

Mr. John Sohn
CRTIU Coordinator
Los Angeles District Office
255 E. Temple Street, 4th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90012

EEOC Charge Number : 480-2014-03014

October 2, 2014

Dear Mr. Sohn:

I am enclosing page 2 of the University committee's decision on my original complaint letter. It was never followed up on yet notice the date of the University letter and page 2. The protection order had to interfere with reappointment; the Bylaws of the University which the Committee on Privilege & Tenure suggest were violated otherwise would have supported a prima facie reinstatement according to the committee. This protection order is ongoing as a form of retaliation and denial of academic rights.

Given the prima facie nature of the reinstatement planned in the P&T letter, the only other reason that a tenured professor would be denied rights this long would be the University used the protection order as ONGOING discrimination as explained in the "Description of Discrimination in the UC System" document. In addition, as changes in yearly staff occur due to retirements etc., the University also failed to keep the list of who I could contact to up to date (called "protection order updates"). For example, according to the UCR web site Mary Johnson is no longer an employee at UCR and there is no updated contact for her (or substitute). This denies my ability to communicate with them after wrongful termination and about wrongful termination and to defend my rights directly in committee on employment benefits. This yearly update of staff contacts concerning benefits was never updated and sent to me with changes that arose and the updates I needed to follow.

Equally disconcerting, the P&T letter asserts a prima facie case for reinstatement was in the offing. How could EEOC 180 day and 300 day rules be adhered to given the P&T letter which suggests they were planning to fix this case? The University is typically prompt with these matters but the P&T letter shows they stalled the employment law longer than my Federal rights by 180 day and 300 day rules. See page 2 of their letter. I did not expect the University to take this amount of time given the University letter from P&T.

The protection order "updates" also suggest a problem that denies rights and the ongoing nature suggests a very recent denial of rights on a day to day basis.

If the University

- violates its own bylaws by not promptly reinstating according to the P&T letter,
- stalls the adjudication past federal time deadlines by not responding on that concern since my 2011 complaint was sent (that I have been made aware of) by attempting to confirm my claim of wrongful termination as prima facie and taking a very long time and never responding to me about it,

- protection order further stalls matters including tenure/emeritus rights and overall employment and direct methods to contact them,
- fails to respond on a prima facie case one would expect a response from or University bylaws were broken and so one would necessarily expect a response either way promptly to preserve my timelines with your agency,
- deadlines set in the letter indicate an internal date for all to reply but no external date I would expect to hear from them about the matters resolution,
- lengthy time adjudication of this matter that stall and deprives me of rights become my negligence by Federal standards because they did not respond
- why is it the victim (me) to be assumed to be negligent for lack of timely filing rather than the University stalling, delaying and not responding to my complaint causing me to lose these rights to be the problem?

I hope you can factor these issues into the exception letter I requested in an earlier email.

Sincerely,
Brett D. Fleisch, Ph.D.