

G Blanche
10 Avon St
Cymmer
SA13 3LT

Claim Number: K19ZA750

17th December 2023

To Beth Cara

Please can you explain to the claimant and court, how in any future defence to all the claim, and whilst asking the court to set aside a default judgement, you will deal with withholding of documents by your client?

As you might be aware, withholding documents to cause someone a loss, is a party to fraud, and in this case it has happened several times.

To help you with this, and to bring this case to a swift end and not waste any more time for all concerned, I believe you need to address the following as a matter of urgency, before proceeding any further. If you do not, it is going to be the first thing I will need to bring to the court's attention.

1. There is a withheld document by the chairperson which is fatal to any defence. This document would have been sent to the external examiner by the chairperson on most likely the 4th or 5th of June 2022. Mr Blanche alerted the Research support lead on the 4th of June 2022, with a request for 'minutes of the viva'. This would have triggered the chairperson into action, and he would have sent his first draft of his and the University's report to the external examiner, and the first modification of the chairperson's document was at 17.27pm on the 5th of June 2022 (see below). The document the chairperson withheld during FOI requests is the University's first draft of the Addendum report authored by the chairperson. To not share and deny the existence of this document and withhold this document is fatal to any defence. It must exist as the external examiner is only a modifier of the subsequent document, Decision_revisions_required_DW, created on 6th June, although first modification is on the 5th (I can explain everything about how they produced the reports, they left all the evidence to track). The screenshot below, is of the document saved by Mr Widanalage, with a different name given to the document, to the original document he received from the chairperson the previous day. It is more than likely the external examiner added, '_DW' to the original title of the chairperson's document as the chairperson names future documents, 'Decision_revisions_required'.

Decision_revisions_required_DW - Read-Only • Saved to this PC

geoffrey blanche

Info

Decision_revisions_required_DW

C:\Users\geoffrey\AppData\Local\Temp\Temp430270b3-8de1-4f0c-a9ae-a95a8fe92550_OneDrive_2023-08-07.zip\GB SAR 076

Upload Share Copy path Copy local path Open file location

Read-Only Document

This file has been opened in read-only mode. Changes cannot be made to the original file.

Save As

Protect Document

Control what types of changes people can make to this document.

Inspect Document

Before publishing this file, be aware that it contains:

- Revisions
- Document properties and author's name
- Characters formatted as hidden text

Check for Issues

Version History

View and restore previous versions.

Properties

Size: 23.1KB

Pages: 3

Words: 1253

Total Editing Time: 321 Minutes

Title: Add a title

Tags: Add a tag

Comments: Add comments

Related Dates

Last Modified: 06/06/2022 17:42

Created: 06/06/2022 17:11

Last Printed:

Related People

Author: HS Huw Summers

Add an author

Last Modified By: WD Widanalage, Dhammika

Decision_revisions_required_DW Properties

General Summary Statistics Contents Custom

Created: 06 June 2022 17:11:00

Modified: 10 August 2023 10:51:00

Accessed: 10 August 2023 10:51:00

Printed:

Last saved by: Widanalage, Dhammika

Revision number: 3

Total editing time: 321 Minutes

Statistics:

| Statistic name | Value |
|----------------------------|-------|
| Pages: | 3 |
| Paragraphs: | 28 |
| Lines: | 121 |
| Words: | 1253 |
| Characters: | 7290 |
| Characters (with space...) | 8531 |

OK Cancel

The external examiner failed to author any document, failing in his professional duties, and ignoring the rules he has a duty of care as a public officer to perform. He was coerced into this by the university but also a willing participant. This is known as all documents have been received from the university according to the university. It is not the chairperson's duty to author reports. From the rules we have:

1.2 Chair of Examining Board

The Chair of the Board shall be **independent in the examining process** and shall be responsible to **the Postgraduate Research Committee** for the conduct of the examination. The Chair of the Examining Board is required to chair the oral examination and any meeting of the examiners. **Have a clear understanding of the University's regulations and procedures.**

[This rule tells us:

1. The examiners are to examine and write and produce the reports.
2. The rule states the chair should be independent from the examining process and is responsible to the PGR committee for the conduct of the examination, i.e. the rules are properly applied. The chair states in pre viva meeting:

“my role is just to manage process, ensure it’s conducted according to the university’s procedures, its rigorous and fair, it’s the examiners role to examine, right? So I take no part in the actual examination side, I’m just there as I say, to manage the process.”]

This we know from the very specific rules and procedure stated in the rules, which I sent you. See rules 18 and 19, which define what the chair should do, his role is then complete unless there is an appeal, when he is required to write a report (rule 13), which he did not do. The chairperson clearly admits in the pre viva meeting, which I sent you, he knows the rules and the expected procedure,. This is an admission by the chairperson, with this evidence the proof he did know what he was doing but then went and wrote the reports on behalf of the PGR committee anyway. He then goes on to claim in the complaints process interview with Billy Seagrim, this is ‘normal practice’. Let me be honest with you now, the analysis gets a lot worse (if it could) for your clients.

There is evidence of an attempted cover up, but I will sit on this for now.

The examiners believe that a focused report, limited to presentation and explanation of the temperature-dependent battery performance could potentially meet the requirements of an MSc and will therefore consider a resubmission if made by the 30th May 2023.

The re-submitted thesis MUST meet all of the requirements listed below:

1. The author will remove with immediate effect the presentation of this thesis in the public domain: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/356042013_Endothermic_electricity
Following examination this document is found to be in error. It does not represent the views of Swansea University and should not be used to suggest otherwise.
2. The thesis title is: **An Investigation of the Photoelectric Effect to the Endothermic Electric Effect during the Electric Field** Widanalage, Dhammika, 05/06/2022 17:27:00 added: effect has not been studied chapter on the be changed. The photoelectric effect has not been studied
3. ~~A summary chapter on the of~~ relevant standard models of battery operation, how a battery generates heat as irreversible and reversible heat and the including temperature effects, should be presented so that the experimental data can be assessed in reference to accepted knowledge of the device under study.
- ~~3-4.~~ The above chapter must include a section explaining the battery entropy coefficient and how it plays a part as a reversible heat source term behaving either as an exothermic or endothermic heat source term (based on the state-of-charge the battery is at).

Widanalage, Dhammika
Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.63 cm, No bullets or numbering

3. The word document of the appeal outcome pdf letter by Gemma Wilkins was withheld due to the university not wanting to reveal who modified the document. For your information there should be no person modifying the Director's nominee's outcome letter, a clear fraud to the rules.

To:geoffblanche@yahoo.com

Thu, 3 Aug at 14:08

Dear Geoff

I write in reply to your request dated 7th July 2023 for your personal data under the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), specifically documents held by members of Academic Services. The GDPR places an obligation on the University when holding personal information to provide a copy of that information (unless an exemption applies) to the individual concerned on request.

Response to your Personal Data Subject Request

The searches undertaken revealed that personal data relating to you is processed by or on behalf of Swansea University. From the details you have supplied in your request, the information the University is required to supply under the provisions of the Regulation can be found here: GB SAR 078 . The link is password protected with your DOB in the format dd/mm/yyyy

The University is entitled to rely on an exemption where it is unable to comply with a request without adversely affecting the rights and freedoms of others. Accordingly, certain documents containing personal data relating to other individuals have been withheld relying on Paragraphs 16, Schedule 2, Part 3 of the DPA 2018 to protect the rights of these individuals.

The University has not included two of the documents for the following reasons:

'The word document made by Gemma Wilkins the PDF was produced from, the appeal outcome letter dated 29/09/2022 with full text' – this document has been modified by a junior member of staff and it would not be in their expectation for their name to be disclosed as part of a SAR Response.

Further information


If, upon receiving a response to a written request for information, you are dissatisfied with the outcome, you are entitled to appeal against the decision reached by contacting dataprotection@swansea.ac.uk

If you have any questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me using the details below.

Kind Regards

Lisa Hughes

3, The filler pdf, sent to the chairperson by Clare Goss has been withheld. A copy of this was requested and denied.



4. It is also believed, as seen in the claims, a word version of this pdf Clare Goss authored, also exists, and is denied existing by the university, and has been withheld.

It is vital you get to the root of this request immediately before you proceed with anything else. This evidence is fatal to any defence. Your client cannot lie or gaslight their way out of these claims, and to try to do so in a defence in court, will cause you and your firm serious professional damage.

When you have achieved this, we can then move on to settling the damages required.

Regards

Geoff Blanche

07429 925970