

The University Administration, at UC, Riverside, did several incompetent things that violated Regents orders and University Bylaws in 2011. These were never investigated by the administration. The University lawyers also were not diligent to investigate the claims. Consequently, Robinson, Kulkarni, Petrokokis[sic], Barton all should be replaced.

1. UC issued a report that a faculty member could not retract their resignation. Since it was never tendered by me, it was a moot point. It had no bearing on the issues. I did issue an email that "the actions" should be undone.

2. UC ignored the fact that the Administration was admonished by Dr. Ran to correct the problem of resignations not being "legal" and being misinterpreted by UC administrators. My so-called resignation was a "firing". Dr. Bhuyan decided to fire me; he needed to replace a lecturer apparently. I complained and the P&T complaint was later answered by a "complaints manager" instead of P&T.

3. UCR then had this same "complaints manager" instead of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure adjudicate the complaint instead of Privilege and Tenure. See the document at [www.brettfleisch.com/SOC.pdf](http://www.brettfleisch.com/SOC.pdf). Note that the committee said they planned a response by October 2011. Instead, a Professor of Psychology, relatively incompetent in the legal aspects, decided it was a resignation to have another faculty member fire me. He did not read the journal article that explains the matter and did not relate the prima facie evidence cancelling whatever Laxmi did. He just fired me again.

Overall, this violated my academic rights. The disparaging report was an interoffice memo that made no sense. Furthermore, it had the most derogatory statements in it that I have ever seen to insult me. After working at UC, Riverside for over 19 years, this administrator decided that I would cause a "lockdown of the entire campus" if I were to "come back" because the staff put in anecdotes to reclaim my office space with a "protection order" that were disparaging.

The protection order claimed:

1. nothing by Dr. Bhuyan that fired me....it was a blank page,
2. I had a broken fire alarm according to Jackie Li,
3. and Tom Payne said I was "preoccupied".
4. The final page was from Amy Ricks who was told a confidential story about a joke because Laxmi fired me. I assumed the firing was a joke. I told her we were to never do an eye for an eye joke because it could be misunderstood. Never repeat that story then. Ok? Understood? So what does she do? She promptly puts the story into written prose and uses it as her section of the "homage" to reclaim my office space. The story never happened and I told her that she shouldn't repeat what I said because the joke could cause harm. She did just the opposite. Look for statements like "**but that never happened**" in her story.

The four stories in the protection order had no common complaint. No competent lawyer would have put these independent anecdotes together. There was no common incident report. The process **should** go through through the Committee on Charges. UCR did the wrong thing and charged me with absolutely nothing because I did nothing wrong. So it couldn't go thru the Committee on Charges and would have been discarded.

The reason for my protection order is because the protection orders are being misused. When faculty resign or there is a purported resignation, the protection orders are being used for space reclamation on campuses. This material shows incompetence in managing tenure rights at UCR and misusing protection orders without investigation at the UCOP system offices by the four lawyers mentioned earlier. The UC Police may be signing these civil orders, an abuse of their badges. Likely they don't read them nor investigate them. More to the point, the fraud in the construction and during construction besmirches the law enforcement officer

that attests legal construction by the signature when in fact the piecemeal cross-purposing leads to construction fraud.