

U.S. Department of Justice
Civil Rights Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Office of the Assistant Attorney General, Main
Washington, D.C. 20530

December 8, 2015

Dear USDOJ:

Enclosed are three letters for review. In the one letter, I show legals "connecting the dots wrong" by simply using David Funder's proof that I resigned as the basis of a protection order against me to obtain office space. In addition, Funder's proof bypassed internal procedures at the University of California and violated Regents Orders and University Bylaws.

The protection order made statements by the legals that I resigned. This is a false statement. In addition, I show the proof of Funder, which is the basis of the UC case and the DAs case against me, specious. David Funder's proof is both legally incorrect and wrong in computer security terms as well. The protection order itself was poorly constructed. They do not include a copy of the resignation letter. Even if they did, a competent judge would have struck the order because it was not legally submitted with notarization and proof of a complete chain of custody. Moreover, evidence of wrongdoing on their part can be found at <http://www.brettfleisch.com/9-8-10UCRDecision.pdf>.

A protection order with legally incorrect statements written by legals should not be the basis of convictions associated with violating a "protection order". These violations occur when arrests arise from "contempt of court" charges. In my case, Judge Moyner recused Frank Stanton Peasley and signed the order not in my presence. A judge appointed the public defender who declares doubts about my competency without looking over the order and its evidence, including a copy of the resignation. I declared my attorneys were incompetent in a Marsden motion the judge did not put into evidence/transcripts and properly consider in the courtroom.

The FAQ on homages, which I believe shows violation of emeritus rights of the faculty is found at www.brettfleisch.com/FAQ.pdf These homages are a violation of faculty rights to secure space internally, when homages. The homages when placed in protection orders become illegal use of a "protection order" and a felony in the State of California. Although I prefer to think of this as an 18 USC 241 or 242 violation under 2nd ammendment rights, the State of California has state codes about protection order misuse that are felonies.

The University Lawyers: Kulkarni, Robinson, Petrokokis, etc to have assisted in writing about against University faculty. Even if a faculty member resigns, emeritus rights are curtailed with protection orders and a policy from the Office of the President. I believe there is significant use of these homages as explained in my statement at www.brettfleisch.com/packinglist.pdf I also believe the time I served in jail because of this does not match the time stipulated in the court room by my incompetent attorney's stipulation of 340 days. In addition, a report ordered by Judge Johson redone was never completed and left incomplete by the time I left the courtroom.

At the Federal level, the NSF NoFear Act comments and UC Whistleblower comments about denial of rights and loopholes are mentioned at my web site. Search the "table of contents" for the issues and problems not discussed herein. The loopholes in the UC Whistleblower policy can be a source of concern in the letters written. In addition, OPM was notified but may not be listening to the twitters of these problems.

A letter about reinstatement was sent to the White House. This was not answered despite the over three years of federal service and reinstatement rights explained at OPM.

The Sylvia Spenser rebuttal of NSF decision under No Fear is explained in www.brettfleisch.com/NSF1.pdf and that dropped thru the discrimination cracks at NSF (based on discussions Terri Sisley) and the prohibited personnel issues at OSC. There should be two reinstatements at issue herein. These explained in my earlier letter(s). The letter addressed to Shaub at the Office of Government Ethics shows that office not upholding its earlier memos and not responding to the complaints. Also, I mention in the letter to the President of the United States a violation of the No Fear Act wrt annual disclosures to former employees.

Sincerely yours,

Brett D. Fleisch, Ph.D.