetence and incorrect University procedures. The Chair's download (or unknown staff member's download) of my resignation does not fit the legal definition of a resignation per the article in the references. I did not resign. Moreover, the events indicate I never appeared and no "procedural safeguards" was used. This is because an obsolete posted copy of resignation paperwork was used instead of me tendering voluntarily a current, originally-signed document, in-person. Quite frankly, since I was not present when I was fired, the exact staff member that fired me was never disclosed.

Evidence suggests the MSO took credit in RIC1110397 for the download of a photocopy and giving it to the Chair. The Chair took credit for the download in the email exhibit in references. But, lastly, a third party could have been involved and heard the voice memo; both parties do not affirm hearing the voice memo themselves. The exhibits can mislead one to believe both acted on *hearing* the voice memo. In fact, a third party may have told the MSO to perform these acts. Employment causes associated with past events (for staff) may be the reason the third party told the MSO to do this. No power of attorney to change the dates on obsolete documents was granted to faculty or staff.

REFERENCES:

www.brettfleisch.com/Bhuyan.pdf
www.brettfleisch.com/SOC.pdf
www.brettfleisch.com/Resignations-PB.pdf
www.brettfleisch.com/9-8-10UCRDecision.pdf
www.brettfleisch.com/Nugget.pdf
www.brettfleisch.com/exhibits-2.pdf
www.brettfleisch.com/fleisch_vitae.pdf

Also review:

www.brettfleisch.com/statement2.pdf

The above documents are hyperlinked and hyperlinks *should be looked over*.