

18/01/2022

Misfeasance in a Public office by staff of Swansea University Corporation.

1.1

University Rules

[Guide to the Examination of Research Students - Swansea University](#)

The university rules are very well defined. These rules are defined in this way as to make sure the procedure is fair, rigorous and devoid of misfeasance. The staff of this university tried to carryout a complex crime but the rules were not obeyed and this exposed the fraud.

Viva Misdoings

Mr Blanche made recordings of the complete viva process. Transcript 2 in the examination rebuttal report (ERR) exposes the false claims made by the examiners and the rule breaking by the chairperson.

1.2

Suspects

Representing the Postgraduate Research Committee/Team of the Engineering Department – This is an unknown committee /team, their identity has been protected under public interest rules by the compliance officer. As explained in the rules, this committee controls the chairperson, examiners and supervisors and are therefore responsible. Perumal Nithiarasu is the head of this committee.

1.3

Supervisors

Zhongfu Zhou, Karol Kalna, Augustine Egwebe, Paul Rees

Examination Board

External Examiner: Dhammika Widanalage

Internal Examiner: Lijee Li

Chairperson: Huw Summers,

Research Lead Support Zoe Perry,

Academic Services

Two unidentified persons referred to as the *Filtering Committee*, Natalie Wathan, Gemma Wilkins, Adrian Novis

Supporting Documents

1. R & R Forms
2. Addendum to R & R forms
3. Examination rebuttal report (ERR)
4. Addendum to rebuttal report
5. Masters of Science by Research
6. 1st Appeal Outcome
7. 2nd Appeal Outcome
8. Vice Recordings of the viva process

1.4 Damages to Mr Geoff Blanche

Censoring career work; Stopping the achievement as a professional qualification; Stopping career development, i.e. PhD study; Ending Career; Gas-lighting, Defamation; discrimination

1.5 Motives

To censor the knowledge in the thesis, which includes historical crimes, energy production using endothermic motor/generator technology. An alternative narrative to the covid19 vaccine, alerting university of death and injury by experimental drugs falsely said to be safe and effective. Concerns about funders of the university not in the public interest.

1.6 Geoff Blanche had applied to undertake a Master's of Science by Research and started study of the endothermic electric effect at Swansea University in October 2019. This discipline allowed for one year of research and one year to write up the report. A draft of the work was submitted to the supervisors in August 2020, and Geoff Blanche received this reply.

"Please note: Joseph Westley Newman, whose work has been universally rejected by all credible scientific examiners, including the American National Bureau of Standards after they thoroughly examined his apparatus. we would, therefore, be extremely wary of endorsing any published work which referred to Newman's 'Energy Machine'. The supervision team does not support to include the work of Joseph Westley Newman in your thesis."

These claims were false, Joseph Westley Newman was a victim of an historical crime which included The National Bureau of Standards, American Patent Office, American Judiciary. There is no supporting evidence to support these claims made by the supervisors, that Newman's machine is not correct, on the contrary, research demonstrates his invention is correct An electric field charge is first endothermic which means the charge gains energy from the system and the environment. Mr Blanche had researched the energy machine and judicial court case of Joseph Westley Newman and informed the supervisors their statement was false and would now include the politics of Newman's story in the thesis work.

1.7 Next Mr Blanche received an email from the supervisors which was deemed as a threat with malice. Experts should be able to understand the truth about Newman's work from the evidence presented to them by the postgraduate student instead of gaslighting Mr Blanche. .

Definition of Gaslighting *psychological manipulation of a person usually over an extended period of time that causes the victim to question the validity of their own thoughts, perception of reality, or memories and typically leads to*

confusion, loss of confidence and self-esteem, uncertainty of one's emotional or mental stability, and a dependency on the perpetrator

Gaslighting can be a very effective tool for the abuser to control an individual. It's done slowly so the victim writes off the event as a one off or oddity and doesn't realize they are being controlled and manipulated.



Zhou Z.

Wed 31/03/2021 13:19

To: BLANCHE G. (946484)

Cc: Kalna K.; Egwebe Augustine.



NITS (Notice of Intention to S...

121 KB

Dear Geoff,

Thank for sending us the form. Please find the attached NITS (Notice of Intention to Submit) form with our comments.

Please note: As you insist to include the disputed parts in your thesis, the supervisor team has to make it clear to you that to submit the thesis in its current form is going against the advice of your Supervisors, and that if you was unsuccessful in your degree that all documentation would be made available, in the event of any appeal.

Best wishes

Zhongfu, Karol and Augustine

There were several zoom meetings, Mr Blanche found the supervisors hostile and the 1st supervisor resigned from the project and was replaced by Paul Rees who was line managed and worked on publications with the chairperson Huw Summers.

1.8 Mr Blanche submitted his final Thesis on October 1st 2021. The next stage was the viva voce. The viva voce was held on Monday 30th may 2022. An oral examination by two examiners with the chairperson as an impartial observer to apply the rules and regulations. Full details in ERR.

Some of University Rules For the Examination

13. Particular Role of Chair of Examining Board

It is the responsibility of the Chair to ensure that the process is rigorous, fair, reliable and consistent with University regulations and procedures. In the event of a review of an examination decision or an appeal, the Chair is required to provide a written report on the conduct of the examination as necessary.

17.3

The Chair should explain the purpose of the oral examination to the examiners and the student. The purpose of the oral examination is:

- *To enable the examiners to assure themselves that the thesis is the student's own work;*
- *To give the student the opportunity to defend the thesis and to clarify any obscurities in it;*
- *To enable the examiners to assess the student's contextual knowledge in his or her particular field of learning.*

15. Report and Result Forms

The Examiners' Report and Result forms are intended as instruments for the reports of the examiners and the Chair of the Examining Board, and are used by the Examining Board to make a formal recommendation to Swansea University on the outcome of the examination process. Examiners are advised that under the terms of Freedom of Information Act 2000, students have the right to request access to any comments made about them in these reports.

2.1

During the viva there was more gaslighting by the examiners and procedural fraud by the chairperson. This all identified in the ERR.

Procedural fraud after the Viva

The first event that should have been carried out after the failure decision by the examiners in viva voce per the rules was:

[19. Informing the Progression and Awards Board](#)

After the oral examination is completed and all sections of the Report and Result Forms have been signed, the Chair should ensure that the original Report and Result Forms are sent to Academic Services immediately. The viva outcome should also be recorded on the Research Management System. The recommendation of the Examining Board must be presented to the Progression and Awards Board for ratification before a result letter can be prepared. Once confirmation that all conditions have been met is received, the student will be informed by Academic Services of the formal outcome of the examination.

[15. Report and Result Forms](#)

The Examiners' Report and Result forms are intended as instruments for the reports of the examiners and the Chair of the Examining Board, and are used by the Examining Board to make a formal recommendation to Swansea University on the outcome of the examination process. Examiners are advised that under the terms of Freedom of Information Act 2000, students have the right to request access to any comments made about them in these reports.

As can be seen from the rules the examiners are supposed to produce two sets of reports.

1. There was no original report filed with academic services immediately, rather, the original R & R forms that was requested by Geoff Blanche from academic services arrived to them from Zoe Perry on the 10th of June and not on the 30th of May.
2. The R & R forms received by academic services were the only report forms produced.

2.2 See below email for request to academic services,



● Geoffblanche <geoffblanche@yahoo.com>

To: Sara Kane



Mon, 22 Aug at 12:12



Hi Sara,
I really need to get my viva report finished as a matter of urgency so i can move on with my studies. If you can respond to this request today that would be great.
Regards
Geoff

▼ Hide original message

On 20 Aug 2022 17:45, Geoffblanche <geoffblanche@yahoo.com> wrote:

Hi sara,
I would just like to thank you for your time over the last month and i have just one more freedom of information request.
1. I require a copy of the original results and report form you received after my oral viva.
2. The time and date you received this.
3. Who sent or gave it to you and how you received it with some evidence.
Regards
Geoff Blanche

Academic services reply



● Sara Kane <s.l.kane@swansea.ac.uk>

To: Geoffblanche

Cc: Jane Lewis Normand



Tue, 23 Aug at 10:53

Hi Geoff,

Please see my responses in red below.

1. I require a copy of the original results and report form you received after my oral viva. **Please see attachments**
2. The time and date you received this. - **10 June 2022 at 13:39**
3. Who sent or gave it to you and how you received it with some evidence. - **Zoe Perry, see below e-mail**

Thanks
Sara

From: Zoe Perry <Z.Perry@Swansea.ac.uk>
Sent: 10 June 2022 13:39
To: Sara Kane <S.L.Kane@Swansea.ac.uk>
Cc: Sinead Hancock <Sinead.Hancock@Swansea.ac.uk>
Subject: R&R Form - Geoffrey Blanche 946484, Resubmission Decision


Dear Sara

Further to our discussion, please see the attached R&R Form and Addendum to the R&R Form for ratification.

Many thanks


Zoë

2.3 On Sat 4th June Geoff Blanche writes to Zoe Perry, requesting the Chair's minutes.



Perry replies at 15.58 on Monday June 6th stating, there are no minutes, and R&R forms will be supplied to the University by examiners any time within the next month.

2.6 External examiner replies and confirms he has no notes and does not produce the reports (forms), his notes show up as a report, he claims, and admits the chair, Huw Summers, is coordinating the feedback and has his notes confirming Huw Summers produces the reports and not the examiners. He also says “hopefully”. He cannot supply Mr Blanche with his notes, or the academic papers he said he could produce to him which he falsely stated during the viva refuted Mr Blanche’s theory, see ERR.



Widanalage, Dhammika <Dhammika.Widanalage@warwick.ac.uk>

To: BLANCHE G. (946484)

Mon 06/06/2022 18:38

Dear Geoffrey,

Hope you had a good long weekend.

You should hopefully receive the feedback (including links to battery entropy coefficient work) soon from our discussions during the viva. The feedback will include that of the internal, external and the chairperson as well.

You will receive this from the university and Huw is coordinating the feedback atm.

Regards,

Dhammika

Dhammika Widanalage | Associate Professor

WMG, University of Warwick | Energy Systems

Coventry, CV4 7AL

Widanalage, Dhammika <Dhammika.Widanalage@warwick.ac.uk>

To: BLANCHE G. (946484)

Tue 07/06/2022 16:15

Dear Geoffrey,

*All documents need to be sent to you via Swansea research office (or equivalent degrees office), I can't directly email to you. My notes appear as the External examination report **which Swansea has**, there is also the Internal examination report as well **(which Swansea will have as well)**.*

Regards,

Dhammika

2.7 According to the external examiner, he had already deposited his notes, and not his report, he did not give anyone a report, and he categorically states this on Monday 6th and Tuesday 7th of June. He also says 'hopefully', he is not writing the forms (reports) which he should, according to the rules. He is under obligation of the Freedom of Information Act 2000, GDPR 2016, to supply Mr Blanche with this information when requested, but he cannot and he doesn't know when the forms will be presented to Mr Blanche. This has all been arranged by Huw Summers and the supervisors to fail Mr Blanche.

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

Huw Summers was coordinating all the feedback and was cc'd in all email correspondence between Mr Blanche and Zoe Perry. Therefore one can only come to one conclusion, Huw Summers wrote the reports with the supervisors as he works with Paul Rees, he had all the notes and he was coordinating the feedback. Huw Summers was acting as the entire examination board and not independent as the chairperson is supposed to be according to the rules and by his own admission in part 1 of the transcript (voice recording). This is the agenda to fail Geoff Blanche if he kept Newman in his Masters work, as previously threatened by supervisors.

Zoe Perry after conferring with Huw Summers in an email on Wednesday the 8th June she is still waiting for the reports from the examiners. More gaslighting.

The screenshot shows an email client interface. On the left is a sidebar with a list of emails. The top email is from 'Employability - Faculty of Scie...' with a subject 'Microsoft Embrace Me...' dated 08/06/2022. Below it is an email from 'Zoe Perry; PGR - Faculty ...' with a subject '> Your Viva - Monday 3...' dated 08/06/2022. The selected email is from 'Widanalage, Dhammika' with a subject '> Geoff Blanche viva' dated 07/06/2022. The main pane on the right displays the content of the selected email. The header of the email is 'Your Viva - Monday 30 May 2022 at 1pm'. The email is from 'Zoe Perry' to 'BLANCHE G. (946484)' and cc'd 'Huw Summers'. The body of the email starts with 'Dear Geoff,' followed by 'Thank you for your email. The notes that Professor Summers made during your viva were to assist him in completing the Chair's Report in the Report and Results form. As soon as that form has been received and ratified therefore, we will provide you with a copy of it.' It then says 'Many thanks' and 'Zoë'. At the bottom, it identifies 'Zoë Perry' as 'Post Graduate Research Support Lead | Arweinydd Cymorth Ymchwil Ôl-raddedig'.

Focused Other 18 Filter

Dear all There is food available in En...

E Employability - Faculty of Scie...
Microsoft Embrace Me... 08/06/2022
Navigating your career can be challe...

O Zoe Perry; PGR - Faculty ...
> Your Viva - Monday 3... 08/06/2022
Dear Geoff, Thank you for your email...
Bay Campus Ma...

WD Widanalage, Dhammika
> Geoff Blanche viva 07/06/2022
Dear Geoffrey, All documents need t...

R [Draft] researchmanagement@swan...
> Swansea University R 07/06/2022

Your Viva - Monday 30 May 2022 at 1pm

Zoe Perry
To: BLANCHE G. (946484)
Cc: Huw Summers
Wed 08/06/2022 10:55

Dear Geoff,

Thank you for your email. The notes that Professor Summers made during your viva were to assist him in completing the Chair's Report in the Report and Results form. As soon as that form has been received and ratified therefore, we will provide you with a copy of it.

Many thanks

Zoë

Zoë Perry
Post Graduate Research Support Lead | Arweinydd Cymorth Ymchwil Ôl-raddedig

2.8 Summary

1. Zoe Perry on Monday 6th June confirms to Mr Blanche he has failed but she has not received the R & R report from the examiners.

2 According to the external examiner, he had already deposited his notes, and not a report, contradicting Zoe Perry. He did not give anyone a report, and he categorically states this on Monday 6th and Tuesday 7th of June. He says 'hopefully', he is not writing or producing the R & R forms as he should have according to the rules. He is under obligation of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and GDPR act 2016, to supply Mr Blanche with this information but he cannot and he doesn't know when the forms will be presented to Mr Blanche. This has all been arranged by Summers and the university to fail Mr Blanche due to the knowledge and content of his thesis.

3 Perry states again on Wednesday the University has not received the R&R forms from the examiners, and Huw Summers notes were for his use only, to complete his part of the forms. Perry was under instruction from Huw Summers what to tell Mr Blanche, and obviously Summers had not completed his writing of the R & R and Addendum forms.

4 Perry states on Friday 10th June to Mr Blanche that he has failed, and says she has the R & R and Addendum forms on this date.

5. Huw Summers was coordinating all the feedback and was cc'd in all email correspondence between Mr Blanche and Zoe Perry. Therefore one can only come to one conclusion, Huw Summers wrote the reports with the supervisors. He had all the notes and he was coordinating the feedback. Huw Summers was acting as the entire examination board and not independent as the chairperson is supposed to be. Agenda to Fail.

6. Zoe Perry was assisting Huw Summers to commit this fraud. Acting as the go between to Mr Blanche.

7. There were no notes shared by any of the examination board, there was a non-existent ORIGINAL R & R FORM that the Chairperson is supposed to log with academic services immediately after the viva. All of the examination board were asked for their notes (freedom of information act 2000) but none of the examination board would share these notes, as there was no original R & R form. Summers kept notes which he would not share during the oral exam

and wrote along with the supervisors, the R & R and Addendum forms that were eventually produced by Perry on the 10th of June.

8. Perry forwarded R & R forms to Sara Kane of Academic services on June 10th.
9. The Internal examiner failed to respond to any emails.

3.1

False Signatures and Forgery of the R & R Forms

What is Signature Forgery?

Signature forgery is the act of falsely replicating another person's name or signature on documents, which is against the law and considered a crime that comes with numerous consequences for someone or their business. The penalties include criminal charges, jail time, documents annulment, money reimbursement for the victim, or more.

[False Signature on Contract: Everything You Need to Know \(upcounsel.com\)](https://www.upcounsel.com/false-signature-on-contract)

- As can be seen in 3.3 below, each examiners and chairpersons signatures are geometrically identical to their own signatures on all sheets that they appear of the R & R forms, NOT SIMILAR, GEOMETRICALLY IDENTICAL.
- The signatures were cut and paste into the documents FROM ONE SET OF SIGNATURES, and this can be seen from the dotted lines UNDERNEATH THE SIGNATURES, they were cut and paste and not wet ink signatures.
- The R & R forms are for specific sections of the examination process and the only part of the forms that should have a pre viva or day of the viva date (as specified in the rules, see 3.2) are 1.1 and 2.
- The specific sections of the R & R documents should have specific dates to show the process of the examination was followed as per rules. Document 3 (the Joint report) being a post viva document and one will notice a handwritten date. The external examiners signature is identical, not similar but identical to the signatures on pre viva document 1.1 dated 20/04/2022 to document 3, which is 6 weeks earlier to the 1.2 doc, 3 doc, and the final signatures section doc dated 30/05/2022. This is an impossibility unless the signature was cut and paste after the viva date 30th May. This shows they colluded together to falsify and produce forged R & R documents.
- Whoever cut and paste the signatures and wrote the reports (chairperson and supervisors) also didn't realise, 1.3 (Matters of General Concern and Interest) was an after viva document as stated in the rules, and put in the wrong date of 20/04/2022.

- This was a pre-meditated and planned crime.

3.2 SWANSEA RULES AND REGULATIONS

18. Process After Viva

The External Examiner should complete Section 1.2 (External Examiner's Report on the Oral Examination), and, if appropriate, 1.3 (Matters of General Concern and Interest).

18.2

The external should then, together with the internal examiner, complete Section 3 (Joint Report by External and Internal Examiners). The report should draw together any disparate views on the thesis which may have been expressed by the examiners in their individual reports. A brief agreed view on the candidate's principal strengths and weaknesses, the approach to the topic, and on the performance at the oral examination might also be expressed.

18.3

The Chair of the Examining Board should complete Section 4 (Report by the Chair of Examining Board), commenting on the conduct of the oral examination and noting any procedural issues. If the examiners have recommended that the thesis should be resubmitted for examination without a second oral examination, a clear justification for this decision should be presented in the Chair's report and should be counter-signed by both examiners

3.3 External Examiners Signatures from R & R forms

1.1 signature and date.

- On Pg 77 you state "hence discharge of the ions..." there is no discharge reactions taking place in these results (the

Name (block capitals) DHAMMIKA WIDANALAGE (External Examiner)

Signature WD Widanage Date 20/04/2022

1.2 signature and date.

Name (block capitals) DHAMMIKA WIDANALAGE (External Examiner)

Signature WD Widanage Date 30/05/2022

1.3 signature and date.

Name (block capitals) DHAMMIKA WIDANALAGE (External Examiner)

Signature WD Widanage Date 20/04/2022

2. Internal Examiners Report

Signature and date

Name (block capitals) Lijie Li (Internal Examiner)

Signature Lijie Date 30 May 2022

3. Joint Report

Signature WD Widanage (External Examiner)

Signature Lijie (Internal Examiner)

Date 30/05/2022

SWANSEA UNIVERSITY

RESULT FORM

Information to Accompany the Outcomes of Examination for the above Degrees

1. NB. If the corrections, amendments or re-submission stipulated are not completed to the satisfaction of the examiners or not submitted for scrutiny within the given time period, then the candidate will be judged to have failed and will be not approved for the award of a degree.
2. Where a re-submission is stipulated, Candidates must pay the relevant re-submission fee.
3. A candidate may be allowed a single opportunity to re-submit the work.

Signature W.D. Widdanage (External Examiner)
Signature Lijie (Internal Examiner)
Signature Joe (Chair of Examining Board)

Date 30/05/2022

3.4 CONCLUSION OF SIGNATURE FRAUD

- The Chairperson did not file the R & R form immediately and was not independent during the examination process as defined by the external examiner, and the rules. The Chairperson was coordinating all feedback, and had all information as stated on the date 07/06/2022, this is 8 days after the oral examination.
- The chairperson and the supervisors produce the only R & R form that arrived at academic services on 10th June.
- The chairperson and the supervisors produced the Addendum form that arrived at academic services. The Addendum form has no signatures at all but claims to be written by the two examiners. The addendum report was produced by the chairperson and the supervisors between the 30th May and 10th June 2022.

For more in depth analysis of the fraud see ERR and Addendum to ERR.

4.1 Appeal Fraud

- The 1st appeal was placed on 30th August 2022
- The outcome was given on 29th September 2022
- The 2nd appeal was placed on the 20th of October 2022
- The 2nd outcome was given on 20TH December 2022

The first outcome decision was on 29th September 2022 - Again the staff did not apply their own rules, to continue to fail the Masters even when evidence was supplied in the form of the ERR report. This shows that this was being orchestrated from the hierarchy of the university. The evidence of the crime is overwhelming and well presented. They failed to act in good faith with a duty of care to Mr Blanche.

The second outcome decision was on 20TH December 2022- Again the staff did not apply their own rules, with a motive to continue to fail the Masters of Geoff Blanche with a drunken approach and abuse of their powers in a public office. The evidence was even more overwhelming this time with an Addendum to the ERR given. After this, there was emails exchanged but Mr Blanche then realised there would be no justice with this corrupt “woke corporation”. Mr Boyle’s academic services appeal office intentionally rejected Mr Blanche’s academic appeal, thereby upholding the decision of the Examining Board and denying Mr Blanche his educational, first theory in endothermic electricity in history.

4.2

Student Cases <studentcases@swansea.ac.uk>

To:geoffblanche@yahoo.com

Thu, 29 Sept 2022 at 12:12

Dear Geoffrey,

Re: Outcome of Academic Appeal

Please see the attached letter from Gemma Wilkins, Student Cases Officer

The Student Cases Team try to password protect correspondence, where possible. Please use your date of birth in the format DDMMYY to access any password protected correspondence.

Kind Regards,

Cath Burns

Cynorthwy-ydd Achos Graddio a Myfyrwyr | Graduation and Student Cases Assistant

Gwasanaethau Academaidd | Academic Services
Rhagenw a ffefrir: Hi/Ei....hi | Preferred pronoun: She/Her

4.3

On 17 Oct 2022 15:39, Adrian Novis <a.c.novis@swansea.ac.uk> wrote:

Dear Mr Blanche

I write further to the outcome of your academic appeal and specifically the letter from my colleague, Gemma Wilkins, to you dated 29 September 2022 whereby you were advised that your academic appeal had been rejected thereby upholding the decision of the Examining Board but in light of the issues raised had been reclassified as a complaint. I note further correspondence from you dated 30 September, 7 October (including additional attachments) and 12 October and in particular your references to an investigation of fraud against the School of Engineering.

I can confirm, following consultation with University Legal Services, that your options are those set out within the letter from Gemma Wilkins dated 29 September 2022, namely, to submit a request for final review against the outcome of your academic appeal and/or to pursue issues raised under the University's Student Complaints procedure. There is no scope under any University procedures for students to initiate fraud investigations. Can you confirm therefore whether it is your wish that matters raised be considered under Stage 2 of the Student Complaints procedure?

kind regards

Adrian C Novis

Director of Academic Services | Cyfarwyddwr Gwasanaethau Academaidd

Academic Services | Gwasanaethau Academaidd

Swansea University | Prifysgol Abertawe

Singleton Park | Parc Singleton

Swansea | Abertawe

SA2 8PP

Phone | Ffôn: +44(0)1792 602447

Email | E-bost: a.c.novis@swansea.ac.uk

Zoom: <https://swanseauniversity.zoom.us/j/8108586526>

4.4

From: Geoff Blanche <geoffblanche@yahoo.com>

Sent: 18 October 2022 12:12

To: Adrian Novis <A.C.Novis@Swansea.ac.uk>

Subject: Re: Outcome of your academic appeal

Hi,

My claims against the suspects of the crimes are well set out in my evidence reports and I also have more evidence to give at a later date if required. It is in your university's best interests to meet my demands. Just to reiterate.

Misconduct in a public office,

Scientific fraud by examination board, academic misconduct by postgraduate research committee, pre meditated procedural fraud with intent to fail, failed to meet gdpr regulations and freedom of information act, examiners did not write reports, no original r and r form, lying in emails to deceive, defamation, trying to coerce me to take an experimental drug with potential death from it whilst claiming it is safe and effective.

It is now for you to decide whether or not you proceed to investigate the actions of the suspects of these crimes. You can call it a complaint if you wish but my claims will not change.

There are other ways in law to bring these serious criminal acts to justice as I'm sure your legal services will inform you. It is quite obvious one person is pulling the strings just by the way you pass the complaint around to a different member of staff each time you write to me. So I will now give you 3 days to decide how you wish to proceed and inform me as such.

Regards

Geoff Blanche

4.5

On Tuesday, 18 October 2022 at 13:41:47 BST, Adrian Novis
<a.c.novis@swansea.ac.uk> wrote:

Dear Mr Blanche

Thank you for your email. To be clear, please confirm that you request that your case be considered under the University' Student Complaints procedure. As I previously stated there are no other University procedures in order that this may be considered, save of course for any request for final review that you may wish to make in respect of your academic appeal.

kind regards

Adrian Novis

4.6

On Tuesday, 18 October 2022 at 19:05:00 BST, Geoff Blanche
<geoffblanche@yahoo.com> wrote:

hi Adrian

just to be clear, does your complaints procedure consider the following:

Misconduct in a public office,

Scientific fraud by examination board, academic misconduct by postgraduate research committee, pre-meditated procedural fraud with intent to fail, failed to meet gdpr regulations and freedom of information act?

If so we can proceed.

Regards

Geoff Blanche

4.7

On Thursday, 20 October 2022 at 22:19:09 BST, Geoff Blanche
<geoffblanche@yahoo.com> wrote:

Hi Adrian,

You have failed to reply, and i did stipulate a time. I therefore must assume your complaints procedure cannot accommodate:

Scientific fraud by examination board, [THIS IS STATED ON THE FRONT COVER OF THE EXAMINATION REBUTTAL REPORT] also, academic misconduct by postgraduate research committee, Misconduct in a public office, pre-meditated procedural fraud with intent to fail, fail to meet gdpr regulations and freedom of information act are concerns.

This is no surprise as the appeal was turned down by Mr Boyle on the grounds of:

“The following shall not be considered grounds for appeal:

- Questioning the academic or professional judgement of the examiners;
- A candidate’s disappointment with a result where marks have been accurately recorded, assessment regulations correctly followed and where no evidence of material irregularity exists;”

I'm left shaking my head at these claims. Even a full investigation of an appeal was rejected under false claims. but this time by the vice chancellor. Although, my claim for appeal is very well laid out in the rebuttal report.

I would like to take this opportunity to point out to you once more that you cannot follow your own rules, for example:

13. Particular Role of Chair of Examining Board

It is the responsibility of the Chair to ensure that the process is rigorous, fair, reliable and consistent with University regulations and procedures. In the event of a review of an examination decision or an appeal, the Chair is required to provide a written report on the conduct of the examination as necessary.

WHERE WAS THE CHAIR'S written report on the conduct of the examination as necessary?

At least this would have given the Chairperson a chance to write a report when he is expected to, rather than the misconduct in a public office we have seen from the Chair AND OTHERS. Mr Boyle should also refer to the claim of an appeal, and obey his own rules when considering an appeal, and then address the appeal in the correct manner. There should be a final review of the decision/outcome in accordance with the Final Review Procedure. In fact i request a final review, take this as a formal request. this is not a request for a complaint procedure.

Regards

Geoff Blanche

4.8

From: Geoff Blanche <geoffblanche@yahoo.com>

Sent: 20 October 2022 22:42

To: Adrian Novis <A.C.Novis@Swansea.ac.uk>

Subject: Re: Outcome of your academic appeal

please find attached docs to go with my final review request.

there is some new evidence attached in the form of the addendum.

Regards

Geoff Blanche

4.9

On Friday, 28 October 2022 at 11:56:51 BST, Adrian Novis
<a.c.novis@swansea.ac.uk> wrote:

Dear Mr Blanche

Thank you for your email and attachments and I can confirm that your final review will now be considered and you will hear from one of my colleagues in due course.

kind regards

Adrian Novis

5.1

On 31 Oct 2022 14:06, Geoff Blanche <geoffblanche@yahoo.com>
wrote:

Hi

I have tried contacting you by phone, but this seems impossible. Please can you tell me the name of your colleague that will contact me and his contact details so i can communicate with this person.

Regards

Geoff Blanche

5.2

Geoff Blanche <geoffblanche@yahoo.com>

To: Adrian Novis

Tue, 1 Nov 2022 at 07:25

Hi Adrian,

I have requested a review of the appeal procedure, as the rules were clearly not followed. This time we shall require the following to be established before any recommendations are derived.

We need to establish with evidence provided, that the examination board was legitimate and assembled within the rules that are laid out in...

<https://myuni.swansea.ac.uk/academic-life/academic-regulations/research-guidance/guide-to-the-examination-of-research-students>

Mr Boyle needs to establish and show and detail the rules and regulations were rigorously followed, before you can apply any more rules governing an appeal.

When this is established to be correct, we then require the chairperson to write a report not Gemma Wilkins or anyone else.

I telephoned you on 31/10/2022 to clarify this but I was only met with an answer phone, so I left a message asking for a call back. I will try to contact you by phone one more time.

Regards

Geoff Blanche

07542 78241

5.3

On Wednesday, 9 November 2022 at 16:20:19 GMT, Student Cases <studentcases@swansea.ac.uk> wrote:

Dear Mr Blanche,

Re: Final Review Acknowledgement

I am writing on behalf of Mr Adrian Novis, Director of Academic Services, in relation to your Final Review application and related attachments which you submitted to Mr Novis on **20th October 2022**.

Mr Novis, or his nominee, will consider your application in accordance with the University's Regulations governing Final reviews and you can find more information at <https://myuni.swansea.ac.uk/academic-life/academic-regulations/conduct-and-complaints/final-review-procedure/>.

Please be aware that we are currently dealing with an exceptionally high volume of work and, therefore, to be realistic, it has been necessary for us to temporarily extended the anticipated completion dates for final reviews. However, please be assured that all cases will still be dealt with as quickly as possible within this timeframe.

At the present time, we anticipate being in a position to provide you with the decision within two calendar months of receipt of your application. Therefore, you could expect to receive an outcome to your final review by **20th December 2022**.

If there is any need to extend this timeframe we will keep you updated and your patience in this matter will be greatly appreciated.

I take this opportunity to remind you that the Students' Union Advice Centre can provide you with free advice and support in relation to your request for final review. Information and their up-to-date contact information can be found at https://www.swansea-union.co.uk/support/advice_support_centre/.

Please also find attached details of support available to you that you may find helpful.

Kind regards,

Kim

Kim Moody

Cynorthwy-ydd ysgrifenyddol/ Student Cases Assistant

Gwasanaethau Academaidd/ Academic Services

5.4

On Wednesday, 16 November 2022 at 09:04:30 GMT, Kim Moody <n.k.moody@swansea.ac.uk> wrote:

Dear Mr Blanche,

Thank you for your email and attachments of 11th November 2022. I note that you have confirmed that you will await the outcome of your final review, which is currently ongoing, and I will file your email and the attachments within your folder for the information of the officer conducting your final review.

Kind regards

Kim Moody

Cynorthwy-ydd ysgrifenyddol/ Student Cases Assistant

Gwasanaethau Academaidd/ Academic Services

5.5

From: Geoff Blanche <geoffblanche@yahoo.com>

Sent: 16 November 2022 10:00

To: Kim Moody <n.k.moody@swansea.ac.uk>

Subject: Re: Final Review Acknowledgement

Hi Kim

please can you forward me the contact details of the officer who is conducting the final review in this open communication process.

Regards

Geoff

5.6

Student Cases <studentcases@swansea.ac.uk>

To: Geoff Blanche

Mon, 21 Nov 2022 at 10:03

Dear Mr Blanche,

Thank you for your email.

As stated in your Final Review Acknowledgement email (thread below):

“Mr Novis, or his nominee, will consider your application in accordance with the University’s Regulations governing Final reviews and you can find more information at <https://myuni.swansea.ac.uk/academic-life/academic-regulations/conduct-and-complaints/final-review-procedure/>.”

I’m sorry I cannot be more specific at this time.

Kind regards,

Kim Moody

Cynorthwy-ydd ysgrifenyddol/ Student Cases Assistant

Gwasanaethau Academaidd/ Academic Services

Rhagenw a ffefrir: Hi/Ei....hi | Preferred pronoun: She/Her

We Are Professional. We Work Together. We Care

6.1

from: Geoff Blanche <geoffblanche@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, January 1, 2023 2:02 PM
To: Natalie Wathan <N.A.Wathan@Swansea.ac.uk>
Subject: Geoff Blanche final review outcome

Hi Natalie,

You have failed to be impartial as you have blatantly ignored evidence i supplied, and you have cherry picked what you based your decision on, for example you state:

*Whilst I have taken into account all documentation which had been submitted to the Committee and which has been provided by you, **my decision does not necessarily refer to all the documentation provided and points raised** .*

“The following shall not be considered to satisfy the grounds for appeal:

- Questioning the academic or professional judgement of the examiners.
- A candidate’s disappointment with a result where marks have been accurately recorded, assessment regulations correctly followed and where no evidence of material irregularity exists.”

The Filtering Committee failed to apply the rules WHICH WAS SUPPLIED TO THEM: PAGE 56 OF ERR.

13. Particular Role of Chair of Examining Board

It is the responsibility of the Chair to ensure that the process is rigorous, fair, reliable and consistent with University regulations and procedures. In the event of a review of an examination decision or an appeal, the Chair is required to provide a written report on the conduct of the examination as necessary.

NO REPORT FORTHCOMING from CHAIRPERSON AND THE FILTERING COMMITTEE AND YOURSELF, IGNORE THIS RULE.

YOU ADMIT YOU Cherry Picked Evidence and ignored other evidence:

THE FILTERING COMMITTEE IGNORED From ERR

THERE WERE *assessment regulations THAT WERE NOT correctly FOLLOWED, AND THERE IS A MOMENTOUS AMOUNT OF evidence of material irregularity, FROM PROCEDURE TO SCIENTIFIC FALSE STATEMENTS , AND WITHHOLDING INFORMATION.*

Chapter 5 Examiners Duties that were not met in Examination Process according to Swansea regulations

Chapter 6 Examination Board Failures

Chapter 7 Emails before and after Viva, except some information extracted by Gemma Wilkins about Zoe Perry lies.

THE EXAMINERS SHOWED FROM THEIR FALSE CLAIMS DISPLAYED IN THE MINUTES THAT THEY HAVE NO ACADEMIC OR PROFESSIONAL JUDGEMENT, THEY PORTRAY GROSS ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT, BUT YOU IGNORE THIS.

I CLAIMED **-Scientific fraud by examination board,** NOT ACADEMIC JUDGEMENT.

[THIS IS STATED ON THE FRONT COVER OF THE EXAMINATION REBUTTAL REPORT]

SEPTEMBER 1, 2022

SCIENTIFIC FRAUD COMMITTED BY EXAMINATION BOARD IN COLLUSION WITH SWANSEA UNIVERSITY STAFF, AGAINST MR GEOFFREY BLANCHE BSc , AND HIS MSc BY RESEARCH.

also, academic misconduct by postgraduate research committee, Misconduct in a public office, pre-meditated procedural fraud with intent to fail, fail to meet gdpr regulations and freedom of information act are concerns.

YOU ALSO GO ON TO STATE:

In the absence of these issues 1-17 having been investigated and determined as being substantiated or not through the complaints process, I am satisfied that the grounds of appeal you relied upon were not supported on the evidence provided to the Filtering Committee, namely:

YOU REFUSE EVIDENCE AS LEGITIMATE EVIDENCE FOR APPEAL, DUE TO THE FACT THAT IT HASN'T BEEN THROUGH A COMPLAITS PROCEDURE?.

I MUST REMIND YOU, THIS IS THE APPEAL PROCEDURE AND I SUPPLIED A REPORT (ERR) WITH SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE AND INFORMATION FOR THIS APPEAL PROCEDURE THAT YOU NOW STATE IS IRRELEVANT?

In summary, I have satisfied myself that the Filtering Committee considered your appeal in accordance with the relevant Academic Appeal Procedures and that the decision of the Filtering Committee to reject your appeal and to reclassify issues raised as issues of complaint, had accorded with the Academic Appeals Procedure and had been reasonable on the evidence provided to the Filtering Committee.

NO REASONABLE PERSON COULD HAVE COME TO THIS FINAL OUTCOME, YOU AND THE FILTERING COMMITTEE IGNORED EVIDENCE AND THEIR OWN PROCEDURAL RULE IN THE EVENT OF A *review of an examination decision or an appeal*,

WHAT WAS THE POINT OF SUPPLYING ANY EVIDENCE TO AN APPEAL IF IT IS IGNORED? OR NEEDS TO GO THROUGH A COMPLAINT PROCEDURE BEFORE IT CAN BE USED AS EVIDENCE IN AN APPEAL? IS THIS POSSIBLE?

THEREFORE MY CONCLUSIONS ARE:

YOU WERE NOT IMPARTIAL AS YOU CLAIM.

ALL YOU CAN STATE IS THAT I QUESTIONED ACADEMIC JUDGEMENT AND THEN EXPECT ME TO ENGAGE IN A COMPLAINT PROCEDURE AND TRY TO MAKE ME BELIEVE THAT SOMEONE ELSE WILL BE IMPARTIAL FROM THIS ORGANISATION!

YOU AND THE FILTERING COMMITTEE ALONG WITH GEMMA WILKINS, MR NOVIS AND PAUL BOYLE (AS THIS IS HIS DEPARTMENT) HAVE FAILED TO BE IMPARTIAL AND THIS IS POINTED OUT BY YOUR OWN ADDMISSION TO IGNORE RULES AND EVIDENCE, AS SHOWN ABOVE.

I HAVE PROVIDED COMPREHENSIVE EVIDENCE OF AN AGENDA TO FAIL MY WORK THAT YOU ARE IGNORING TO DEAL WITH, YOU AND THE FILTERING COMMITTEE HAVE FAILED TO FOLLOW THE RULES AS STATED ABOVE AND HAVE NOW PUT YOURSELVES IN A POSITION WHERE YOU DEMONSTRATE YOU HAVE CARRIED OUT A FRAUDULENT PROCEDURE

WHAT ARE YOU GOING TO DO ABOUT THIS?

REGARDS

GEOFF BLANCHE

6.2

On Wednesday, 11 January 2023 at 15:24:04 GMT, Natalie Wathan <n.a.wathan@swansea.ac.uk> wrote:

Dear Mr Blanche,

I write in relation to your below email. I am sorry that you feel that I have not acted impartially and have ignored the evidence you supplied - points which I do not agree with. In my assessment of your final review, I considered all documents which you submitted for your academic appeal and final review – as stated in my outcome letter to you.

Whilst I explained in my letter to you that it did not necessarily refer to all the documents/ points raised, I also explained that it *"referred...to all material and points raised which I considered necessary to make my decision on your final review application"*.

Although you have raised a number of issues/allegations, **there have been no findings made that these issues/allegations had occurred**. Such issues would need to be thoroughly investigated and determined, on the balance of all evidence obtained through the investigations, and the University's Complaints Procedure (not the Academic Appeals Procedure) provides the method for such issues to be thoroughly investigated and determined.

I can only reiterate that it is open to you to allow the University to investigate and determine (i.e. make findings on) the issues/allegations you have raised in accordance with the Complaints Procedure. As advised in my letter to you:

"At the conclusion of the determination of the complaint, you would be provided with a letter/report confirming the investigator's findings on each issue of complaint raised, and reasons for their findings. If any issue(s) of complaint is/are found to be substantiated on the evidence, the complaint response will also detail any offer which the investigator considers to be appropriate to make by way of outcome of the complaint and will take into account the outcomes you are seeking. You would have opportunity to submit a new final review application in relation to the outcome of the complaint."

In addition / alternatively, you have the option to apply for a review of your academic appeal and final review case to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIA) as detailed in my letter.

Kind regards,

Natalie

Natalie Wathan

Student Cases Manager | Rheolwr Achosion Myfyrwyr

Student Academic Services | Gwasanaethau Academaidd Myfyrwyr

Swansea	University		Prifysgol	Abertawe
Singleton	Park		Parc	Singleton
Swansea				Abertawe
Wales				Cymru
SA2 8PP				

6.3

Re: Geoff Blanche final review outcome2

Yahoo/Sent

Geoff Blanche <geoffblanche@yahoo.com>

To:Natalie Wathan

Wed, 11 Jan at 19:10

Hi Natalie

There is no need to instigate a complaints procedure to know that you have not applied your own rules in appeal and you have ignored evidence of procedural abnormalities. This in my opinion is to come out with a decision that supports the examination boards failures, and the two unidentified individuals who

should have also applied this rule and evidence in the first appeal. The evidence has been laid in front of you but you decide not to look at it. I will not regurgitate my last email to you and you still have NOT made any reasonable decision that someone who is impartial would COME TO. There is only one conclusion i can come to, you cherry picked rules and ignored others and evidence to suit an outcome desirable for the University to protect their own interests. This is a very serious situation for all the staff that have been involved with my masters and you continue to perpetuate the wrong doings.

13. Particular Role of Chair of Examining Board

It is the responsibility of the Chair to ensure that the process is rigorous, fair, reliable and consistent with University regulations and procedures. In the event of a review of an examination decision or an appeal, the Chair is required to provide a written report on the conduct of the examination as necessary.?

Zoe Perry has already stated there were no minutes kept in the viva, and the Chairs notes were only for himself to fill in a few tick boxes apparently, therefore how will the chair report to the appeal committee without any minutes to refer to?? The chair boasted to me that he was impartial and there in the examination process to make sure the rules and regulations were applied to the examination process as per the rules.

I kept minutes but it is not my duty to write the report for the appeal, it is the Chairs, and unless this is done the appeal is NULL AND VOID and due to these findings so is the viva and the entire examination process, **Can you comment on this please as you are impartial?** The university have shown gross incompetence, no academic integrity, this is misfeasance in a public office. Supervisors behaved with malice and threatening behaviour and ignored historical facts to perpetuate a fake historical narrative that they seem to want to protect as the truth. If you've read my report you will understand this is true.

Can you clarify this please... *"Although you have raised a number of issues/allegations, there have been no findings made that these issues/allegations had occurred."*

Obviously you have done some investigations, what issues and allegations are you referring to? You are vague in your statement, please state what the findings relating to what you have investigated are please, WITH EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT

YOUR FINDINGS. As far as i am concerned i only supplied you with factual information backed with evidence. The evidence i have supplied in my reports has been ignored in your appeal system and it seems it has been ignored to suit "a particular outcome" this is what any reasonable person will come to.

I will not enter into a complaints procedure until you satisfy me you have conducted a proper appeal and applied the above rule you are ignoring, this is a reasonable decision otherwise in a complaints procedure i will be complaining about the appeals procedure unable to satisfy the original appeal against the examination board due to ignoring evidence and cherry picking information and rules to apply,

Another point i would like to raise is "ACADEMIC JUDGEMENT". This is not an undergraduate degree, i also have academic judgement, and therefore we all have academic judgement.

Academic judgement was never in question, what is in question is, scientific fraudulent statements in reports and viva, academic misconduct, and applying the rules correctly.

I have asked you 4 questions in this email that i need answered from you.

Regards

Geoff

6.4

Natalie Wathan <n.a.wathan@swansea.ac.uk>

To: Geoff Blanche

Fri, 13 Jan at 13:46

Dear Mr Blanche,

I cannot add to the reasoning set out within my final review outcome letter to you. I consider it is entirely reasonable to invite you to use the University's Complaints Procedures to enable the University to investigate and determine the issues you have raised.

As explained, you do have the option to apply for a review of your academic appeal and final review case to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIA) as detailed in my letter. The OIA would then review the outcome of your final review.

Kind regards,

Natalie

Natalie Wathan

Student Cases Manager | Rheolwr Achosion Myfyrwyr

Student Academic Services | Gwasanaethau Academaidd Myfyrwyr

Swansea	University		Prifysgol	Abertawe
Singleton	Park		Parc	Singleton
Swansea				Abertawe
Wales				Cymru
SA2 8PP				

6.5

SUMMARY

- All departments involved, gaslight Mr Blanche to achieve a chosen outcome by some hierarchy of the university.
- The supervisors were the first staff of Swansea University to threaten and act with malice towards my work, and threaten to use everything against me in an appeal if I happened to fail.
- The examination board with the research support lead, committed procedural fraud, made false scientific claims, falsifying signatures, forgery, etc
- The external examiner states the chairperson Huw Summers is coordinating the feedback which is contrary to the rules, and his notes appear as a report.

- The chairperson claims he is independent of the examination process in pre viva meeting with Mr Blanche
- Zoe Perry makes fraudulent claims to gaslight Geoff Blanche after the Viva Voce
- The examination board and chairperson will not share their notes
- Geoff Blanche spends 3 months of his time correlating the fraud in the ERR
- On the 30th of August 2022 Geoff Blanche appeals the decision with ERR
- On 29th September, Mr Boyle's Appeal office uphold the examination board decision. The two unidentified filtering committee staff ignore all the evidence supplied in their outcome. Ignore their own rules.
- On the 17th of October the director of academic services Adrian Novis states *"There is no scope under any University procedures for students to initiate fraud investigations"*. The university fail to initiate fraud investigations. Continually trying to *"invite"* Mr Blanche into a complaint procedure and continue gaslighting.
- On the 18th October Mr Blanche informs (yet again, 5 times in all) the appeals office, they are not following the university's own rules.
- On the 20th of October 2022 the final review of the appeal procedure starts.
- On 9th of November Kim Moody requests an extra month to review procedure, more gaslighting.
- On November 21st Kim Moody states the director of academic services will apply the rules to the final review (more gaslighting)
- December 19th final review decision is given, same outcome as 1st outcome, more gaslighting.
- On January the 1st, Geoff Blanche objects to the cherry picking of the rules for the university's preferred outcome and ignoring all the evidence presented.
- January 11th Nathan Wathan claims she has been impartial although does state: *I considered all documents which you submitted for your academic appeal and final review – as stated in my outcome letter to you. Whilst I explained in my letter to you that it did not necessarily refer to all the documents/ points raised, I also explained that it "referred...to all material and points raised which I considered necessary to make my decision on your final review application"*.

Also states: *“there have been no findings made that these issues/allegations had occurred”*. Ignores all my evidence in the ERR. Signature forgery in Addendum to ERR. Ignores they don’t apply their own rules. More gaslighting.

- On the 13th January Natalie states: *“I cannot add to the reasoning set out within my final review outcome letter to you. I consider it is entirely reasonable to invite you to use the University's Complaints Procedures to enable the University to investigate and determine the issues you have raised. “*

Obviously she is being told what to say, and cannot explain why the evidence and rules are ignored. More gas lighting.