

In May 2011 I went into the office and the staff, who I found out later may have also put in a "protection order" against me, said "we processed your resignation". UC thought I wasn't clear if I wanted to be fired by the Department Chair (or staff) downloading a resignation and terminating my appointment.

I complained at the time that the action should be undone promptly via email. UC responded with "you can't retract your resignation". A moot point. I never tendered it. In fact, tendering a resignation was never requested. Further, no voicemail will substantiate a claim that I suggested someone else tender my resignation.

I submitted a complaint. The hyperlink to the response from the complaint is <http://www.brettfleisch.com/SOC.pdf>. However, the UC system didn't answer my complaint when they said they would; instead incorrect officials answered not conforming to the Bylaws. In fact, it has not been answered correctly to this date. Privilege and Tenure did not respond.

This administrative incompetence required that I sign into the retirement system until they figured out what they were doing. In addition, Mary Johnson said I would lose the annuity if it went beyond a year. I did wait six months. Still no answer to date on the P&T document.

Only a committee decision can be accepted for a tenure matter. In this case a Professor of Psychology (a complaint manager) wrote me with a specious proof that I resigned and fired me without cause. Moreover, short circuiting the tenure process with a complaint manager making ridiculous adjudications makes little sense. See "Lunacy in Action" in the Table of Contents at my web site www.brettfleisch.com. See also proof links that follow that refute the logic of UC administrative aplomb. UC Bylaws must support a complaints manager but unfortunately Regents Order and Bylaws were broken.

The protection order misuse complaint went in to the FBI, the DA. It was used to obstruct justice. It has a suggested investigation method and is explored at <http://www.brettfleisch.com/investigation.pdf> The mechanics of the fraud conducted on faculty is explained at <http://www.brettfleisch.com/packinglist.pdf> There would be no reason that my office inquiries over the years would be "a personnel matter".

The stale data in this "protection order" and other factors caused an arrest where they drove me to campus and interrogated me there. I have no idea why they drove me to campus to interrogate me. A botched search arrest was conducted on campus rather than the start point.

The investigation interrogation was defective. The protection order could not be figured out by the investigator, me, or the judges due to the fraud in the complaint. I haven't been to UCR since 2011 otherwise. Please see "homages" on my web site in the Table of Contents.. It is rather apparent, due to lack of emeritus offices for the faculty, a form of fraud was employed to deny faculty rights when faculty resign¹ for many years. It's rather well explained now in documents at my web site. Defective investigations that fail to debug the paperwork construction methods abounds.

This fraud against a faculty member who never legally resigned needs to end. The UC regents case and arrest should be vacated as explained to the DA months ago in a letter never acknowledged as received nor investigated <http://www.brettfleisch.com/hestrin.pdf> See also [hestrin2.pdf](#) and [hestrin3.pdf](#) and [doj1.pdf](#). I argue the misuse of civil orders is rampant in the California legal system due to UC lawyers that are negligent in their production; they failed to understand the use these orders for space reclamation and possibly uniformly against Assistant Professors not tenured.

¹ From certain units bypassing the campus lottery for resources

The UC policies went further to "game" protection orders as explained in <http://www.brettfleisch.com/Whosigns.pdf> and further violated academic rights. It is no coincidence that the number of TPOs is more than normal for these homages.

The [informal Brady](#) complaint at my web site says even if the lawyers were unintentional, prejudice ensued. The Whosigns complaint is easily made a Brady complaint. The fraud by gaming the TPOs is the most innovative part of the UC fraud and the associated convictions and outstanding bench warrants caused by specious practices wrt the civil law. These also deny emeritus rights. See the three conditions in the Brady motions that are required. Focus on b) for the UC lawyers and the Whosigns complaint.