

IN REPLY and Defense to the Defendant’s Counterclaim

Mr Geoffrey Blanche (Original claimant)

Date: 6th March 2024

10 Avon Street, Cymmer, SA13 3LT

Claim No: K19ZA750

IN THE CIVIL NATIONAL BUSINESS CENTRE

B E T W E E N:

GEOFFREY CHARLES BLANCHE

Claimant

-and SWANSEA UNIVERSITY

Defendant

Contents

Reply to Reach a Settlement	3
Reference: Blanche 4	3
Points of Law relating to this case.....	4
16 POINT A.....	5
17 POINT B.....	10
Email Communication Alongside the Production of the Addendum (exhibit 4)	11
Emails taken from exhibit 5 (these were all available to Billy Seagrim).....	12
Point C	18
Point D	34
Point E.....	35
Blanche 5 (Defense to Counterclaim)	36
Private and Confidential Investigation Report Regarding: Mr Geoffrey Blanche (946484) Author: William Seagrim Report Date: 22 June 2023	42
12 Corporation developing covid19 micro needles.....	48
28 You’re not allowed to question academic judgement.....	59
Misrepresentation of the truth.....	60
33 False statements about Newman.....	63
34 Misleading the court	64
35 The examiners and supervisors were not experts in Electromagnetism.....	65
DEFENCE.....	71

Reply to Reach a Settlement

Reference: Blanche 4

Mr Blanche

10 Avon Street, Cymmer

SA13 3LT

Date: 16th February 2024

MY Ref: Blanche 4

Court Claim No: K19ZA750

Please reply no later than March 5th 2024

Hi Beth,

It was noted you did not respond to my last email dated, Tue, 16 January at 22:50. We need to cooperate to meet our duties to comply with the overriding objective.

- 1 This communication (Blanche 4) is an attempt to give Swansea University Corporation the opportunity to settle the claim in keeping with the overriding objective. I will grant you a month stay if you request it, to negotiate a settlement to the claim for punitive damages.
 - 1.1.1 The defendant with the defense party made 5 false statements and mislead the court in their application ELC 01. Points, 1, 10, 22, 31 and 33.
- 2 I have tried to settle since the issuing of the pre protocol action on November 18th, 2022. So far, the defendant has made it quite clear that they intend to defend all the claim to allow the facts to be exposed in court.
- 3 Their defence N244 application, received on the 15th January 2024, contains around 30 false statements throughout, they are not all exposed in this document. The defendant seems to have no intention of settling or admitting fault and wrongdoing. The distrust to the staff of this Corporation is 100%, it will be no surprise if they revert to inventing evidence. The defendant has denied any misconduct, wrongdoing; whilst making false statements to mislead the court. They rely on Billy Seagrim's complaint investigation as a bare faced defense. The barrister Billy Seagrim acting as the complaint's investigator did not investigate the complaint correctly, (POC 24 and 27). Billy Seagrim's investigation was another intentional act of defamation and dishonesty.
- 4 They have demonstrated no cognitive decision making.
- 5 However, if they request a one month stay, to seek a settlement I will agree, the claim is for punitive damages. It will be no surprise if the defendant will seek to introduce delays to avoid liability or to complicate the court process and costs, which will not be in keeping with the overriding objective. I am suspicious of this and make the court aware of this. Otherwise, if no attempt to make a settlement is made by the defendant, I recommend we continue to a multi-track trial.
- 6 We need to make it clear to the court that there is a genuine attempt to make a settlement, I will take this opportunity to underline evidence that is indefensible.

- 7 If there is no settlement, I make proposals for sharing electronic and non-electronic documents.
- 8 There are 3 withheld documents which I highlighted in an email to Beth Cara with attachments On Sun, 17 Dec 2023 at 11:10. withheld docs pdf, please respond to how you will share these withheld documents. There are also other documents which the information is blacked out. Will you be sharing this information without the black boxes? so the court can see what is written in the boxes? eg. Gemma Wilkins filtering committee notes dated 28/04 2023? All SAR responses with blacked out boxes removed?
- 9 Do you agree to settle the claim out of court and before any hearing?
- 10 If you do not settle, do you agree to a multi track?
- 11 What do you propose for non-electronic format of your electronic documents?
- A I propose we produce our own copies of electronic documents and non-electronic documents for our own use, and each of us produce our electronic documents and a non-electronic format for the court.

B We should agree on duplicate documents.

- 12 What do you propose in relation to disclosure that meets the overriding objective?

I propose a standard disclosure N265.

To include:

31.6 Standard disclosure requires a party to disclose only—

(a) the documents on which he relies; and

(b) the documents which –

(i) adversely affect his own case;

(ii) adversely affect another party's case; or

(iii) support another party's case; and

(c) the documents which he is required to disclose by a relevant practice direction.

Points of Law relating to this case.

Mr Blanche was told by Swansea, he had all the documents relating to his Viva on 23rd August 2023. The R and R Form tells lies about itself. The R and R form was falsified by the examination board, THE EVIDENCE DEMONSTRATES THIS, and is regarded as fraud and forgery in law. For example,

Section 1 Forgery Act 1981 states:

A person is guilty of forgery if he makes a false instrument, with the intention that he or another shall use it to induce somebody to accept it as genuine, and by reason of so accepting it to do or not to do some act to his own or any other person's prejudice.

A false instrument is one that "purports" to be something which is not - i.e. it must tell a lie about itself (see the decision by the House of Lords in R v More [1988] 86 Crim App R 234).

As to your false claims in your defense:

3. *The premise of the case is fanciful. At its core, the Claimant alleges that he has made a scientific discovery – the “Endometric Electric Effect” – which is akin to Albert Einstein’s identification of the Photoelectric Effect. This claim has been roundly rejected by the Claimant’s academic supervisors, including the Exam Board. Further, the claim raised is fundamentally an issue of academic judgment – and not one on which it is open to the Court to adjudicate: Clark v University of Lincolnshire and Humberside [2000] 1 WLR 1988; Abramova v Oxford Institute of Legal Practice [2011] EWHC 613 (QB) (Burnett J (as he then was) stating that as a result “most claims brought in contract which amounted to a challenge to academic process would be struck out”.*

4. *The claim as pleaded is vague and difficult to understand. The Defendant has responded to the allegations to the extent it is able. However, the Defendant maintains that the Claimant’s Particulars of Claim (the “POCs”) fail to state a case of fraud, misconduct, defamation, discrimination, or breach of contract. As such, it intends to apply to strike out and/or dismiss this claim.*

13 The case of *R (Gopikrishna) v University of Leicester and The Office of the Independent Adjudicator* [2015] EWHC 207, was found in favour of the claimant due to the university abandoning its rules and regulations. Dishonesty, Irrationality and procedural unfairness by a university, can be determined by civil law, without even considering academic judgement.

[*Gopikrishna, R \(on the application of\) v The Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education & Ors* \[2015\] EWHC 207 \(Admin\) \(06 February 2015\) \(bailii.org\)](#)

14 In a case where fraud is alleged, it is well established that such plea must be made in clear terms, setting out the facts that are relied on to show that the defendant was dishonest and not merely negligent. As dishonesty is often a matter of inference from primary facts, it is necessary to plead the primary facts which will be relied upon at trial to justify that inference. It is not open to the court to infer dishonesty from facts which have not been pleaded. There must be some fact that justifies an inference of dishonesty, and this fact must be pleaded and proved.

(Lord Millett in *Three Rivers District Council v Bank of England* [2001] UKHL 16, [2003] 2 AC 1).

15 The Court of Appeal’s decision in *Bank St Petersburg PJSC v Vitaly Arkhangelsky & Ors* [2020] EWCA Civ 408 (*Bank St Petersburg PJSC v Vitaly Arkhangelsky*)

This decision is particularly important for those fighting against sophisticated frauds, where defendants can often create complex, seemingly innocent, explanations for events. It emphasises that while dishonesty is inherently more improbable than an innocent explanation, compelling evidence (both documents and witness evidence) of dishonesty will shift this balance.

[The Standard of Proof in Civil Fraud Claims \(rahmanravelli.co.uk\)](#)

16 POINT A

As to your false claim in:

30.4. The R and R Forms were properly completed including the External Examiner's Report on Thesis (1.1)

From the Rules


16. Conduct of the Examination

The external examiner should complete Section 1.1 of the Report form (External Examiner's Report on Thesis) and take the whole form to the oral examination. Some Faculties/Schools may permit an electronic copy to be sent ahead of the examination. The Chair of the Examining Board should arrange for the internal examiner's report to be typed in, or otherwise attached to, Section 2 (Internal Examiner's Report).

- 1 Below is a screenshot of the examiners 1.1 pre viva report produced in adobe acrobat pro.

- On Pg 76 TA increases because the cell is placed in warmer environment and not because of an exothermic reaction.
- 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  Date 20/04/2022

This is an image

R&R Form - MA/MSc/LLM by Research - Version 4.0 (February 2020)

1.2 External Examiner's Report on the Oral Examination

During the examination, the student explained that the motivation for his work is the Newman energy machine. and that lithium-ion batteries are meant to be an example of a electrochemical device displaying endothermic thermal effects as a way of verifying the Newman machine phenomena.

- 2 In this screenshot the adobe program identifies the signature as being an image. This image was added to the document when it was created on June 9th 2022 at 11.10am. Mr Blanche had previously pointed this out in his document for the Final review in October 2022, the signatures were identical.
- 3 The chairperson was then faced with no choice but to admit during his interview with Billy Seagrim on 22nd May 2023, during the Complaint Investigation, The chairperson says: *"Almost certainly cut and paste of electronic signatures. Chair's role was to collate and finalise the report. The only fraud would be if I wrote it, put signatures there and said that is what they wrote."* (see POC 27)

He acted against the rules he is governed by, he did write most of the reports from his withheld notes. He still maintains no wrongdoing, and claims this is *normal practice* to not follow your own rules whilst pretending you did. He dishonestly tells Mr Blanche in the pre viva meeting on the 20th May 2022, (From exhibit 11 and exhibit 12 Voice recording):

"Ah, my role is just to manage process, ensure its 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."

Rule 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;

The procedure is very well defined in the rules (GUIDE TO THE EXAMINATION OF RESEARCH STUDENTS), especially 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, the exact procedure the chairperson should follow before, during and after the oral exam in the event of an appeal.

It is also noted the experience of the chairperson is vast, the chairperson (Huw Summers) has:

- BS: Your employment position? Professor?
- HS: Yes.
- BS: How long have you been a lecturer?
- HS: 30 Years. Since 2008 in Swansea.
- BS: How experienced are you as a chair of exam boards?

-
- HS: Very, at least 30, and I've externalled and internalled.
- BS: Is there anything you would like to add or clarify?
- HS: No.

- 4 Prof. Summers was nominated by Paul Rees and his involvement in the examination process was to deceive Mr Blanche. His actions were intentional, he knew the rules, and the PGR committee (some or all, (this is undetermined)) using the chairperson deceived Mr Blanche, the evidence of how they produced the reports and withheld documents tells us this. The chairperson knew the process he should follow, the rules are unambiguous and specifically designed to stop any misfeasance.
- 5 This also applies for the rules set out for the appeal procedures, which were not followed or investigated by Billy Seagrim. (POC 41-50)
- 6 The same signatures image was used to produce all the examiners signatures on the documents, pre viva and post viva sections.

7 This tells us that section 1.1 and section 2, are not genuine pre viva documents completed correctly to the rules, it was not completed and produced on the 20/04/2022 and 30 May as claimed by the defense, there is no original pre viva1.1 document provided by the external examiner.

POC 25 There was an internal examiner's word document pre viva report (as-well as a PDF version, exhibits 35 and 39) obtained by FOI request, and received 24th July 2023. The word document was authored and dated 31/05/2022 which was the day after the oral exam and represented (by being identical) the text of section 2 of the R & R form. Therefore, the internal examiner produced his pre viva report section 2, the day after the viva and not before the oral exam per the rules (this makes the R & R report tell a lie about itself). This word document (exhibit 35) had an original date of 31/05/2022 but this was changed to '30 May' on the R & R form, as-well as the signature changing. Section 2 is the internal examiners pre viva report, but whoever made the R & R form on the 9th of June 2022, must have realised this report date was not a pre viva date and changed the date to cover up the fact there was no pre viva report by the internal examiner and the rules had not been followed. The chairperson confirmed he used exhibit 39 to produce the R & R and Addendum reports. The date on section 2 was altered with intent to deceive Mr Blanche by the chairperson or Clare Goss from the original date, this was changed to '30 May' on R & R form, to meet the requirements of the rules. It is also believed this date was written differently and, in this style, compared to the 7 other dates on the R & R form, to intentionally pass it off as genuine due to the internal examiner being of Asian descent. This would be considered a normal response and grammar for an Asian speaking and writing the English language, if it was under scrutiny, making it sound he had written and produced the report as it is dated. It seems the chairperson or Clare Goss were inventing an alibi through pronunciation if it was ever questioned?

Exhibit 35

INTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

(Additional sheets may be appended, if necessary.)

The below technical recommendations must be addressed before re-submission of thesis.

1. Equation (1) needs to be corrected.
2. Equation (2) cannot be used for explaining the special case presented in the experiment, i.e. the endothermic effect at the start of charging process.
3. All equations must be used quantitatively and correctly referenced, i.e. calculated results must be presented with the equation.
4. Photoelectric effect is not applicable to this experiment.
5. The image quality of all experimental figures needs to be improved. All experimental figures need to be added error bars.
6. Figures 52 and 53 are not correct, electrons don't flow in air circling a conductor.
7. Basic operation principle of the battery under investigation must be presented.
8. Part or full of reference papers cannot be directly copied and pasted into thesis, for example on page 114, section 19.2
9. References should be correctly formatted, for example using standard IEEE conference or journal format. More literature study needs to be conducted in relation to batteries, battery charging, temperature characteristics of batteries.

Name (block capitals) **Lijie LI** (Internal Examiner)
Signature  Date **31/05/2022**

17 POINT B

It is noticed in your defense point 36, Jennifer Thelen did not sign the statement of truth, but wrote more than several false statements within the document.

As to, your false claims:

30.4. The R and R Forms were properly completed including the External Examiner's Report on Thesis (1.1); the External Examiner's Report on the Oral Examination (1.2); External Examiner's Report on matters of general concern or interest (1.3); the Internal Examiner's Report (2); **the Joint Report by External and Internal Examiners (1.4)***; and the Report by the Chair (4). The R and R Forms were timely sent to academic services, as was the Addendum R and R Form (setting out the requirements for resubmission).

* not 1.4, This is section 3, perhaps Jennifer Thelen was thinking of:

Paragraph 1.4 of the Code of Conduct for Solicitors sets out the requirement not to mislead the court, the client or others.

Solicitors who are complicit with their client in misleading the court, or who do so themselves, risk serious consequences. The courts have made it very clear that they regard this as 'one of the most serious offences that an advocate or litigator can commit'. Examples include:

- making false or misleading statements
- making applications to the court (for example, solely to delay proceedings and increase costs) which serve no useful purpose in upholding the rule of law or the proper administration of justice.

[SRA | Conduct in disputes | Solicitors Regulation Authority](#)

Section 3* of the report tells us (POC 27 and 35) that the actions of the chairperson were an intentional act to pass off the reports as genuine and deceive Mr Blanche,

Signature	<i>W.D. W. Dunage</i>	(External Examiner)
Signature	<i>Lizie</i>	(Internal Examiner)
	Date	30/05/2022

This is an image

R&R Form – MA/MSc/LLM by Research - Version 4.0 (February 2020)

4. REPORT BY THE CHAIR OF EXAMINING BOARD

The Chair of Examining Board should ensure that the correct documentation was supplied in good time to the examiners and that a pre-viva meeting was held to allow the examiners to compare notes on their reports and agree a strategy for the viva. The Chair should meet with the student prior to the viva in order to ascertain if there are any extenuating

As to:

28.4. It is denied that the R and R Forms, and the Addendum to the R and R Forms (which set out the requirements for re-submission), are fraudulent (paragraph 27.2 above). This matter was considered in the Complaint Report and there is no evidence in support of this allegation; paragraph 24.9 is repeated.

30.3. The Chair was independent (paragraph 29.1); paragraph 24.8 is repeated.

- 1 These are more false statements by the defense to mislead the court. As to 28.4, This withheld document (POC 12)
- 2 The examination board acted dishonestly whilst producing the R and R form and the Addendum to the R and R form. They withheld documents; would not share their notes; made false statements in emails; to produce false instruments that were falsified to deceive Mr Blanche.

See emails, 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 15,16. 16A

Email Communication Alongside the Production of the Addendum (exhibit 4)

There was no production of an R & R form report until the 9th of June 2022, all outside the rules for a specific outcome.

1. Geoff emails Perry for Chairperson's minutes Sat June 4th at 8.12am **EMAIL 1**

This alerts Summers that the fraudulent plan is in danger.

2. Geoff emails Widanalage for notes on Monday June 6th at 11.25 **EMAIL 8**
3. Geoff emails Lijie Li for notes on Monday June 6th and Tuesday 7th at 14.00, never receives any replies. **Email 16**
4. Perry replies at 15.58 June 6th stating R&R form to be supplied to the University by examiners any time within the next month. **There is no R & R form being written by the examiners.** **EMAIL 5**
5. Geoff requests Summers notes again from Perry at 16.41 Monday 6th June and resent same email on Tuesday due to no reply. **EMAIL 2**
6. Widanalage emails Geoff at 18.38 Monday June 6th, stating Huw Summers is coordinating feedback and the feedback includes Huw Summers' feedback. **This is an inadvertent admission by the external examiner Mr Summers has written some of the report (which we know is true from the analysis) and Widanalage is unaware of the rules.** It is very probable that Mr Widanalage had just emailed exhibit 33 back to Mr Summers as his last edit had been an hour earlier. **EMAIL 9**
7. Geoff emails widanalage again and requests info on MON June 6th 21.11 **EMAIL 10**
8. Widanalage emails Geoff on **Tuesday June 7th at 16.15** and says: "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" **Within an hour of this email, or even before looking at the times on exhibit 53, Mr widanalage had received the document back from Summers. And was now**

going to make more edits that would never make the final report.

EMAIL 11

9. Perry replies to Geoff on Weds June 8th AT 10.55 and says: **EMAIL 6**

*“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.

This report, the R & R form was made on the 9th of June, and it was never in the hands of the examiners, it did not exist until the 9th of June. This is a blatant lie about what Summers’ notes were for, with an attempt to cover up why he needs these notes and cannot share them. Pretending to be waiting for the R & R report, whilst in the background, Summers was orchestrating the production of the Addendum report.

10. At 15.34, on Wednesday the 8th, Geoff claims victory in viva, he knows they are cheating and committing fraud. **EMAIL 15**
11. **The R & R form and Addendum report, are ‘finalised and collated’ or really they are made by Summers, Goss and Perry between 11.10 and 11.55 on Thursday 9th June. With the first production of the R & R form and the first appearance of lots of text, (SEE BELOW).**
12. Perry informs Geoff of receipt of R&R form and failure Friday 10th June at 11.22 **EMAIL 7**

Emails taken from exhibit 5 (these were all available to Billy Seagrim)

Email 1

The screenshot shows an email inbox on the left and a detailed view of an email on the right. The inbox contains several entries, including one from 'Employability - Faculty of Science' dated 08/06/2022 and another from 'Zoe Perry; PGR - Faculty of Science and Engineering' dated 08/06/2022. The detailed view shows an email from 'PGR - Faculty of Science and Engineering' dated Fri 27/05/2022 17:11, with the subject 'Retention: Exchange Retention Policy'. Below this is an email from 'BLANCHE G. (946484)' dated Sat 04/06/2022 08:12, with the subject 'Hi Zoe' and the body text: 'Please can you forward me a copy of the minutes of my viva for my records, which were kept by huw summers during the viva. I have also copied Mr Summers in this mail. Regards Geoff Blanche'.

EMAIL 2

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...

Zoe Perry; PGR - Faculty ...
> Your Viva - Monday 3... 08/06/2022
Dear Geoff, Thank you for your emai...
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
Scroll down for English version. Ann...

Your Viva - Monday 30 May 2022 at 1pm

To: BLANCHE G. (946484); PGR - Faculty of Science and Engineering
Cc: Huw Summers

Mon 06/06/2022 15:58

You forwarded this message on Tue 07/06/2022 13:47

Retention: Exchange Retention Policy

BG BLANCHE G. (946484)

To: PGR - Faculty of Science and Engineering

Mon 06/06/2022 16:41

Hi Zoe,

Mr Summers kept minutes, therefore i would like a copy of these minutes or notes or whatever you call them for my records, this is a reasonable request. A mobile phone photo of these notes, as long as they are readable will suffice, you can email them to me or i will call in to your office for the copy of these notes. this shouldn't be any inconvenience for anyone and only take 15 minutes to do.

Regards

Geoff Blanche

EMAIL 5

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...

Zoe Perry; PGR - Faculty ...
> Your Viva - Monday 3... 08/06/2022
Dear Geoff, Thank you for your emai...
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
Scroll down for English version. Ann...

R ResearchGate
New login from Edge o... 07/06/2022
New login from Edge on Win10 Geo...

ResearchGate

Your Viva - Monday 30 May 2022 at 1pm

P PGR - Faculty of Science and Engineering

To: BLANCHE G. (946484); PGR - Faculty of Science and Engineering

Cc: Huw Summers

Mon 06/06/2022 15:58

Dear Geoff,

Thank you for your email.

Viva's are not minuted as a matter of course, however Examiners do produce a Report and Results Form (R&R Form) following the Viva and as soon as it is received and has been ratified we will be able to provide you with a copy. Please note that whilst we do request that examiners complete the Report and Results form within 14 days of a viva, sometimes it can take a bit longer, particularly at this time of year when Examiners also inevitably have large marking commitments.

As soon as we are in receipt of this form we will provide it as a matter of urgency, however please note that the 'clock' for your resubmission does not start running until this document has been ratified by the central team and you receive a letter confirming the deadline for your resubmission.

I hope this helps.

Many thanks

Zoë

Zoë Perry

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

EMAIL 6

✓ **Focused** Other 18 Filter
Your Viva - Monday 30 May 2022 at 1pm 1

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...

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


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

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



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

EMAIL 7

✓ **Focused** Other 18 Filter
Viva Outcome - Re-submission 1

PR **Postgraduate Research**
New session: Staying w... 10/06/2022
 This brand new session will equip yo...

PGR - Faculty of Science and E... ←
 > Viva Outcome - Re-s... 10/06/2022
 Dear Geoff, We have received your R...

R **ResearchGate**
Paoti Chang published ... 10/06/2022
 This week's research from your netw...

E **Employability - Faculty of Scie...** 📎
Summer Work Experie... 09/06/2022
 Deadline: 29 June 2022. Please do n...

FR **FSE Reception** 📎
MvUni Stand at Bav Rec... 09/06/2022



PGR - Faculty of Science and Engineering
 To: BLANCHE G. (946484)

📧 ↶ ↷ ↲ ↳ ...
 Fri 10/06/2022 11:22

Dear Geoff,

We have received your Report and Result form and can see that the recommendation of the Examination Board is that you have been unsuccessful in your candidature for the degree of MSc by Research. However, the Examining Board has recommended that you be permitted to modify your thesis and re-submit it for the degree of MSc by Research on one further occasion within 12 months.

Once Academic Services have ratified your Report and Result form, you will be sent an e-mail from them confirming your outcome. Your deadline will be a year from the date you receive this e-mail. Once you have received this, an e-mail will also be sent from our team confirming your deadline and providing you with a copy of the Report and Results Form together with details of required corrections in order for your thesis to reach the standard required of an MSc by Research.

Kind regards

Zoë

Zoë Perry

EMAIL 8

The screenshot shows an Outlook web interface for Swansea University. The left sidebar contains folders like 'Inbox' (2297), 'Drafts' (19), and 'Deleted Items' (6). The main pane shows a list of emails, with the selected one being a draft from Dhammika Widanalage to Geoff Blanche. The right pane displays the content of the selected email:

Geoff Blanche viva
 To: Dhammika.Widanalage@warwick.ac.uk
 Mon 06/06/2022 11:25

Dear Professor
 I am now evaluating my viva and need to write a report. Please can you forward me the notes you wrote in your deliberation that made up your viva decision. If you just take a photo of the original notes as evidence of what you wrote on the day, what questions you asked, and what you based your decision on, and email them to me will be fine. You also said you had links you could share with me about investigation into the endothermic electric effect if you could please send these for my ongoing professional qualification work (Msc), i would be most grateful.
 Regards
 Geoff Blanche

EMAIL 9

The screenshot shows the same Outlook web interface. The selected email is now a reply from Dhammika Widanalage to Geoff Blanche:

Geoff Blanche viva
 To: Dhammika.Widanalage@warwick.ac.uk
 Mon 06/06/2022 11:25

Widanalage, Dhammika
 <Dhammika.Widanalage@warwick.ac.uk>
 To: BLANCHE G. (946484) <g.blanche.946484@swansea.ac.uk>
 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

EMAIL 10

University of Bertawe Outlook Search Teams call

New message Delete Archive Junk Sweep Move to Categorise Snooze

Focused Other 94 Filter

Other: New conversations
ResearchGate; Employability - Faculty of...

2297

[Draft] Widanalage, Dhammika
> Geoff Blanche viva 18:38
Dear Geoffrey, Hope you had a goo...

Student Experience - Faculty ...
Invitation to the FSE Profess... 16:10
**Sent on behalf of the Faculty Lead...

Elizabeth Hall
[Students-fse] Invitation to L... 16:09
Dear Students, To celebrate the Facu...

PGR - Faculty of Science ...
> Your Viva - Monday 30 Ma... 15:58
Dear Geoff, Thank you for your emai...

Geoff Blanche viva

<Dhammika.Widanalage@warwick.ac.uk>
To: BLANCHE G. (946484) <g.blanche.946484@swansea.ac.uk> Mon 06/06/2022 18:38

BG To: Widanalage, Dhammika <Dhammika.Widanalage@...>

Hi Professor,
Thanks for your reply, and for letting me know Huw is coordinating everything, but i still need your notes on the day as record of your participation and what you brought to the viva, ie. a list of questions, evidence that you brought to dispute my theory, and anything you were not sure of. I need to make a full report as you expect, as this is a professional qualification. Although Huw is coordinating everything, you are still responsible for your notes, participation directly to me.. This will take a little bit of your time maybe 5 mins to send this to me and is a reasonable request.
Regards
Geoff

EMAIL 11

Focused Other 94 Filter

Other: New conversations
ResearchGate; Employability - Faculty of...

Widanalage, Dhammika
> Geoff Blanche viva 16:15
Dear Geoffrey, All documents need t...

[Draft] researchmanagement@swan...
> Swansea University Resear... 13:41
Scroll down for English version. Ann...

ResearchGate
New login from Edge on Win... 10:44
New login from Edge on Win10 Geo...

ResearchGate
Geoffrey, people are reading ... 10:42
Geoffrey, people are reading your w...

Yesterday

Student Experience - Faculty ...
Invitation to the FSE Pro... Mon 16:10
**Sent on behalf of the Faculty Lead...

Elizabeth Hall
[Students-fse] Invitation to... Mon 16:09

Geoff Blanche viva

WD Widanalage, Dhammika <Dhammika.Widanalage@warwick.ac.uk> Tue 07/06/2022 16:15
To: BLANCHE G. (946484) <g.blanche.946484@swansea.ac.uk>
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

BG BLANCHE G. (946484) Tue 07/06/2022 17:36
To: Widanalage, Dhammika <Dhammika.Widanalage@warwick.ac.uk>

Dear Professor,
Firstly, i would like to remind you that the chairperson is supposed to be impartial, so there is no need to avoid sending me your notes from the day no matter what you have been instructed. Science is an open and transparent process, If you're not going to share the documents directly with me, i will claim victory in the viva , as you have presented nothing on the day to show my theory is incorrect and now when approached a week later you will not present your findings to allow me to get on with my report. If you go to the index of my work there is a section on academic integrity, i think you should reconsider your position for 5 minutes of your time. This a reasonable request.
Regards
Geoff Blanche

Email 15

BG

BLANCHE G. (946484)

To: Zoe Perry; Lijie Li; Widanalage, Dhammika <Dhammika.Widanalage@warwick.ac.uk>; Huw Summers
Cc: Augustine Egwebe; Paul Rees

👍 ↶ ↷ ↲ ↳ ...

Wed 08/06/2022 15:34

Hi Zoe,

Sharing the minutes which you said you didn't keep and notes sometime in the future is not good enough. Science is a transparent and open process, and these notes and evidence should have been provided to me on the day. I have contacted the 2 panellists and the chairperson, and nobody wants to share their notes, or questions, or any evidence that they brought to the viva as evidence they had on the day to refute my theory. With no minutes there is no evidence what happened at the viva except their word against mine. A viva is what happens on the day and should be evidenced as such and shared amongst all participants as a record of events. This has not been done, no one wants to share their notes, therefore whatever report you make in the future is useless without the minutes and notes that should have been made available on the day. The minutes and notes that should be produced on the day, must tally with the final report. You cannot provide a mishmash of combined notes and report whenever you like and think it is legitimate, after all, this is for a professional qualification. Not following a correct procedure makes the viva null and void.

The chairperson, the 2 panellists are behaving with academic misconduct, but this is no big surprise due to the events of my time at this university. I have a witness that saw there was no order or proper recording or proceedings to the viva, the panellists brought no notes, did not give me a list of questions they wanted to ask, they were totally unprofessional. They did not examine my work thoroughly that was perfectly obvious at the viva, and it's too late for them to read up on my work and pretend to have given my work a thorough investigation, you made claims in the viva but produced no evidence., if you think you can include information of claims (not that any information of claims will prove my theory incorrect) in any final report you are mistaken, you had your chance to prepare and your chance on the day.

This is obvious to anyone; the panel had been coerced by the chairperson to fail my work just like the University promised in March 2021. Not only that, the chairperson who will not share his notes, but maybe now after pursuing a copy of this information, he might perhaps give me a copy sometime in the future. He claimed impartiality at the beginning of the viva, although he did break all the rules (if there are any) by staying in the room whilst the panel deliberated, i was watching them through the window as they conferred with each other. i destroyed the panel's arguments, they had a fundamental lack of scientific knowledge and the subject to be examined ie. electromagnetism, the clue was in the title of the thesis. They presented no scientific evidence at the viva to show my theory is incorrect, if they had read my work, they might have learned something. I now claim victory at the viva, if the panel and the chair want to challenge my claim, I will be all too willing and eager for this day.

Regards

Geoff Blanche

Email 16

LL

Lijie Li ☆

L.Li@swansea.ac.uk

✉ Send email 📄 View profile

👍 Results ☰ Filter

All results

Zoe Perry; Lijie Li; Widanalage, Dhammi...
> Your Viva - Monday 30 ... 08/06/2022
Hi Zoe, Sharing the minut... Sent Items

 Bay Campus Ma...

○ Lijie Li
> Geoff Blanche viva 07/06/2022
No preview is available. Sent Items

Geoff Blanche viva

📄 You forwarded this message on Tue 07/06/2022 14:00

📄 Retention: Exchange Retention Policy

BG

BLANCHE G. (946484)

To: Lijie Li

👍 ↶ ↷ ↲ ↳ ...

Mon 06/06/2022 11:28

Dear Professor

I am now evaluating my viva and need to write a report. Please can you forward me the notes you wrote in your deliberation that made up your viva decision. If you just take a photo of the original notes as evidence of what you wrote on the day, what questions you asked, and what you based your decision on, and email them to me will be fine.

Regards

Geoff Blanche

BG

BLANCHE G. (946484)

(No message text)

Tue 07/06/2022 14:00

Email 16A Email from Supervisors 14 months before oral exam



Zhou Z.

Wed 31/03/2021 13:19

To: BLANCHE G. (946484)

Cc: Kalna K.; Egwebe Augustine.



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

Point C

Withheld document.

1A. **Analysis of 3 Exhibits.**

- 1 Decision_Revisions_Required_DW (Exhibit 33)
- 2 Decision_Revisions_Required (Exhibit 41)
- 3 Decision_Revisions_Required (Exhibit 53)

Email FOI Requests

1. A request was made for:

 **Geoff Blanche** <geoffblanche@yahoo.com>
To: Lisa Hughes

 Tue, 4 Jul at 09:08 

Hi Lisa,

Please can you supply me with the 2 original word documents with full text which these 2 PDF's were created from:

- 1 Decisions_revisions_required_DW' PDF
- 2 'internal examiner corrections' PDF

ALSO ANY OTHER DOCUMENTS YOU HAVE NOT ALREADY PROVIDED ME WITH, SUCH AS:

Any other word documents or PDF's you hold authored by Dhammika Widanalage and Lijie Li, before or after the exam outcome for Geoffrey Blanche.

Regards
Geoff Blanche

▼ Hide original message

On Tuesday, 4 July 2023 at 07:47:33 BST, Lisa Hughes <l.e.hughes@swansea.ac.uk> wrote:

Dear Geoff

Can you please clarify what you are requesting? The document 'Decisions_revisions_required_DW' PDF has already been provided to you.

Kind Regards

Lisa

2. The following documents were obtained from Lisa Hughes

 **Lisa Hughes** <l.e.hughes@swansea.ac.uk>
To: geoffblanche@yahoo.com

 Thu, 3 Aug at 08:37 

Dear Geoff

I write in reply to your request dated 4th July 2023 for your personal data under the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), specifically original word documents and documents authored by Dr Dhammika Widanalage and Professor Lijie Li. Please note that this response also covers the request dated 20th July 2023 for the original 'Decisions_revisions_required' word document. 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 076](#) The link is password protected with your DOB in the format dd/mm/yyyy

court > exhibits > OneDrive_2023-08-07 > GB SAR 076



 Search GB SAR 076

<input type="checkbox"/>	Name	Type	Compressed size	Password p...	Size	Ratio	Date modified
<input type="checkbox"/>	comments	DOCX File	16 KB	No	16 KB	0%	07/08/2023 15:28
<input type="checkbox"/>	Decision_revisions_required	DOCX File	23 KB	No	23 KB	0%	07/08/2023 15:28
<input type="checkbox"/>	Decision_revisions_required_DW	DOCX File	24 KB	No	24 KB	0%	07/08/2023 15:28
<input type="checkbox"/>	internal report	DOCX File	20 KB	No	20 KB	0%	07/08/2023 15:28

To: Lisa Hughes <L.E.Hughes@Swansea.ac.uk>
Subject: Re: Subject Access Request - Response

Hi Lisa in response to the foi response 29th June, documents supplied by one drive folder, please can the university define which document corresponds to which request in my request for this information.

i.e foi No.1 a,b,c,d.

foi No 2. a.b

Regards

Geoff

On Monday, 3 July 2023 at 14:44:08 BST, Lisa Hughes <l.e.hughes@swansea.ac.uk> wrote:

Dear Geoff

Request 1

- a. 'RandR Form MA MSc LLM by Research Standard Nov2021' word document
- b. No notes held.
- c. The Microsoft Word document was converted into a fillable PDF Form used by the PGR Office, hence why Clare's name is stated as Author. Clare was not involved in adding the information from the student's viva.
- d. No notes held.

Request 2

- a. 'Decisions_revisions_required_DW' PDF and 'internal examiner corrections' PDF
- b. 'Decisions_revisions_required' word document, 'Addendum to R&R Form' word document, 'Addendum to R&R Form' PDF, 'Confidential – Report and Results Form' email.

Kind Regards

Lisa

Confirmation I have all documents made by the examination board

Yahoo/Inbox

Geoff Blanche <geoffblanche@yahoo.com>

To:l.e.hughes@swansea.ac.uk

Thu, 10 Aug at 12:19

Hi Lisa,

Please can you confirm if i have received everything from the request dated 4th July, see below..

You sent me documents where Dhammika Widanalage was the modifier of documents authored by Huw Summers in sar 076.

Are there any more documents authored by Huw Summers and modified by Mr Widanalage you have not supplied me with?

If so please can you forward them all immediately please.

Regards

Geoff

Lisa Hughes

Dear Geoff I write to confirm receipt of your request below. Kind Regards Lisa

Mon, 14 Aug at 14:06

Lisa Hughes <l.e.hughes@swansea.ac.uk>

To:Geoff Blanche

Wed, 23 Aug at 08:30

Dear Geoff

I can confirm that there are no further documents to provide.

Kind Regards

Lisa

1B **Addendum Report Conclusion**

The Monday 3rd of July (and confirmed by Lisa Hughes on 23rd August 2023) response, tells us which documents Huw Summers used to write the Addendum, see Request 2. We can now account for:

- a) What was written by whom.
- b) by counting Mr Widanalage's modifications,
- c) the words used from the internal examiners report to the total number of words in the final Addendum, exhibit 4.

THE FACTS

1. There were no original report documents authored by Dhammika Widanalage.
2. There was an earlier version of exhibit 41 and exhibit 53(June 7th), being exhibit 33(June 6th).
3. Exhibit 33 is the earliest document given to Mr Blanche, dated 6th June 2022 and created by Mr Widanalage at 17.11pm, but authored by Huw Summers at an earlier time. Lisa Hughes confirms this On Monday 3 July 2023, and re-confirms this on 23rd

August 2023, there were no earlier or other documents that were used for the final reports.

4. On analysing document Exhibit 33, there had been at least one previous version of this document with the modifications tracked from this original missing document authored by Huw Summers. This can be seen from the editing times and the screenshots taken and the fact that exhibit 33 is modified by the external examiner Mr Widanalage.
5. The meta tag data tells us there is an original version authored by Huw Summers not supplied and withheld when requested in FOI requests.

NB: It is noted in the analysis for word counts, the number will vary slightly due to different word package being used, i.e word 13 compared to word 365. However, this slight variation has no impact on conclusions.

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 PGR committee 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). This 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. The external examiner inadvertently admits the chairperson is writing the documents in email 9 (exhibit 5), It can be totally explained how they produced the reports, they left all the evidence to track.

The external examiner failed to author any document, failing in his professional duties, and ignoring the rules he has a duty of care to obey 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 on the 20th May 2022, (Exhibits 11, 12):

“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.”

We know from the very specific rules and procedure stated in the rules, which I sent to the defense on 17th December 2023, how the examination should be performed. See rules 15,16,17,18 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, he knows the rules and the expected procedure. This is an admission by the chairperson, with this evidence the proof that 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' to 'collate and finalise' the reports, yet he failed to mention the specific procedures to this, and he should not be involved in writing the reports.

1C

Exhibit 33

The screenshots below, are 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’.

The screenshot shows the Microsoft Word 'Info' pane on the left and a 'Decision_revisions_required_DW Properties' dialog box on the right. The 'Info' pane displays the document title 'Decision_revisions_required_DW' and its location. The 'Properties' pane shows document statistics: 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, Last Modified By: WD Widanalage, Dhammika). The Properties dialog box shows the following details:

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

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 be changed. The photoelectric effect has not been studied. 17:27:00 added: chapter on the
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

2. → The thesis title is: **An Investigation of the Photoelectric Effect to the Endothermic Electric Effect during the Electric Field Charge.** This is misleading and must be changed. The photoelectric effect has not been studied.

3. → A summary chapter on the of relevant standard models of battery operation (**what happens at the anode and cathode during irreversible and reversible heat**) should be presented so that the experimental data can be understood in the context 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).

4.5. The limitations and inaccuracies of the experiment must be discussed. These include the resolution of the temperature measurement, calibration of multiple sensors to ensure cross-sensor accuracy, experimental error in relation to repeated measurement and the possibility of thermocouple hysteresis.

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

7.10. Any hypotheses presented must be referenced to existing refereed, scientific literature, or justified by detailed evidence from experiment. The experiments presented do not provide proof of the electric field charge theories of Joseph Newman and no such claim should be made in the thesis. Discussion of Newman's work should be limited to its presentation as an alternative explanation of the observed phenomena, which cannot be proven due to the limited scope and accuracy of the measurements.

8.11. Where scientific theories are presented and applied to the experimental observations, each term should be specified **and applied to the experimental observations.** ~~and a full explanation must be given of how the equation links to measured variables and any prediction be corroborated by the experiment. Why weren't any prediction of the cell temperature and voltage made with the equations that were presented?~~ Where well established theories are presented, they need to be interpreted in the standard way, as understood by the scientific community.

9.12. The purpose of the thesis is to present the student's work. Where other work is referred to should be referenced, instances of full reproduction of other reports and papers should be removed from the thesis.

9-12. The purpose of the thesis is to present the student's work. Where other work is referred to it should be referenced, instances of full reproduction of other reports and papers should be removed from the thesis.

13. Any material in the thesis relating to other batteries must be removed.

10-14. The formatting and presentation quality of chapters (Chapter 13, 14 and 15). Why do recommendations chapter (move it to the relevant information, authors, date numbered (some were numbered as letters, avoid copying equations as images), the variables in them defined and used within the main text of the body.

Widanalage, Dhammika, 05/06/2022 17:49:00 added:
10.14. The formatting and presentation quality of the thesis needs to improve. Avoid one-page chapters (Chapter 13, 14 and 15). Why does the Glossary come before the Reflections and recommendations chapter (move it to the end)? Citations must be appropriately formatted with the relevant information, authors, date of publication, title, publisher etc. Equations should be numbered (some were numbered as letters, avoid copying equations as images), the variables in them defined and used within the main text of the body.

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

The examiners will re-assess a re-submitted thesis, they will not conduct a 2nd viva examination.

9. When interpreting the measurements established models review should be presented. In particular, the literature re-entropic changes within the battery should be thoroughly interpreting the results.

See for example:

- Richardson, Giles, and Ivan Korotkin. "Heat generation energy in Li-ion batteries." *Electrochimica Acta* 392 (2021): 138909. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.electacta.2021.138909>
- Viswanathan, Vilayanur V., et al. "Effect of entropy change cathodes and anodes on Li-ion battery thermal management." *Journal of Power Sources* 195.11 (2010): 3720-3729. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpowsour.2009.11.103>
- Geng, Zeyang, Jens Groot, and Torbjörn Thiringer. "A time-and cost-effective method for entropic coefficient determination of a large commercial battery cell." *IEEE Transactions on Transportation Electrification* 6.1 (2020): 257-266. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TTE.2020.2971454>
- Mercer, Michael P., et al. "The influence of point defects on the entropy profiles of Lithium Ion Battery cathodes: a lattice-gas Monte Carlo study." *Electrochimica Acta* 241 (2017): 141-152. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.electacta.2017.04.115>
- Schmidt, Jan Philipp, André Weber, and Ellen Ivers-Tiffée. "A novel and precise measuring method for the entropy of lithium-ion cells: ΔS via electrothermal impedance spectroscopy." *Electrochimica Acta* 137 (2014): 311-319. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.electacta.2014.05.153>
- He, Tengfei, et al. "A comprehensive numerical study on electrochemical-thermal models of a cylindrical lithium-ion battery during discharge process." *Applied Energy* 313 (2022): 118797. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2022.118797>

Widanalage, Dhammika, 06/06/2022 17:22:00 added:
See for example: - Richardson, Giles, and Ivan Korotkin. "Heat generation and a conservation law for chemical energy in Li-ion batteries." *Electrochimica Acta* 392 (2021): 138909. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.electacta.2021.138909> - Viswanathan, Vilayanur V., et al. "Effect of entropy change of lithium intercalation in cathodes and anodes on Li-ion battery thermal management." *Journal of Power Sources* 195.11 (2010): 3720-3729. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpowsour.2009.11.103> - Geng, Zeyang, Jens Groot, and Torbjörn Thiringer. "A time-and cost-effective method for entropic coefficient determination of a large commercial battery cell." *IEEE Transactions on Transportation Electrification* 6.1 (2020): 257-266. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TTE.2020.2971454> - Mercer, Michael P., et al. "The influence of point defects on the entropy profiles of..."

ika
ft: 1.27 cm, Space Before: 0 pt, hg

Widanalage, Dhammika
Formatted: Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0.63 cm + Indent at: 1.27 cm

See for example:

- Richardson, Giles, and Ivan Korotkin. "Heat generation and a conservation law for chemical energy in Li-ion batteries." *Electrochimica Acta* 392 (2021): 138909. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.electacta.2021.138909>
- Viswanathan, Vilayanur V., et al. "Effect of entropy change of lithium intercalation in cathodes and anodes on Li-ion battery thermal management." *Journal of Power Sources* 195.11 (2010): 3720-3729. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpowsour.2009.11.103>
- Geng, Zeyang, Jens Groot, and Torbjörn Thiringer. "A time-and cost-effective method for entropic coefficient determination of a large commercial battery cell." *IEEE Transactions on Transportation Electrification* 6.1 (2020): 257-266. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TTE.2020.2971454>
- Mercer, Michael P., et al. "The influence of point defects on the entropy profiles of..." *Electrochimica Acta* 137 (2014): 311-315. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.electacta.2014.03.011>
- He, Tengfei, et al. "A comprehensive review of cylindrical lithium-ion battery during..." *Applied Energy* 2022.118797. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2022.118797>

No bullets or numbering

Widanalage, Dhammika, 06/06/2022 17:41:00 added:

See for example: - Richardson, Giles, and Ivan Korotkin. "Heat generation and a conservation law for chemical energy in Li-ion batteries." *Electrochimica Acta* 392 (2021): 138909. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.electacta.2021.138909> - Viswanathan, Vilayanur V., et al. "Effect of entropy change of lithium intercalation in cathodes and anodes on Li-ion battery thermal management." *Journal of Power Sources* 195.11 (2010): 3720-3729. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpowsour.2009.11.103> - Geng, Zeyang, Jens Groot, and Torbjörn Thiringer. "A time-and cost-effective method for entropic coefficient determination of a large commercial battery cell." *IEEE Transactions on Transportation Electrification* 6.1 (2020): 257-266. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TTE.2020.2971454> - Mercer, Michael P., et al. "The influence of point defects on the entropy profiles of..." *Electrochimica Acta* 137 (2014): 311-315. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.electacta.2014.03.011>

Widanalage, Dhammika

Formatted: Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0.63 cm + Indent at: 1.27 cm

What they did to create exhibit 33,

1. The viva was 30th May 2022, Huw Summers kept notes throughout the viva.
2. On 31st May, Liji Li the internal examiner, writes his pre viva report and gives it to Mr Summers between 31st and 6th June.
3. Between 31st May and 5th June, Huw Summers writes half the Addendum with the PGR Committee, and some comments for the R & R report (as lots of comments are duplicated on both reports).
4. On 4th June Geoff Blanche asks for Mr Summers notes, this alerts Huw Summers to Mr Blanche's suspicions.
5. On the 4TH or Sunday 5th of June, Mr Summers sends the first version (and missing document) of what will become the Addendum, to Dhammika Widanalage. The report already has 10 of what will become 14 points when Widanalage finishes editing it. It can be seen that Mr Widanalage is editing already existing sentences.
6. Widanalage's first edit is at 5.27pm Sunday evening, it must be urgent to work on your weekend.
7. Widanalage makes approximately 10 separate edits which takes him until 5.49pm. Approximately editing for 22 mins.
8. Next edit is the following day 6th June, at 12 10pm.
9. At 17.11pm, Widanalage creates the new version of the word document by a 'save as', over writing the old version and creating this new version, with the name it now has. The editing time is still showing how long the document has so far been edited for since

its creation, and the document retains all the modification tags with time and dates.

10. At 17.41pm, Widanalage performs his final save with an editing time of 31 minutes. This leaves the document with two further modifications. This document was edited approximately 10 times by Widanalage but it now shows only 3 revisions due to the 'save as'. (Now is a good time to read emails 9,10 and 11)
11. At the end of the modifications the document has: 1257 words.
12. Before the modifications the document had: 660 words.
13. Mr Widanalage added: 420 words to the document. There are 177 words for the academic papers links, which Widanalage falsely claimed would refute Mr Blanche's theory. Mr Widanalage wrote very little. Mr Widanalage was used in the oral exam to put up false arguments about batteries (which when you read the transcript of the exam (exhibit 5), this went extremely bad for him due to his very little grasp of the real study, electromagnetism), and he was never going to be writing the reports.
14. This is now the present document shared with Mr Blanche on 3rd August 2023.

1D

Exhibit 53

Exhibit 53 was previously obtained in an FOI request dated 29th June 2023., sar 073,

Decision_revisions_required

Documents » court » exhibits » GB SAR 073

Upload Share Copy path Copy local path Open file location

Protect Document
Control what types of changes can be made to this document.

Inspect Document
Before publishing this file, check for issues.

- Document properties are correct
- Characters formatted as expected

Version History
View and restore previous versions of this document.

Manage Document
There are no unsaved changes.

Decision_revisions_required Properties

General Summary Statistics Contents Custom

Created: 07 June 2022 13:32:00
 Modified: 29 June 2023 11:06:18
 Accessed: 18 August 2023 10:18:01
 Printed:

Last saved by: Huw Summers
 Revision number: 2
 Total editing time: 126 Minutes

Statistic name	Value
Pages:	3
Paragraphs:	29
Lines:	126
Words:	1263
Characters:	7261
Characters (with space...):	8511

Properties

Size: 20.7KB
 Pages: 3
 Words: 1263
 Total Editing Time: 115 Minutes
 Title: Add a title
 Tags: Add a tag
 Comments: Add comments

Related Dates

Last Modified: 07/06/2022 13:32
 Created: 07/06/2022 13:32
 Last Printed:

Related People

Author: HS Huw Summers
 Add an author
 Last Modified By: HS Huw Summers

1. Before 13.32pm Huw summers opens exhibit 33 and modifies some of the document which had been returned to him by Widanalage, and then creates a new version of exhibit 33. Mr Summers then sends the document back to Mr Widanalage.
2. Exhibit 53 is claimed by the University to be one of the documents used to make the reports.
3. As can be seen, this document was modified by Huw Summers from the last time it was modified by the external examiner (exhibit 33) and given a new name. Point No. 1 has now been changed and is a modification made by Huw Summers:

1F

Exhibit 41 (A Possible Cover Up)



Info

Decision_revisions_required

C:\Users\geoffrey\AppData\Local\Temp\Temp2_OneDrive_2023-08-07.zip\GB SAR 076

Save As

Read-Only Document
This document has been opened in read-only mode. Changes cannot be made to the original document. To save changes, create a new copy of the document.

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

Check for Issues

Inspect Document
Before publishing this file, be aware that it contains:

- Revisions
- Document properties and author's name
- Content that people with disabilities find difficult to read

Manage Versions

There are no previous versions of this file.

Properties

Size 22.1KB
Pages 3
Words 1291
Total Editing Time 159 Minutes
Title Add a title
Tags Add a tag
Comments Add comments

Related Dates
Last Modified 08/06/2022 12:06
Created 07/06/2022 13:32
Last Printed

Related People

Author Huw Summers
Add an author

Last Modified By Widanalage, Dhammika

Decision_revisions_required Properties

General Summary Statistics Contents Custom

Created: 07 June 2022 13:32:00
Modified: 08 August 2023 07:44:02
Accessed: 08 August 2023 07:44:08
Printed:

Last saved by: Widanalage, Dhammika
Revision number: 8
Total editing time: 159 Minutes

Statistic name	Value
Pages:	3
Paragraphs:	29
Lines:	128
Words:	1291
Characters:	7407
Characters (with space...)	8685

OK Cancel

- The document exhibit 41, supplied by SAR on the 19th July 2023.
- Exhibit 41 was authored by Huw Summers and modified by Dhammika Widanalage.
- Created 7th June at 13.32pm and final modification on 8th June 12.06pm.
- Point 1 has been deleted from exhibit 33 and now replaced with point 2. This change does not show up as a modification by Widanalage in exhibit 33, but must be a modification made by the author in exhibit 53 when Huw Summers received exhibit 33 back from Mr Widanalage.
- Exhibit 33 had been sent back to Huw Summers after Mr Widanalage finished his last modification at 17.42pm 6th June 2022. Then the document re-appears as exhibit 53 at 13.32pm 7th June, for a short while, whilst being edited by Mr Summers then sent back to Mr Widanalage when it then becomes exhibit 41.
- This document when it arrives back to Mr Widanalage, as-well as having text deleted (point No. 1), there has also now been some of the internal examiner's 'supposedly pre viva' document that was actually written the day after the viva (exhibit 35), added to it.

- 7 Mr Widanalage makes 2 edits and that's the last of Mr Widanalage's input and the final editing from him.

But the oddest thing is, these edits by Mr Widanalage are never updated onto the final Addendum report? There could be a couple of scenarios why this is the case.

a) Mr Summers is now very worried the plan is going wrong and now comes up with a cover story. He sends exhibit 41 back to Widanalage with the sole purpose of what happens next is to make him look ethical if it ever gets questioned. He will say that the external examiner although making more changes, was now out of time and he could not allow these last modifications to the document to be put on final report.

Or,

B) Perhaps Mr Summers was in a rush the day he wrote the final reports

Or,

C) Perhaps the document never existed at this time? **This could be the case; it is easy to send a computer back in time to make a forgery.**

There were only 2 revisions made to exhibit 41 by Mr Widanalage, you can see there are 8 revisions in total. All the other revisions were already made by Summers in exhibit 53.

The internal examiner's comments added a possible count of 4 new revisions. There are also another 2 revisions in the document that do not belong to either the external examiner or the internal examiner comments or modifications.

Mr Widanalage's edits from exhibit 41 never made the Addendum.

- 8 Therefore, to calculate who contributed how many words to all the documents: Exhibit 33 was opened (being the first, except from the withheld document) and all modifications by Widanalage were removed, and thus leaving how many words the missing withheld document written by Summers contained. We have:

Document	Total No. of Words	Huw Summers No. of words	Widanalage No. of words	Internal examiner No. of words	Date of Final Modification
Exhibit 33	1257	660	420 (177 link words)		6 th June 2022 17.42pm
Exhibit 41	1286	592	448 (177 link words)	69	8 th June 2022 12.06pm
Exhibit 53	1258	592	420 (177 link words)	69	7 th June 2022 13.32pm
Addendum exhibit 4	1286	620	420 (177 link words)	69	9 th June 2022 11.57am

Modifications from exhibit 41 that never made the Addendum.

110797: <https://doi.org/10.1010/j.dpehney.2022.110797>

¶

9.10. → Any hypotheses presented must be referenced to existing refereed, scientific literature, or

justified by detailed evidence from experiment. The experiment of the electric field charge theories of Joseph Newman and the thesis. Discussion of Newman's work should be limited to explanation of the observed phenomena, which cannot be explained by the accuracy of the measurements. ¶

¶

~~10. → Where scientific theories are presented the link and relevance of measurement data must be more clearly made. Where equations are stated, each term should be specified and applied to the experimental observations. The equation links to measured variables and any prediction be corroborated by the experiment. Why weren't any prediction of the cell temperature and voltage made with the equations that were presented? Where well established theories are presented, they need to be interpreted in the standard way, as understood by the scientific community. ¶~~

¶

11. → The purpose of the thesis is to present the student's work. Where other work is referred to it should be referenced, instances of full reproduction of other reports and papers should be removed from the thesis. ¶

¶

Widanalage, Dhammika, 08/06/2022 11:34:00 deleted:

10. Where scientific theories are presented the link and relevance of the theory to the measurement data must be more clearly made. Where equations are stated, each term should be specified and applied to the experimental observations. Explanations must be given on how the equation links to measured variables and any prediction be corroborated by the experiment. Why weren't any prediction of the cell temperature and voltage made with the equations that were presented? Where well established theories are presented, they need to be interpreted in the standard way, as understood by the scientific community.

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 within a 12-month period.

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

¶
1. → The thesis title is: **An Investigation of the Photoelectric effect during the Electric Field Charge.** This is misleading and effect has not been studied. ¶

¶
2. → Where scientific theories are presented the link and relevance of the theory to the measurement data must be more clearly made. The key observed variables in this work are current, voltage and temperature. The theory and equations provided was not applied to predict any of the observed quantities. Where equations are stated, each term should be specified and applied to the experimental observations. Explanations must be given on how the equation links to measured variables and any prediction be corroborated by the experiment. Why weren't any prediction of the cell temperature and voltage made with the equations or theory that was presented? Where well established theories are presented, they need to be interpreted in the standard way, as understood by the scientific community. ¶

¶
2.3. A chapter on the relevant standard models of battery operation (what happens at the anode and cathode during a charge or discharge), how a battery generates heat as irreversible and reversible heat and the temperature effects, should be presented so that the experimental data can be assessed in reference to accepted knowledge of the device under study. ¶

Widanalage, Dhammika, 08/06/2022 11:34:00 added:
2. Where scientific theories are presented the link and relevance of the theory to the measurement data must be more clearly made. The key observed variables in this work are current, voltage and temperature. The theory and equations provided was not applied to predict any of the observed quantities. Where equations are stated, each term should be specified and applied to the experimental observations. Explanations must be given on how the equation links to measured variables and any prediction be corroborated by the experiment. Why weren't any prediction of the cell temperature and voltage made with the equations or theory that was presented? Where well established theories are presented, they need to be interpreted in the standard way, as understood by the scientific community.

1G

R & R Forms Exhibit 3,

The missing text from the R & R forms would have been added to the R & R Forms on the day they were produced, on Thursday 9th June 2022, by Huw Summers, Clare Goss and Zoe Perry, using the notes Huw Summers kept during the viva, there is no other explanation or source for this missing text.

They were never waiting for this R & R form as stated by Perry in emails, 5,6, and 7. Perry was lying to allow Summers and Widanalage the time to produce the Addendum between them. The R & R form was produced on the 9th of June, adding pastes of signatures and a handwritten date. This missing text on the R and R form did not appear in Huw Summers documents, exhibits 33,41,53,

Missing text that is only in the R & R form:

1.1

- 1 First 5 Paragraphs missing
- 2 Paragraph 7, missing text
- 3 Paragraph 8 and 9 missing

1.2

Paragraph's 1, 2 and 3 missing

1.3

Completely Missing

2

Internal examiner report supplied (exhibit 35) is authored by Lijie Li but dated 31st May 2022. The date and signature are changed on R & R form.

1 Point 4. Photoelectric effect is not applicable to this experiment.

2 Change of text in Addendum,

From Summers word June 7th 2022 The photoelectric effect has not been studied.

Claim of Fraud and Forgery

1 The Chairperson, the research support lead, and the examiners intentionally mislead Mr Blanche after the exam. They each told a different story of events. See emails.

2 The Chairperson with the research support lead, pretended they were waiting for the examiners R & R report whilst secretly they were writing the documents the addendum report would be made from, alongside the external examiner, with only some edits by the examiner. It is calculated the chairperson and the PGR office wrote 48% of the Addendum, there are 13% links added by external examiner, leaving 39% shared between sources of the two examiners.

Point D

Electronic Documents

I will share by email all electronic documents/recordings i will rely on in court. The formats will be: pdf. word document. Mp3. Mp4.

Please outline the following or what you deem to be relevant:

- 1 The parties and their legal representatives must also, before the first case management conference, discuss the disclosure of Electronic Documents. In some cases (for example heavy and complex cases) it may be appropriate to begin discussions before proceedings are commenced. The discussions should include (where appropriate) the following matters –

(1) the categories of Electronic Documents within the parties' control, the computer systems, electronic devices and media on which any relevant documents may be held, storage systems and document retention policies

Point E

- a) Mr Blanche knows of no reason; the disposal of a defence should await trial.
- b) I have already alerted the defense to their right to rely on evidence opposing the applicant.
- c) There was no evidence supplied or a justification included in their N244, in their claim to set aside a default judgement, They Set out no reasoned evidence how they can or intend to defend the claims. Stating, 'the case has no merit', provides no evidence for a successful defense or reason why the court should set aside a default judgement.
- d) It was noted in the N244 from the defense Beth Cara, the defense and the defendant made misleading statements to the court whilst being in contempt of court.

The facts stated in this claimant statement are within my own knowledge, and I believe to be true.

Regards

Geoff Blanche
07429 925970

My Reference:

Blanche 5 (Defense to Counterclaim)

IN Defense to the Defendant's Counterclaim

Mr Geoffrey Blanche (Original claimant)

Date: 6th March 2024

10 Avon Street, Cymmer, SA13 3LT

Claim No. K19ZA750.

Claimants' comments in red.

I am giving the defense every chance to settle this in accordance with the overriding objective.

In defense of the counterclaim by the defendant, I reply to:

- a) the defendant's reliance on the Complaint Investigation by Mr Seagrim**
- b) To the points made by Jennifer Thelen, Defendant's barrister.**

1 The defense relies on Mr Seagrim:

A bare faced denial, with misrepresentation of the truth to mislead the court. Mr Seagrim quotes no facts or rules which apply to the "due process", he just dismisses all claims and found no evidence, which is unbelievable on many levels. University staff are supposed to be the "cream of the milk" of our learning establishments. In this defense they highlight no rules to back their claims of defense except an attempt to mislead the court by quoting half a rule. Statements such as, "All credible scientists", "Mainstream academic community", "special case," "There is not a shred of evidence" are all hollow statements. They try to use a not-so-subtle gaslighting approach to win the reader, to believe their bare faced lies, "we would be shouting from the roof tops", "Mr Blanche would be champion of Swansea".

2 The claimant was not under investigation and had good reason not to participate in Mr Seagrim's complaint investigation. Mr Blanche had already predicted this would be another cover up for the wrongdoing of staff, Mr Seagrim did not disappoint. Mr Seagrim falls well below any professional investigation standard. Mr Blanche was refused help by all university staff with his own investigation, Exhibit 23. According to Mr Seagrim his report is a Non-Criminal Investigation. Mr Seagrim uses a tabloid style of writing and Swansea university hit new lows in public standards with Mr Seagrim's defamatory report investigation writing. His investigation is devoid of all, and any facts presented by Mr Blanche. He makes no attempt to see if "due process" had been followed and he claims due process was followed, contrary to the evidence; he does NOT examine or discuss any evidence. He said he had read all the documents listed carefully and further information held by the university in documents. He analyses none of the documents or makes any

attempt to follow the paper trail to see if rules were obeyed. He does not even (just as the two appeals did), look to see if the reports were filed correctly. The reason he does not investigate is because academic services covered up the wrongdoing. This is what the evidence presents to the investigation carried out by Mr Blanche.

What is Due process?

The Encyclopaedia Britannica tell us:

[Due process | Definition, Examples, & Facts | Britannica](#)

Due process, a course of legal proceedings **according to rules** and principles that **have been established** in a system of **jurisprudence for the enforcement and protection of private rights**. In each case, due process contemplates an exercise of the powers of government as the **law** permits and sanctions, under recognized safeguards for **the protection of individual rights**.

Rules are due process. Billy Seagrim says in his investigation: *Prof. Summers stated that it was his job as chair to follow a due process.*

Mr Summers knew what the due process was, and tells us this in the pre viva meeting, but he does not apply the due process. i.e. the rules. He is dishonest, Mr Blanche is deceived by the chairperson, the examiners, and PGR office. This is then continued in the academic services office during appeal procedures and then by Billy Seagrim. How do we know this? The document evidence and witnesses expose their wrongdoing. They will now claim academic immunity to try and use a parliament privilege for a nefarious use and mislead the court.

3 One of Mr Seagrim's objectives in his report is to invent Mr Blanche has a conspiracy theorist. He uses the word conspiracy over 27 times, instead of discussing and presenting the facts of the case. Mr Blanche is the victim, and Mr Seagrim has no duty of care to the victim. This is not an investigation by Mr Seagrim. It is, gaslighting, more defamation, devoid of facts presented, and just another attempt by this Corporation to cover up wrongdoing. "WE WORK TOGETHER" is their moto.

4 The Academic Services office, freedom of information (FOI) requests, is under the directing mind and will of Paul Boyle the vice chancellor. This office withheld documents when Mr Blanche made FOI requests. Natalie Wathan states in exhibit 9,

*"The purpose of the Complaints Procedure is to enable issues of complaint to be thoroughly investigated and for findings to be made upon the issues of complaint alleged based on **all evidence collated through the investigations.**"*

Mr Seagrim admits to collecting and reading the evidence but identifies nothing wrong, all allegations dismissed. During Mr Blanche's investigation, Mr Blanche uncovered withheld documents. The defense has been informed of this with evidence shared on December 17th withheld doc.pdf and in Blanche 4, to reach a settlement. Yet in any of their defense document there is no mention of these withheld documents. Withholding documents to cause a loss:

Point 1 Fraud Act 2006 (legislation.gov.uk)

(1) A person is guilty of fraud if he is in breach of any of the sections listed in subsection (2) (which provide for different ways of committing the offence).

(2) The sections are—

(a) section 2 (fraud by false representation),

(b) section 3 (fraud by failing to disclose information), and

(c) section 4 (fraud by abuse of position).

(3) A person who is guilty of fraud is liable—

(a) on summary conviction, to imprisonment for a term not exceeding 12 months or to a fine not exceeding the statutory maximum (or to both);

(b) on conviction on indictment, to imprisonment for a term not exceeding 10 years or to a fine (or to both).

(4) Subsection (3)(a) applies in relation to Northern Ireland as if the reference to 12 months were a reference to 6 months.

2 Fraud by false representation

(1) A person is in breach of this section if he—

(a) dishonestly makes a false representation, and

(b) intends, by making the representation—

(i) to make a gain for himself or another, or

(ii) to cause loss to another or to expose another to a risk of loss.

(2) A representation is false if—

(a) it is untrue or misleading, and

(b) the person making it knows that it is, or might be, untrue or misleading.

(3) “Representation” means any representation as to fact or law, including a representation as to the state of mind of—

(a) the person making the representation, or

(b) any other person.

(4) A representation may be express or implied.

(5) For the purposes of this section a representation may be regarded as made if it (or anything implying it) is submitted in any form to any system or device designed to receive, convey or respond to communications (with or without human intervention).

3 Fraud by failing to disclose information

A person is in breach of this section if he—

(a) dishonestly fails to disclose to another person information which he is under a legal duty to disclose, and

(b) intends, by failing to disclose the information—

(i) to make a gain for himself or another, or

(ii) to cause loss to another or to expose another to a risk of loss.

4 Fraud by abuse of position

(1) A person is in breach of this section if he—

(a) occupies a position in which he is expected to safeguard, or not to act against, the financial interests of another person,

(b) dishonestly abuses that position, and

(c) intends, by means of the abuse of that position—

(i) to make a gain for himself or another, or

(ii) to cause loss to another or to expose another to a risk of loss.

(2) A person may be regarded as having abused his position even though his conduct consisted of an omission rather than an act.

5 “Gain” and “loss”

(1) The references to gain and loss in sections 2 to 4 are to be read in accordance with this section.

(2) “Gain” and “loss” —

(a) extend only to gain or loss in money or other property;

(b) include any such gain or loss whether temporary or permanent; and “property” means any property whether real or personal (including things in action and other intangible property).

(3) “Gain” includes a gain by keeping what one has, as well as a gain by getting what one does not have.

(4) “Loss” includes a loss by not getting what one might get, as well as a loss by parting with what one has.

Point 2 Forgery and Counterfeiting Act 1981 (legislation.gov.uk)

Section 1 Forgery Act 1981 states:

A person is guilty of forgery if he makes a false instrument, with the intention that he or another shall use it to induce somebody to accept it as genuine, and by reason of so accepting it to do or not to do some act to his own or any other person's prejudice.

It must be shown that D intended for the false instrument it be used to induce somebody to accept it as genuine and, by reason of so accepting it, to do or not to do some act to his own or another's prejudice: R. v. Mary Sylvia Campbell (1985) 80 Cr.App.R. 47, CA.

An intention to induce another to accept a copy of a forgery will also suffice: R v Ondhia (1998) 2 Cr.App.R 150 CA

A false instrument is one that "purports" to be something which is not - i.e. it must tell a lie about itself (see the decision by the House of Lords in R v More [1988] 86 Crim App R 234)

a) They had a legal duty to disclose this withheld document - The withheld document is the First draft of the Addendum report and is completely not mentioned in their defense, as it is fatal to their case. It is a document authored by the chairperson and PGR office, then sent to the external examiner (Warwick) who modifies it and this new document (which is supplied) is listed as, Exhibit 33. Mr Boyle the vice chancellor is the head of freedom of information requests, it is a subsidiary of his department. The defense statement of case omits any mention of this withheld document from their defense even after being informed prior to Jennifer Thelen writing their defense. This withheld document demonstrates more than half the reports were written by the PGR committee through the chairperson and not by the examiners, the document evidence or paper trail tell us the complete story. POC 12. See 28.4, 30.3 by the defense. See 'Blanche 4' where the withheld document is exposed. The document was either:

- I. never filed to academic services**
- or**
- II. academic services decided not to share it.**

b) Gemma Wilkins Appeal outcome exhibit 8, pdf. The Microsoft word outcome letter doc. that this pdf was generated from is withheld not to reveal who modified it, they claim it was a junior member of staff. POC 46, Mr Seagrim fails to uncover this.

c) Gemma Wilkins filtering committee notes are written by Gemma Wilkins, there was no filtering committee. exhibit 21. Exhibit 50. Mr Seagrim fails to uncover this.

5 Mr Seagrim failed to include or discuss one set of rules under scrutiny – The academic appeals procedure rules, exhibit 13.

6 Mr Seagrim gaslights the reader and invents Mr Blanche has a "conspiracy theorist" and there is a university wide conspiracy invented by Mr Blanche, although all Mr Blanche ever did was present the evidence with the facts and supporting references. Mr Seagrim's tactic is to draw the reader to irrelevant points as-well as inventing misleading arguments, just as Gemma Wilkins attempted. He fantasises that Mr Blanche has a warped personality; it seems Mr Seagrim is upset Mr Blanche did not participate in his

investigation. He reverts to what can only be considered as “hate speech” whilst writing this utterly defamatory report.

“ As Mr Blanche has refused to be interviewed, I am unable to discern whether or not Mr Blanche believes these various conspiracy theories, i.e., whether Mr Blanche has an honest but warped view of what has happened, or whether Mr Blanche is dishonest in his claims and willing to say anything in order to achieve his desired result(s), or indeed whether the one has become the other. It is unnecessary for me to determine which of these is the more likely.

7 Whilst reverting to this type of language against Mr Blanche for no reason, in the interviews Mr Seagrim conducts with the professors; he praises his interviewees and work associates; and agrees with them “unhesitatingly”, that they did nothing wrong, he does not challenge them with the rules and regulations of due process; despite the conclusive evidence against the chairperson and other staff; of wrongdoing uncovered in Mr Blanche’s investigation. Mr Seagrim ignores all due process and professional standards expected by the rules. The professors and Mr Seagrim agree the definition of due process is, he had a “fair shot”.

8 According to Mr Summers, taken from the online pre viva meeting, 20th May 2022.

“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.” (exhibit 11)

N.B “procedures” meaning “the rules”. The chairperson confirms he knows the rules, and it’s quite clear in the rules ,it’s the examiners duties to write and produce the reports. The chairperson has section 4 to complete, on the day, and must file the R and R form on the day as expected, with academic services. He must write a report if there is an appeal, these are what the rules state, nothing else, nothing more, that is the chair’s role. What Mr Summers states in his interview with Mr Seagrim is fantasy to try and cover up his wrongdoing, and they all know it.

9 When requested in an FOI request for all examination board documents, Mr Summers or Mr Boyle withheld the document he would send to the external examiner. On 9th June 2022, the chairperson writes the R & R form report with the PGR office, Supervisors, Clare Ellis Goss, and Zoe Perry, whilst claiming they were waiting for the R and R form from the examiners. They all ignored all the rules to censor Mr Blanche’s research. POC

10 Mr Summers and Zoe Perry continually lied to Mr Blanche that they were waiting for the examiners’ R and R form when they would produce the R and R form all the time on the 9th of June 2022 at 11.10am. They conspired together to deceive. The examiners go along with this and Zoe Perry gaslights and tells lies to Mr Blanche on behalf of Mr Summers several times, after the viva exam, in emails, on the 6th, 8th, and 10th June 2022. Emails 1,2 5,6,7,8,9,10,11

11 Billy Seagrim’s Investigation report,

Private and Confidential Investigation Report Regarding: Mr Geoffrey Blanche (946484) Author: William Seagram Report Date: 22 June 2023

The standard that Mr Blanche must meet to prove any factual allegation is the balance of probabilities, i.e., that something is more likely than not to have happened. **The evidence Mr Blanche presents is: Beyond reasonable doubt.**

7. Several of the University's Regulations are relevant to Mr Blanche's complaint. I have read them carefully. **Did not read them or exhibit 5 and 6.**

If a document is not mentioned herein, it does not mean I have not read it and carefully considered its contents.

h. Mr Blanche's documents setting out a potential civil claim (Annex 11). **Beth Cara misleads the court 3 times in her ELC 01, stating this document did not exist.**

I will consider the appropriate remedy if I find any allegations proved. **Gaslighting.**

For a full appreciation of Mr Blanche's complaint, the reader should read the ERR itself.

This report cannot consider all of Mr Blanche's comments, they are too many.

How do we know he read anything if he does not reply to the claims. We find the same failure by Jennifer Thelen who fails to reply to 35 claims; as-well as then misleading the court with false statements.

8. There is a danger of legitimising Mr Blanche's conspiracy-related theories by providing them oxygen."

In other words: I'll try and fool the reader by saying conspiracy-related theories. But if you investigate the evidence, you will see Mr Blanche is correct, Mr Blanche did investigate the complaint with no cooperation from the defendant. He applied the rules to their actions, and the defendants fall spectacularly from the truth, to be exposed as charlatans. The corporation looks for ways to legitimise censoring by making false representations of the truth, gaslighting, pretending Mr Blanche is studying batteries. Everything is wrong and nothing is correct. Whilst the corporation break all their rules. If they are allowed to continue like this, the next academic term will see the rules re-written to give them more powers of censoring with no double checks to misfeasance.

10. Needless to say, this is not a criminal investigation; Mr Blanche cannot run the investigation; this is obviously not a cover up but a genuine attempt to investigate Mr Blanche's complaints; I have not gaslit Mr Blanche; rather than the allegations being 'way off the mark' they encapsulate all of Mr Blanche's material complaints; and I have not harassed Mr Blanche to do 'my job', but sought his co-operation whilst investigating his complaint. **Gaslighting.**

23. As I will explain, Mr Blanche's complaint suffers from an acute lack of any evidential basis.

False statement, misrepresentation of the truth.

24. One individual I sought to interview, declined to participate: Dr. Zhongfu Zhou;

Dr. Zhongfu Zhou had previously given Mr Blanche a very good reference in March 2020 (see below), (exhibit 51), it would not be advantageous for Mr Seagram during the

complaint investigation to interview or analyse this reference, because it contradicted the examination board claims. The reference states Mr Blanche as the ideal candidate for PhD study at Swansea, and how reliable his data is due to the excellent design of his electronic data collecting circuit. This reference was given before Newman's energy machine was included in Mr Blanche's thesis and before covid. It was after the implied malice by the supervisors and Mr Blanche's objections and demanding further evidence of the supervisors' false claims that omitted the truth about Newman, did Mr Zhou resign, or was he pushed? Mr Zhou displayed integrity to Mr Blanche. Mr Zhou had also agreed, and stated to Mr Blanche in conversation, that Mr Blanche had indeed discovered new knowledge within electromagnetism with the possibility of renewable energy production benefiting from this. These are reasons why the university did not want Mr Zhou involved and why Mr Seagrim is very comfortable with no participation by Zhou in his cover up, there was no investigation by Billy Seagrim, just some polite virtue signalling by the Corporation's employees.

18 March 2020



Subject: Reference letter for Mr Geoff BLANCHE
Date: 18/03/2020

To Whom It May Concern:
Swansea University

I am writing to recommend Mr Geoff BLANCHE for applying for studying PhD at Swansea University.

Mr Geoff BLANCHE is currently a MSc student (research) at Swansea University in 2019/20 academic year and currently under supervision of Dr Augustine, Dr Batcup and me. He is currently engaging research in the area of Lithium Ion battery charging/discharging for endothermal analysis of Lithium Ion battery. He built an excellent laboratory power supply-based battery charging circuit and Arduino microcontroller-based temperature and voltage measurement circuit as well required data acquisition software for his research purpose. Based on the developed circuit he has obtained very good measurement results. He has shown strong interests in exploring new technology particularly in the physics of battery charging/discharging process various battery charging techniques. He is also a hardworking student and always try his best to achieve his research target.

I strongly believe he is suitable to studying PhD course at Swansea university. If you need any additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me at the following address.

Sincerely yours



Dr Zhongfa Zhou

Lecturer in power Electronics
College of Engineering | Coleg Peirian
Swansea University | Prifysgol Abertawe

The chairperson wrote this statement in the withheld document, *“The experiment data has limited accuracy”*, obviously Mr Summers was unaware of the reference from Dr Zhou to Mr Blanche whilst writing his defamatory reports, *Dr Zhou said: “Based on the developed circuit he has obtained very good measurement results”*. This statement that contradicts Dr Zhou, is found in section 3 of the R and R form and most interestingly in the Addendum. Mr Summers claimed to write the addendum from the Decision_revisions_required_DW, (exhibit 33), this was confirmed by Lisa Hughes in email, see Blanche 4 and (exhibit 37). This statement from exhibit 33, was written BY HUW SUMMERS AND THE PGR OFFICE BEFORE THE DOCUMENT HAD ANY MODIFICATIONS MADE BY THE EXTERNAL EXAMINER ON THE 5TH JUNE 2022, AND THIS STATEMENT WILL BE FOUND IN THE WITHHELD DOCUMENT. FATAL TO ANY DEFENSE.

26. Regarding the R and R Forms, he ‘almost certainly’ cut and paste the signatures, and it was his role to collate and finalise the report. Prof. Summers stated that he put the signatures there because that is what those people said / wrote – it was not evidence of a cover up. **False Statement see POC 27**

COVID-19 was not discussed during the viva and has no relevance to his conduct towards Mr Blanche;

False statement - Mr Summers did make a remark about covid19 vaccinations prior to the oral exam, this comment was prompted by the fact the witness was reading a paper and the headline of the paper was about covid vaccinations. Mr Seagrim fails to mention exhibit 6, demonstrating Mr Summers was involved in research to the business product - micro needles - for covid19 injections. The chairperson, the vice chancellor and corporation had a vested interest in these products. From exhibit 6,

“The university have vested financial interest as an independent corporation in covid-19 products [4]. Mr Blanche challenged the vice chancellor’s view, and that the covid-19 vaccines he was promoting to students were not safe and effective as claimed, and Mr Blanche responded in his and other student’s best interests showing the yellow card scheme data as evidence the vaccine was and is dangerous. This has now been reinforced in the ERR with the deaths and adverse reactions increasing from Mr Blanche’s submission date of his Masters to the writing of the ERR.



Whilst taking funding from the public purse to develop these vaccine products, they are also acting as an independent corporation. The chairperson and vice chancellor also have the responsibility and trust of the public and students, acting as public officers within education discovery and research. By Mr Blanche challenging the covid-19 narrative, both the chairperson and vice chancellor have a motive to fail and censor Mr Blanche as Mr Blanche’s research uncovers vaccine deaths and adverse reactions, whilst the chairperson

and vice chancellor are developing products and promoting the covid-19 vaccine as, “safe and effective.”

The vice chancellor (exhibit 62,63) failed to reply to Mr Blanche. The chairperson deceived Mr Blanche (exhibit 11), did not apply the rules and wrote the reports alongside the PGR office. By Mr Blanche opposing the covid vaccines it gave Swansea and the chairperson a direct reason to act the way they did. They were protecting their careers and the corporation’s business interests. One of the funders of this technology is Bill Gates, who was funding mRNA interference at Swansea as-well as being a major funder of the WHO and many other corporations including mainstream media, i.e. BBC. Mr Blanche included this information in his prologue (exhibit 7) as opposition to untested technology and experimenting on humans.

[Swansea University Receives Grand Challenges Explorations Grant For Groundbreaking Research in Global Health and Development](#)

Professor Paul Dyson’s idea developed at Swansea University Institute of Life Science comes under the heading of RNA Interference in Insects. RNA is a nucleic acid copy of the DNA of the genes and is an intermediate set of instructions for making proteins. It is the interference of RNA in insects which results in targeted genes effectively being switched off and, as a consequence, the insects stop feeding and ultimately die. The RNA interference is delivered by bacteria that naturally live inside the targeted insects, offering the potential of a new non-chemical pesticide that can be aimed only at the specific insect pest.

*The research sponsored by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation and led by microbial geneticist Professor Paul Dyson at Swansea University is directed at shutting down genes in the Western Flower Thrips (*Franklinella occidentalis*). This insect pest devastates over 500 different species of plants, including a large number of fruit and vegetables. It lays eggs in the crops which hatch into “nymphs” whose voracious appetites are highly destructive. It is also an important vector of plant viruses. RNA interference will stop the millimeter long bugs from feeding, effectively killing them and preventing spread of plant diseases. As the gene based intervention does not involve chemicals and leaves other more beneficial insects such as bees unharmed, the Swansea University technology offers a more environmentally friendly way of eliminating one of the world’s most damaging food crop pests.*

30. Prof. Rees explained that he came into the supervision team quite late and his role was to organize the viva and ensure it was fair, including to ensure there was a robust and sensible examining team. **False statement, did not apply the rules. He should have realised this if he was independent and an experienced professor, more gaslighting, this time from Paul Rees.**

Prof. Rees stated that all went out of their way to ensure Mr Blanche was viva’d in a fair manner.

Prof. Rees rhetorically questioned, if there was a conspiracy to fail Mr Blanche, why would they have done that. **Maybe because they were bio medical professors involved in pushing the covid 19 vaccinations narrative? whilst Mr Blanche stood alone against this technology and for good, researched reasons. This would never be a reason they could give to censor Mr Blanche’s work, but the evidence for all the wrongdoing must hide a truth they do not want exposed. More conspiracy framing by Mr Seagram.**

38. the viva was conducted fairly and gave a fair shot to Mr Blanche to defend his work.

(POC, 4,5,6,7,8,14,15,16)

More gaslighting. The viva and examiners reports were not subject to the rules.

36. Mr Blanche must bring evidence of such a university-wide **conspiracy**. there is no actual evidence of a conspiracy to fail Mr Blanche and / or of dishonesty towards Mr Blanche or his work.

False statement.

Mr Blanche had the same evidence available to him as Mr Seagrim; Mr Blanche's work was failed. Mr Blanche was never studying batteries. In the Addendum report it is quite clear that this research is forbidden. The evidence is beyond reasonable doubt.

(Exhibit 4, 12). "Any material in the thesis relating to other areas of science, unrelated to endothermic properties of batteries must be removed"

(Exhibit 4, 2). "A chapter on the relevant standard models of battery operation (what happens at the anode and cathode during a charge or discharge), how a battery generates heat as irreversible and reversible heat and the temperature effects, should be presented so that the experimental data can be assessed in reference to accepted knowledge of the device under study".

3. A summary chapter on the of relevant standard models of battery operation (what happens at the anode and cathode during a charge or discharge), 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.

THE ABOVE (Exhibit 4, 2) IS FATAL TO THE DEFENSE CASE.

39. The sheer volume of people involved in this university-wide **conspiracy** is **improbable**, especially bearing in mind it allegedly involved no less than 8 professors, one being the Vice Chancellor, numerous professional services staffs, and an Associate Professor from a different university. One can imagine the amount of communication required to put into effect such **a conspiracy**, including involving an external examiner. Where is the evidence?

Mr Blanche wrote to the vice chancellor and others numerous times, to alert the staff of the dangers of covid 19 vaccinations to students and staff which was being exposed in the MHRA data. There was no reply by the vice chancellor, the vice chancellor along with other senior staff members ignored Mr Blanche. (see exhibits 62 and 63). Do not look and you will not find.

Fellows - The Learned Society of Wales Mr Seagrim claims in point 39 and 40 there could be no possibility to link communications between individuals, to this improbable claim. The Directing Mind and Will (DMW) personally know each other and have out of work affiliations and are all members of The Learned Society of Wales. There is a possibility for ideological agendas to be played out by corporations through university staff members. Their work is not limited to running a university for student education. There are numerous out of work connections observed.

- I. **Mr Boyle – is the vice chancellor. He is responsible for the academic services appeal and complaints office and is a DMW. He has full discretionary powers for the Swansea University Corporation. He is the chair of the senate. From his portfolio:**

Professor Paul Boyle was appointed Vice-Chancellor of Swansea University in 2019. Prior to this, he was President and Vice-Chancellor of the University of Leicester. Previously, Paul was Chief Executive of the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC), the UK's largest funding agency for social science research; the International Champion of Research Councils UK, with responsibility for international strategy on behalf of all seven UK research councils; and President of Science Europe, representing over 50 European funding agencies.

Paul is a Fellow of the Learned Society of Wales, the British Academy and the Academy of Social Sciences. He is Chair of Universities Wales' Research and Innovation Network; a Board Member of Universities UK, who provide leadership and support to executive heads of 133 UK University institutions, as well as Chair of their Research Policy Network; Vice-President and Council Member of the European University Association which represents over 800 universities in 48 countries; and Chair of Jisc, a not-for-profit organisation providing digital services and solutions to the UK's higher and further education sector.

- II. **Perumal Nithiarasu (PN)- directing mind and will of PGR Committee. Perumal Nithiarasu is Professor and Director of Research in the Department of Engineering, Swansea University. He is also a Deputy Head of Department of Engineering and currently also holds a position of Dean Academic Leadership (Research Impact) (exhibit 54). PN's research areas of interest include computational fluid dynamics/biomedical engineering and recently AI.**

- III. **Huw Summers - the chair of the examination board, biomedicine, nano tech.**

- IV. **Paul Rees – Supervisor and nominee of the PGR, biomedical.**

All bio-medicine/medical engineers except Mr Boyle:

- I. **Huw Summers and Paul Rees:**

Huw is currently Director of the Sêr Cymru NRN in Advanced Engineering and Materials, a Welsh Government funded research network that is promoting research excellence in Wales through the award of PhD, Research Fellow and research project funding. He has been a Senior Affiliate of the Houston Methodist Research Institute since 2010.

Paul Rees, Professor of Biomedical Engineering at Swansea University, has collaborated with world leading institutes such as the Broad Institute of MIT and Harvard, the Methodist Hospital Research Institute in Houston and the Francis Crick Institute in London. His research has pioneered the use of machine and deep learning to high content cell image data for disease diagnosis, therapeutic discovery, and cell function analysis.

Huw Summers and Paul Rees are both members of the Awen Institute. (POC 52)

42. . However, an element of Mr Blanche’s complaint is a more nuanced, i.e., the University are lying about Mr Blanche’s thesis to cover up the lie about Joseph Westley Newman. **There is no evidence of such lies or wide scale cover up. False statement.**

To cover up scientific progress or discovery is anathema to one of the overarching purposes of a university, especially a university’s science department. The more pertinent point is, **why? Corporate agenda, to suppress some technologies to sell their technologies.**

43. it is unfathomable that the University would not celebrate and champion Mr Blanche’s work. **False statement.**

12 Corporation developing covid19 micro needles.

40. There is no evidence that Prof. Paul Boyle has had any communication with any of the other implicated individuals concerning Mr Blanche’s views on **COVID-19, its vaccinations**, or any other purported interest of the University. It is wholly unclear what actual evidence Mr Blanche believes proves that Prof. Paul Boyle **orchestrated a conspiracy or indeed how he did so.**

41. It should be remembered that if these people were found out, they would each likely lose their jobs and reputations. **Exactly.**

44. With respect, why does Mr Blanche believe his views on **COVID-19 vaccinations** are that important to the University or Prof. Paul Boyle, the Vice Chancellor? An objective eye can clearly see that they are irrelevant and unimportant to the University’s operations, and irrelevant to Mr Blanche’s MSc in Electronics and Electrical Engineering. **False statement**



Exhibit 6, ref 4. One month into the vaccine rollout.

The project is funded by the Welsh Government Sêr Cymru funding programme. The IMPACT operation is part-funded by the European Regional Development Fund through the Welsh Government and Swansea University. **Exhibit 54.**

Huw Summers the chairperson, is currently **Director of the Sêr Cymru** NRN in Advanced Engineering and Materials, a Welsh Government funded research network that is promoting research excellence in Wales through the award of PhD, Research Fellow and research project funding.

Huw Summers

Activities

[Collapse all](#)

▼ **Funding** (12)

☰ Sort

Manufacture of silicon microneedles for drug & vaccine delivery

2014-05-14 to 2016-11-14 | Grant
Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (Swindon, GB)
GRANT_NUMBER: [EP/L020734/1](#)
GRANT_NUMBER: [EP/L020734/1](#)

[Show less detail](#)

Organization identifiers

FUNDRREF: <http://dx.doi.org/10.13039/501100000266>
Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council: GB

Total funding amount

GBP 564,437

Added


2016-01-05

Mr Blanche opposing the covid 19 experimental jabs and pandemic narrative is a factor in the defendant's behaviour towards Mr Blanche. In Mr Seagrim's point 40 and 44, Mr Seagrim gaslights how the vice chancellor could not be involved with the decisions to censor Mr Blanche's work. This development of a specific vaccine product would have taken years of planning; the evidence demonstrates this is the case. With respect, Swansea was developing these vaccine products since as early as 2014 with the chairperson the research scientist beneficiary (exhibit 6). He had everything to do with this research by the corporation, it is a business product he is highly involved with.

13 Three years later...



[Daily Mail](#)



14 Mr Seagrim throughout his report wants to promote Covid19 vaccines as a distraction to his non investigation, to develop the conspiracy theory idea he is accusing Mr Blanche of, but here in 2024 we are all out of conspiracy theories and are left with conspiracy fact.

15 There is no study relationship between the prologue or the main thesis as they are generally separated parts of science, although not completely. The connection of the prologue to Mr Blanche's Electromagnetism thesis is the fact this covid event was taking place at the time of Mr Blanche researching his work. The fact Mr Blanche wrote a prologue about his covid research findings, is not an unusual thing to do by any scientist. Writing a prologue on an unrelated subject to the main research is quite often exercised as a 'rite of passage'.

NOUN

rite of passage
(noun);
rites of passage
(plural noun)

1. a ceremony or event marking an important stage in someone's life,

NOUN

prologue
(noun);
prologues
(plural noun)

2. a separate introductory section of a literary or musical work:

Covid impacted on Mr Blanche's work, and he researched this new pandemic phenomenon as any interested research scientist would. What Mr Blanche found out; he wrote in a thoroughly referenced prologue (40 references for 5 pages of research), to his research into electromagnetism.

16 Mr Blanche paid for a service he did not get, he was evicted from the university and never asked back and was told he would not be asked back in as there were more urgent work that needed lab time.

17 **CONTRADICTIONS IN THEIR DEFENSE STRATEGY** Due to Mr Seagrim's incessant mentioning of covid 19 vaccines, it would now seem reasonable to think the defendants defense will be based on their intention to use covid19 vaccines as a conspiracy theory plot invented by Mr Blanche to blame the university for failing his thesis? But no, Jennifer Thelen doesn't develop Billy Seagrim's conspiracy theory in the defense document she writes but does not sign. Mr Seagrim's document falsely claimed covid vaccines as of no interest to Swansea whilst claiming he read all the documents! This defense flaws itself, and this is the reason Jennifer does not take up this argument in the defense and one of the many reasons Jennifer did not sign the statement of truth. Mr Seagrim mentions covid 19 vaccinations in points 12, 16, 17,19, 20, 26, 30, 35, 40, and 44. Mr Blanche can claim because of his objection to covid 19 vaccines; this being a reason why the corporation employees censored Mr Blanche's thesis and failed his work.

18 Experimental gene therapies (Covid 19 vaccines) were opposed by Mr Blanche. Most of the professors involved are bio medical professors of the corporation, relying on public money and philanthropist funders such as Bill Gates and the Clinton foundation. There WAS a reason to mention yellow card data as a worrying concern and report this in his work. There was no response to Mr Blanche by the professors involved, the vice chancellor was forwarding an agenda that was not 'safe and effective'. The corporation would then go about trying to close-down Mr Blanche's research because he objected to their narrative. The corporation did not have a link or any information about the yellow card scheme for students, they never tried to alert the students in a concerted effort. The actions of the staff were not those of objective scientists. Rather, their actions were of corporate employees enjoying good salaries whilst following the narrative to sell the corporations' products, no matter the cost to the health of the students and wider public. What can be said is, three years later, the evidence demonstrates the experimental jabs are dangerous. The amount of evidence to support this fact is so overwhelming in 2024, that Jennifer decides to stay clear of this debate that is included in the Billy Seagrim complaint report, that the defense want to rely on. What Mr Blanche reported is conspiracy fact not a conspiracy theory. A research scientist is not a conspiracy theorist when the research is supported by factual evidence. The conspiracy theorist is Mr Seagrim and the defendant. The documentaries listed below must terrify the bio-medical professors or anyone else who played a role in the 'safe and effective narrative', and involved with covid19 vaccine distribution and promotion:

[DIED SUDDENLY 2022 \(FULL DOCUMENTARY\) \(rumble.com\)](#)

<https://rumble.com/v4bp6pk-autopsy-after-myocarditis.html>

[Archive - COVID Intel - by Dr.William Makis \(substack.com\)](#)

[White clots and sudden death \(rumble.com\)](#)

[What are these \(rumble.com\)](#)

Since 2020, a new pathology has been observed, and is now being investigated by many, Dr John Campbell being one of them, is moto is what science is about.



What you see below are blood clots with a texture they say is “calamari like”, being removed from bodies by embalmers worldwide. Never seen before the covid19 jabs. It is reported by undertaker John O’Loony, the government coroner is

stopping further investigation to this alarming new pathology.

<https://rumble.com/v4cgxbc-white-clots-and-sudden-death.html>



[Dr. John Campbell](#)

[168K followers](#)

[Bombshell Study: We now have 100% Scientific Proof why the Jabbed are Dying Suddenly \(rumble.com\)](#)

[Autopsy after myocarditis \(rumble.com\)](#)

[Excess Deaths In Children Are INCREASING!" Dr Drew On Excess Deaths, Fauci & More - STAY FREE #292 \(rumble.com\)](#)

[BOMBHELL New Zealand Vaccine Data Breach - Steve Kirsch Reveals SHOCKING Findings - Stay Free #262 \(rumble.com\)](#)

The corporation funding landscape within universities tied to the pursuit of making profits, now rule common sense, this is disgraceful behaviour from all involved and a let-down for the public. People have needlessly died. The factual evidence demonstrates this, the devastation of mRNA jabs was already detectable due to the data, available as early as February 2021 (exhibit 61) whilst Mr Blanche reported on 10th September 2021 via the yellow card scheme data in his prologue. Mr Blanche made several attempts to alert the corporation. The corporation were silent about it and still are, and this being one of the reasons they censored Mr Blanche's research. But no, Mr Blanche wasn't failed, just told to remove all mention of certain parts of his research and write about batteries only. Mr Seagrim and the professors must make it look improbable there were underling reasons why they did what they did.

19 The yellow card scheme was first introduced in 1964 due to the thalidomide disaster; to monitor adverse reactions as a warning signal to remove any new experimental drugs from the market that were found to be dangerous.



PICTURE: Thalidomide victims, Why the Yellow Card Scheme was put in place.

Yellow card data From Prologue:

This weeks MHRA Yellow Card figures in a full breakdown.

Condition	Reactions	Fatal
General disorders	340772	551
Nervous system disorders	236355	246
Muscle & tissue disorders	141450	1
Gastrointestinal disorders	111533	29
Skin disorders	79248	2
Respiratory disorders	42146	183
Reproductive & breast disorders	37147	1
Infections	26356	177
Psychiatric disorders	24433	7
Eye disorders	19513	0
Blood disorders	18856	16
Vascular disorders	18292	79
Investigations	15058	3
Cardiac disorders	14727	259
Ear disorders	14433	0
Injuries	13973	3
Metabolic disorders	10629	4
Immune system disorders	4854	6
Renal & urinary disorders	3468	12
Surgical & medical procedures	1136	0
Pregnancy conditions	1105	12
Neoplasms	662	11
Hepatic disorders	614	9
Endocrine disorders	586	0
Social circumstances	563	0
Congenital disorders	160	1
Grand Total	1178069	1612

23:15 · 05 Sep 21 ·

GOV.UK
MHRA Yellow Card Reporting

Search 'summary of yellow card reporting' and on the UK government's website, scroll down to the bottom of 'annex 1' and click the print analysis for each vaccine maker. Why is this not being reported on the BBC and the injections stopped?

1517 DEATHS
1,102,228 ADVERSE REACTIONS

Data correct as of:
02/08/2021

20 The corporation group Universities UK are highly involved in pushing these experimental jabs as 'safe and effective'. Due to the funding landscape the corporation has a vested interest in pushing the jabs. The chairperson comments on this in section 1.3 of the R and R Form. This is the section where Clare Goss or Huw Summers put the wrong date on the form... All the data evidence tells us something completely different to what the corporation want to portray through their foot soldiers. The examination board stayed right away from the topic of covid vaccinations during the oral exam, why? Instead, they chose to comment

retrospectively in a negative way.

21 It is now a very worrying time when corporation and government have merged to censor their own experts from reporting their research. The legislature and executive have given up their separate powers and are now a union-party, the democracy and objectiveness has disintegrated. Even now as I write this, the executive suspends indefinitely, an enquiry into covid. This could be seen as an attempt to not be held accountable to what they did to push this toxic jab as 'safe and effective'.

It is necessary and expected that the judiciary will be the last bastion of the truth and justice, and not succumb to giving up 'the separation of powers'. To join with this

nefarious monopoly and protect the corporation, allowing this villainous behaviour to ferment will surely lead to a public revolution, already we are seeing unrest grow around the UK and the western world. Policies that are being introduced from outside the UK via WEF collaborators in government, are now being opposed by the people of the UK. MPs have failed the people and sold out to the corporation; the UK public will not be fooled by this takeover from a foreign source. Andrew Bridgen MP has stood alone, but no longer, there is descent growing in parliament (exhibit 61) to this corporate takeover of government.

The claimant believes it is the responsibility of the judiciary to send a message, and set an example, to stop this type of censoring behaviour and destruction of freedom of speech and science research censoring by the defendant, if this is not stopped the judiciary itself is in danger of collapse. The public need reassurance they still have a democracy, rather than a corporate/government merging of power. The wellbeing of the public seemed to be a priority of the state at the beginning of the claimed pandemic, but it became all too obvious by any discerning mind, that it is profits for the corporations and collaborators over all else, including peoples' lives.

It has now become dangerous to be a scientist who is prepared to expose an opposite narrative to the corporation/ government agenda. The western world governments have become the old soviet KGB.

This is highlighted in the case of Barry Young from New Zealand:

[NZ Whistleblower Arrested for Exposing the Truth: Here's What They Didn't Want You to See \(substack.com\)](https://substack.com)

In December 2023, the latest data brought forward by Government employee Barry Young from New Zealand: Barry Young, 56, a statistician at the top of his profession, has been arrested by New Zealand authorities for exposing covid vaccine data: Mr. Young, a Ministry of Health employee-turned-whistleblower, examined connections between specific COVID-19 vaccine batches and mortality rates using the government data. What he found was alarming:

Batch ID 1: Total Vaccinated 711, Death Count 152, 21.38% Dead

Batch ID 8: Total Vaccinated 221, Death Count 38, 17.19% Dead

Batch ID 3: Total Vaccinated 310, Death Count 48, 15.48% Dead

Batch ID 4: Total Vaccinated 364, Death Count 37, 10.16% Dead

Batch ID 6: Total Vaccinated 1006, Death Count 101, 10.04% Dead

Batch ID 2: Total Vaccinated 1018, Death Count 98, 9.63% Dead

Batch ID 7: Total Vaccinated 38, Death Count 3, 7.89% Dead

Batch ID 72: Total Vaccinated 5882, Death Count 278, 4.73% Dead

Batch ID 62: Total Vaccinated 18173, Death Count 831, 4.57% Dead

Batch ID 71: Total Vaccinated 11019, Death Count 498, 4.52% Dead

The underlying mortality rate in New Zealand should be only 0.75%, said Young. So the odds of all these deaths happening by chance is approximately 100 billion to 1.

22. 'University UK' tells us: [Work in parliament \(universitiesuk.ac.uk\)](https://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk)

<https://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/what-we-do>

They build and strengthen links with experts, government agencies, professional bodies, industry and commerce, other education sectors and international audiences.

Work in parliament

*The UK government sets policy that impacts all areas of our higher education sector. We maintain close relationships with policy makers in Westminster to **make sure** our members' **needs** are supported **by their policies**.*

Our policy work is co-developed with members and wider stakeholders – from students and staff, to anyone with an interest in seeing universities succeed. We also help universities develop their own responses and approaches through guidance and advice.

*Our policy work has been influential in shaping developments across several areas, including: **funding of universities**, legislation protecting student interests and regulating higher education*

securing conditions for university-based research and innovation to thrive and grow

monitoring and managing security-related risks for international research

*demonstrating the contribution of universities to **tackling the climate emergency***

enhancing free speech and academic freedom

protecting the financial sustainability of universities

ensuring universities are central to delivering a highly skilled workforce

*tackling harassment and **hate crime in universities***

*ensuring universities **support businesses and drive innovation***

protecting** and enhancing the quality of universities' **teaching

securing an effective regulatory environment

helping universities contribute to the post-pandemic economic and social recovery

supporting the mental health of students and staff

For more detail on our policy work, including information, guidance and recommendations to universities and policy makers, see our recent publications.

23 Mr Blanche found conflicting research to the government and academia narrative, in respect to covid and covid vaccinations. He reported this in a prologue to his work. Why shouldn't he? After all it is highlighted above by the corporation, they promote freedom of speech? Yet Mr Blanche did get criticised by Huw Summers for exercising this in his thesis. Mr Summers just like Mr Seagrim spends all his effort in writing a derogatory report that is not the truth. See R and R form section 1.3. Reporting findings no matter what they tell you is an act of a responsible scientist. Should Mr Blanche and other scientists now only report what goes along with the narrative? Should scientists fear being arrested like Barry Young has been? for doing what is morally right?

As for the funding and political landscape, Mr Blanche is interested in who is paying for the professors' research and the employees' salaries. Political study, business, marketing modules and funding landscapes were modules of the BSc degree Mr Blanche undertook. Ignoring this would be a naïve attitude and a mistake. A good all-round scientist should be concerned with funding landscapes and current events. It is a duty to report to the public on your expertise through study; academics are relied upon in a free democratic country to report the facts. Mr Blanche's divulging of researched evidence was with concern for his family and the wider public. It seems, 'Freedom of speech' is not a democratic right at this establishment and Mr Blanche is criticized for exercising his right. Mr Blanche's research was backed up by data from the MHRA regulatory body (it is noted 86% of MHRA funding is received from the people who they regulate, see exhibit 61). The data which is reported to the MHRA is direct evidence the experimental mRNA jabs are dangerous, Mr Blanche demonstrated this in his research at the time, but this fell on deaf ears. The university corporation did not publish this material, although they did say they would put a link on their website to the yellow card scheme. Why were they not monitoring this scheme as a matter of urgency, considering this was untried experimental technology on humans? After all, we need to be able to trust experts, we rely on them to be honest and to tell the truth? This experimental jab was just that, an experiment. The data tells us, it has been a catastrophic drug imposed on mankind whilst being promoted as 'Safe and effective'. It is now public knowledge, the far-reaching effect this drug has had. One of the biggest funders - Bill Gates - is a self-proclaimed eugenicist and claims by vaccination he can reduce the world population? These are not opinions but public knowledge facts in the public domain.

see exhibit 5, emails 22, 27, 28,29,30,31,32,33, 36,37,38

24 The corporation dictate government policy (they tell us this in point 22 above) and are in lockstep with government policy, the fact they lobby parliament to protect their "needs" tells us the corporation's agenda. The official government or we should now assume the corporate narrative, as they proclaim to dictate government policy, tells us - MPs listen to the chief medical officer to set policy, the narrative of "safe and effective" was a lockstep narrative preached by all with no basis in truth; were the people lied to? The Corporation's narrative would be under threat from this yellow card data presented by Mr Blanche. The corporation did not have a *duty of care* for peoples' lives, **ONE MUST RESPECT THE FACT THAT, EACH NUMBER IN THIS YELLOW CARD DATA IS A PERSON**, it reads

like - only profits seem to matter, and an ideology will be followed by academia for the benefit of the corporation, obey or expect to be failed and censored, peoples' lives do not matter.

25 46. There is not a shred of evidence of any conspiracy against Mr Blanche. I dismiss Allegation 1. I go further than finding it not proved. I am sure that there was no conspiracy of any nature. There was no agenda to fail Mr Blanche, he did not, in fact, fail.

A recap from the Addendum report: "A complete re-writing of the thesis is required. 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"

26 45. Of the other various conspiracy theories that Mr Blanche presents as potential motives for an alleged agenda to fail him, it is difficult to relate any of them to him being failed (albeit he was not failed, of course). They are all, in any event, outlandish and unsupported by evidence. Those claims include matters relating to 9/11, paedophilia, genetically modified species, and rapists (see the document entitled '18/01/2022 For the attention of the Registrar').



All research is supported by evidence, see thesis exhibit 7 references, false claim by Billy Seagrim.

The 10,000 strong Architects and engineers for 9/11 truth are currently trying to hold NIST to account as well as the 'American Society of Civil Engineers Journal of Engineering Mechanics' for bogus reports they wrote and falsely promoted and published on structural collapse theory.

These architects and engineers are demanding further details on how NIST came to their conclusions on how Building 7 and the Twin Towers collapsed on that fateful day September 11th, 2001, when nearly 3000 people lost their lives. NIST are currently withholding information contrary to their own rules of disclosure. NIST's official reports on how these buildings collapsed do not match with the \$300,000 PhD studies carried out by Alaska Fairbanks University; Whilst NIST had a budget of 6 million dollars. See exhibit 56 page 21.

[A Structural Reevaluation of the Collapse of World Trade Center 7-March 2020 \(wtc7report.org\)](http://wtc7report.org)

A Structural Revaluation of the Collapse of World Trade Center 7 Authors J. Leroy Hulse, Ph.D., P.E., S.E., University of Alaska Fairbanks And Zhili Quan, Ph.D., Bridge Engineer South Carolina Department of Transportation And Feng Xiao, Ph.D., Associate Professor Nanjing University of Science and Technology Department of Civil Engineering Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering

<http://ine.uaf.edu/wtc7>

The ae911Truth movement and its fellow requesters are now going ahead to file suit against NIST for noncompliance with their own Data Quality Act (September 2021). The aim is to direct the responsible NIST personnel to develop a new “Probable Collapse Sequence” that is consistent with Alaska Fairbanks University PhD studies, factual physics, and the further evidence of explosions reported by eyewitnesses, along with thermate detonation material found in the rubble of the destroyed buildings.

[How Many Architects & Engineers Will it Take? \(ae911truth.org\)](http://ine.uaf.edu/wtc7)

27 Definition and highlighted use and method 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.—Melissa Spino

[Gaslighting Definition & Meaning - Merriam-Webster](#)

28 You're not allowed to question academic judgement.

66. Fourth, and finally, regarding Mr Blanche's claim of 'academic fraud' or 'scientific fraud', an element of that claim patently relies on a challenge to the academic view taken by those supervising and examining Mr Blanche. As explained to Mr Blanche on several occasions, challenging academic judgement is not available within this investigation.

The defense sees this as their gateway to winning this case despite being dishonest, whilst using bare faced lies to disguise the fact they did not follow their own rules. Parliament gave them the privilege of academic immunity 21 years ago. Understanding the corporation dominates parliament, through lobbying, so their needs were met and protected. It protects them to some degree and persuades the justice system to deliberate on their side against academic disputes. The claims made by this corporation are a misrepresentation of the truth and not points of academic judgement. The corporation now try to distort and manipulate the law to protect their narrative. The corporation knows, with these built in protections against students and independent researchers, gives them an advantage. There is very little chance of being exposed or punished for misconduct. They can disguise their actions as improbable. Unless someone has the wit to

investigate and collect evidence; yet any fraud of this nature will have an evidence trail left behind in document form, the document evidence collected by Mr Blanche is indefensible.

The university define academic judgement as,

“the experience and knowledge of a student, the student’s performance and whether he/she has reached the required academic standard, and an awareness of best practice in her education are combined to allow an examiner to make an academic judgement on the ability of a student”.

29

Misrepresentation of the truth

Misrepresentation of the truth does not come under the umbrella of “academic judgement”. They are two totally different claims. The corporation through their staff, discriminated and misrepresented the truth against the claimant, for investigating what they refer to as “DISPUTED WORK”, which they categorically wanted left in the past as endothermic generators have the potential of reducing corporate profits. There was implied malice by the supervisors (email 16A), and the malice was implemented through the examination board by the directing mind and will, using misrepresentation of the truth whilst abandoning due process.

- 30 If a research scientist finds disputed topics, this is butter to the bread for the researcher, and just what they want to explore, to see if they can bring an end to the dispute through experimental research and observations. This is exactly what Mr Blanche did, and due to his inquisitiveness, he adds to the knowledge of mankind and defines James Clerk Maxwell’s 4th equation as an endothermic electric effect in an open circuit electric field charge. Mr Blanche should be acknowledged for such a discovery in the physical sciences, adding to electromagnetism knowledge, and not to be misrepresented with defamation as this corporation as tried to do. The proven non expert staff, simply lie on behalf of their paymasters.
- 31 Educational discovery is now in a mess. By allowing corporations to oversee a public office administering educational discovery we find; the type of research must suit their “needs” not to be censored. Corporations can now dominate a market whilst in control of research – education is pushed aside. It is no longer necessary to pursue discovery that might hinder their “needs”, anyone who might cause a threat to their business agenda will be disposed of, called a conspiracy theorist, ridiculed. They use misinformation and disinformation in their quest to censor what they don’t want the “mainstream academic community” to be aware of. Corporations have also sought to muzzle scientists by including gag orders in research or employment contracts, Dr Judy Mikovits story is a prime example of how the pharmaceutical industry opposed her study as it revealed data that would damage their business model. Tactics used are litigation and open records requests, to tie up their time and resources, universities are now less likely to support important, relevant research as the university has become the corporation. Each of these tactics has the same goal: to silence scientists and stifle

independent research science. This behaviour violates the spirit of scientific inquiry, which is open to all ideas and findings and inclusive of fellow experts looking to learn more about our world. Any efforts to make scientists feel threatened, or to discourage them from publishing or even continuing their research, are direct attacks on our country's scientific enterprise, compromising its ability to effectively serve the public.

FROM

[The Disinformation Playbook | Union of Concerned Scientists \(ucsusa.org\)](#)

Our case studies show how corporations have deployed trade associations and front groups with innocuous-sounding names to undermine science, influence public opinion, and gain access to policy makers while maintaining the illusion of independence.

Working to manufacture doubt and create the appearance of uncertainty where little exists is a blatant abuse of the way independent science operates to develop knowledge and inform the public about threats to their health and well-being.

our case studies show, companies have sometimes exploited their academic alliances to influence research and spread misinformation that serves corporate interests while undermining science.

Like public interest organizations, many companies or industry trade associations lobby the government to help enact legislation favorable to their interests. Some companies, however, go so far as to undermine the way federal agencies use science to develop policy, pushing for changes that make it harder for agencies to fulfill their science-based missions, or using political connections to gain access to top-level agency officials. Such actions compromise the government's ability to protect the public.

Unfortunately, a "revolving door" between industry and government presents a huge opportunity for people with industry ties and clear financial conflicts of interest to hold key decision-making positions. Such officials can help develop policies that benefit a former or prospective employer, policies that may live on long after their departure.

While it's certainly reasonable for industry to participate as a stakeholder in policy decisions, transparency and public vigilance are needed to keep companies from using their deep pockets and powerful networks to promote policies that undermine scientific evidence and threaten public health and safety.

32 They cannot identify the claims and apply the rules.

Billy Seagrim claims many different points:

15. Mr Blanche's documentation is therefore the best evidence of his complaints. **This report cannot consider all of Mr Blanche's comments, they are too many.**

Exhibit 5 and 6 documented too many wrongdoings and therefore Mr Seagrim did not discuss these.

53. There is nothing in the Regulations that requires the viva to be minuted, and nothing that **compels the examiners or the Chair to share notes with Mr Blanche, SEE front page of r and r form POC 24**

54. Paragraphs 1, 13, 16 and 17 of the Regulations have not been shown to be breached. **(bare faced lie)**

56. Mr Blanche seems to me to be fixated on how the R and R Forms were signed and that such was a form of 'forgery', thus proving a conspiracy. First, there was no conspiracy. Second, **there was no forgery**. Prof. Summers openly states that he copied and pasted the signatures. **Prof. Summers states that he did so as he was collating the report and this is what the different individuals said: it is normal practice**. I accept such unhesitatingly. **The only fraud or forgery would be if the individuals had not said what Prof. Summers put in the report and then Prof. Summers put their signature on the bottom of the page, as if they had. That is plainly not what happened. See POC 25,27, 31, 35**

This is another contradictory flaw in their defense argument, Why would you not keep minutes? Mr Summers did do this, there are two witnesses to this. Mr Summers claims he kept notes for two and half hours to help him fill in 8 tick boxes which he should have ticked on the day? Mr Seagrim claims they kept no minutes but at the same time Mr Summers did according to Mr Seagrim's point numbers 26, 53 and 56? Just read the above.

63. First, if there was conduct that could also be categorised as criminal, e.g. fraud by false representation, contrary to Fraud Act 2006, s1, I would have no hesitation in finding such, regardless of the identity of the actor.

Cover up and a false statement, see all the above.

64. Second, and importantly, the conduct that is alleged by Mr Blanche to amount to 'fraud' has already been considered by me above. The label of 'fraud' is just a framing of these alleged acts in a criminal manner. For the reasons explained above, I have not found the acts alleged to have happened.

Their actions describe the fraud act 2006, and forgery act to the letter and dot.

- a) Saying you know the rules then not applying them and doing the opposite.**
- b) writing reports, you should not,**
- c) Failing to write a report when you should**
- d) Ignoring your rules in appeal to cause a loss.**
- e) allowing others to write your reports,**
- f) Modifying documents, you should not.**
- g) changing dates to commit forgery to pass off a report as genuine to your rules,**
- h) Falsifying a report with a picture date to pass it off as a report genuine to the requirement of your rules.**
- i) Intentionally documenting what was not said. Intentional misleading of an investigation.**
- j) Withholding documents to cause a loss.**
- k) Dishonesty in communication**
- l) Inventing committees**
- m) Colluding to cause a loss.**

- n) **Misrepresentation of historical events**
- o) **Misrepresentation of science facts**
- p) **Defamation to cause a loss.**
- q) **Discrimination against research study.**
- r) **Claiming an experimental drug was safe and effective when the data said the opposite, endangered students' lives, even after being made aware of the data.**
- s) **Failure to monitor yellow card scheme as a professional in this field of drug development, whilst claiming the drug was safe and effective, neither being true. Failing to report data of adverse events and death to appropriate authority.**
- t) **Cover up and did not investigate all the documents.**

33 False statements about Newman

48. The claim that the views of the supervisors were false rests on a challenge to the academic judgement of numerous Swansea University academics. This cannot be investigated, let alone sustained. Underpinning the claim that such was dishonest is the motivation of a conspiracy. This has been found not to exist. To the extent that alleged dishonesty is grounded on something else, the claim is devoid of any evidence or merit.

51. The contention of 'gaslighting' refers to Mr Blanche's supervisors indicating that submission of the thesis relying on the theories of Joseph Westley Newman would be against their advice, and that Joseph Westley Newman's theories had been rejected by the credible scientific community (Mr Blanche's document entitled 'Misfeasance in a public office by staff of Swansea University Corporation' details his argument). That academic view is not going to be questioned within this investigation. Any untoward underlying motivation for that view is without any evidence or merit. As already outlined, there was no conspiracy against Mr Blanche. I find that Mr Blanche's supervisors acted appropriately towards him and having interviewed Dr Egwebe and Prof Paul Rees, they were trying to assist Mr Blanche.

Mr Blanche did not rely on any theory by Mr Newman. Mr Blanche developed his own theory from the research and experiment observations.

Newman had been a victim of an historical scandal /crime involving three US government agencies-The National Bureau of Standards, (NBS then renamed to NIST in 1988), the US Patent office and the US Judiciary in 1989. Mr Blanche did not want to turn his research thesis into a political argument but was now forced to 'write in' this observed historical scandal/crime because the university wanted to politicise his work and then reject the thesis due to this scandal being highlighted whilst misrepresenting the truth. Mr Blanche felt it was important to complete his theory and this new understanding in energy physics, for the future development of renewable energy devices; as-well as the advancement of educational physics despite this historical scandal and public officer opposition by Swansea university staff. The supervisors claimed:

'Joseph Westley Newman, whose work has been universally rejected by all credible scientific examiners',

There was no evidence supplied by Swansea staff from apparent 'credible scientific examiners' to refute Newman's machine, as there simply isn't any credible scientific examiners that refute his work. This is a false statement. The only test that refutes Newman's work was carried out by the American National Bureau of Standards Agency who are not credible. They had tampered and changed the design of Newman's machine before testing. (Exhibit 7 page 27, figure 9). On the contrary, Newman's work was fully supported by affidavits from many professional people as seen in his book [reference 42, exhibit 7], as well as independent validation by Naudin in 1998 (exhibit 1). All evidence of this, is denied and ignored by supervisors (exhibit 5, email 20, 21). Mr Summers claims the examiners said there is no independent validation, that is a bare faced lie and is evidenced in the oral viva recording. The external examiner acknowledged the independent validation, POC 27. The evidence demonstrates Newman should have been awarded a Patent for his invention. This was also the decision and writings by the 'Special Taskmaster' who was employed by the court to examine Newman's energy machine during Newman's court case.

The Special Taskmaster recommended to the court:

[William Earl Schuyler \(1914 — July 25, 2007\), lawyer | World Biographical Encyclopedia \(prabook.com\)](#)

Exert from:

[The Triumph & Tragedy of Joseph Newman • How the World Was Denied Free Energy \(review-mag.com\)](#)

The master stated that "[t]here is no evidence corroborating Newman's scientific theory". However, the master also found that the "[e]vidence before the [PTO] and [the district court] is overwhelming that Newman has built and tested a prototype of his invention in which the output energy exceeds the external input energy; there is no contradictory factual evidence". The master concluded that:

Even though the operation of Plaintiff's system seems contrary to recognized scientific principles, Plaintiff has demonstrated the operation of his system by very clear evidence and is therefore entitled to a patent if he otherwise satisfies the requirements of the Patent Statute (35 USC). [In re Chilowsky, 229 F.2d 457, 43 C.C.P.A. 775 \(1956\)](#).

The special master was **William E. Schuyler Jr.**, a former head of the Patent Office. At the time Judge Jackson called Schuyler's credentials superb. Yet, one-year later, in the fall of 1984, Judge Jackson refused to accept Schuyler's results after the special master found that Newman "is entitled to a patent based upon his experiments and results."

34 Misleading the court

65. Third, in any event, it is unnecessary to establish the extent to which any act that Mr Blanche contends is 'fraud' is criminal fraud, over and above considering the conduct alleged. This is not a

criminal investigation, as I explained to Mr Blanche in one of my first emails to him dated 2 May 2023 (and as has been explained to him by others, such as Natalie Wathan on 4 May 2023). This benefits Mr Blanche. Matters he alleges do not need to be proved to the criminal standard. Mr Blanche does not need to prove the exact elements of the criminal offence alleged, e.g. fraud, under the Fraud Act 2006. We do not need to delve into, for example, the criminal definition of dishonesty or whether an individual sought to make a gain or cause a loss by a false representation, and all the complications regarding the mens rea of any respondent. What matters are the facts, and whether Mr Blanche has proved any of the facts he asserts entails the academic, procedural, scientific, or indeed any other type of alleged fraud. This allegation is unnecessary to consider as I have considered the underlying conduct.

Gaslighting, Mr Seagrim does not prove anything, Mr Seagrim fails to investigate. It is the intention of the defense party and defendant to mislead the court, they have already demonstrated this behaviour. They will try to elongate the procedure in the hope the claimant will be tripped up. The plan is to call conspiracy, claim they were "fair" while avoiding the rules they are governed by. As already stated to Beth Cara in 'Blanche 4'; They replied to 20 of the 55 claims. In this bare face defense, they make the excuse it is questioning academic judgement. Where is the analysis of the rules? they do not exist in their defense document? Where do they quote a rule other than academic judgement? Another poignant fact is, academic judgement is a rule from exhibit 13, this is the only rule the raise from exhibit 13, then ignore the rest. Billy Seagrim never mentions this set of rules but likes this one rule and ignores the others exist. They quote half of rule 13 to mislead the court, see 30.10. To try and escape justice they misrepresent the truth as documented by Mr Blanche.

35 The examiners and supervisors were not experts in Electromagnetism.

4) Mr Blanche's viva voce was conducted improperly (including by failing to minute the viva, refusing to share examiner or Chair's notes (Prof. Huw Summers), and by the examiners having a lack of expertise)), and the examiners committed fraud, motivated by an agenda to fail Mr Blanche.

48. The claim that the views of the supervisors were false rests on a challenge to the academic judgement of numerous Swansea University academics. This cannot be investigated, let alone sustained. Underpinning the claim that such was dishonest is the motivation of a conspiracy. This has been found not to exist. To the extent that alleged dishonesty is grounded on something else, the claim is devoid of any evidence or merit.

a) Mr Blanche had superior knowledge in his specialist subject, this was proven in the oral exam and communications with/by supervisors. Included in the witness investigation expert evidence statement there are a lot more examples than given here, also see transcript of the oral exam in exhibit 5. The examiners did not meet GCSE standard or the required expertise in Mr Blanche's field of study as expressed by the rules. For your reference, MR Newman's energy machine is a high voltage device. POC. 28,29

I am not expert in this research area. not able to give you detailed comments on their research listed in this section.it is ...

9.1 **A study into high voltage Transmission Lines**

A study into high powered systems was carried out by F.W.Peek [21] and was presented at the 28th Annual Convention of the A. I. E. E., Chicago, June 26-30, 1911. On page 1486 Peek states:

In alternating-current transmission lines at very high voltages a loss occurs by dissipation of power into the air. This is accompanied by luminosity of the air surrounding the line conductor—the so-called corona. Loss begins at some critical voltage, which depends on the size and spacing of line conductors, etc., and increases very rapidly above this voltage.”

An Investigation of The Photoelectric Effect to the Endothermic Electric Effect during the Electric Field Charge

Endothermic Electric Effect as a

ergy

suggest "charging battery process".

8.2

the statement is not very clear, where does it come from? why is photoelectric effect defined as electromagnetic force ?

The photoelectric effect which is an electromagnetic force or electromagnetic wave and its observed reaction is parameter based,

1. $h\nu$ (Planck's constant and frequency)
2. Density of metal
3. Surface area

$h\nu$, which has two components.

'Planks constant is a physical constant that is the quantum of electromagnetic action, which relates the energy carried by a photon to its frequency. A photon's energy is equal to its frequency multiplied by the Planck constant. The Planck constant is of

It is plain to see the supervisors lacked any expertise in electromagnetism. Mr Blanche's study is based on the following, not 'batteries' as the defendant tries to portray or wants.

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia:

Electromagnetism is one of the [fundamental forces](#) of nature. Early on, [electricity](#) and [magnetism](#) were studied separately and regarded as separate phenomena. [Hans Christian Ørsted](#) discovered that the two were related – [electric currents](#) give rise to magnetism. [Michael Faraday](#) discovered the converse, that magnetism could [induce](#) electric currents, and [James Clerk Maxwell](#) put the whole thing together in a unified theory of [electromagnetism](#). [Maxwell's equations](#) further indicated that [electromagnetic waves](#) existed, and the experiments of [Heinrich Hertz](#) confirmed this, making [radio](#) possible. Maxwell also postulated, correctly, that [light](#) was a form of electromagnetic wave, thus making all of [optics](#) a branch of electromagnetism. [Radio waves](#) differ from light only in that the [wavelength](#) of the former is much longer than the latter. [Albert Einstein](#) showed that the [magnetic field](#) arises through the [relativistic motion](#) of the [electric field](#) and thus magnetism is merely a side effect of electricity. The modern theoretical treatment of electromagnetism is as a [quantum field](#) in [quantum electrodynamics](#).

[Faraday's law of induction](#) states that a magnetic field can produce an electric current. For example, a magnet pushed in and out of a coil of wires can produce an electric current in the coils which is proportional to the strength of the magnet as well as the number of coils and the speed at which the magnet is inserted and extracted from the coils. This principle is essential for [transformers](#) which are used to transform currents from high [voltage](#) to low voltage, and vice versa. They are needed to convert high voltage [mains electricity](#) into low voltage electricity which can be safely used in homes. Maxwell's formulation of the law is given in the [Maxwell–Faraday equation](#)—the fourth and final of Maxwell's equations—which states that a time-varying magnetic field produces an electric field.

FROM: [Photoelectric effect | Definition, Examples, & Applications | Britannica](#)


Photoelectric effect, phenomenon in which electrically charged particles are released from or within a material when it absorbs [electromagnetic radiation](#). The effect is often defined as the ejection of [electrons](#) from a [metal plate](#) when [light](#) falls on it. In a broader definition, the [radiant energy](#) may be [infrared](#), visible, or [ultraviolet](#) light, [X-rays](#), or [gamma rays](#); the material may be a solid, liquid, or gas; and the released particles may be [ions](#) (electrically charged atoms or molecules) as well as electrons. The phenomenon was fundamentally significant in the development of modern [physics](#) because of the puzzling questions it raised about the nature of light—particle versus wavelike behaviour—that were finally resolved by [Albert Einstein](#) in 1905. The effect remains important for research in areas from [materials science](#) to [astrophysics](#), as well as forming the basis for a variety of useful devices.

b)

FUNDAMENTAL KNOWLEDGE We buy electricity in KWH (check your own bill), which is kilowatt per hour, in other words, we pay depending on the amount of use during that hour. Power = Watt/second = voltage x amps/second

Supervisor comment in box, exhibit 44.

critical voltage of power losses. As we know, electricity is related to time (amps per second), there was no experiment made by Peek using time as a parameter for the power losses observed. The system was either on or off and measurements recorded.



not clear how dis you conclude the electricity is related to time.

also not clear what "amp per second" mean ?

Faraday law basically states, "when the magnetic flux or the magnetic field changes with time, the electromotive force is produced".

[Faraday's Laws of Electromagnetic Induction - Lenz's Law, Formula, Derivation, Video, and FAQs \(byjus.com\)](http://byjus.com)

BBC bitesize states:

The National 5 is taken during S4. S4 is roughly an equivalent to **Year 11** in England, GCSE standard.

POC 28,29

Exhibit 5 page 20-21, VT: 29 MINUTES

EXTERNAL EXAMINER DOES NOT KNOW THAT ELECTRIC FIELD CHARGE IS WITH RESPECT TO TIME AND DOES NOT KNOW BASIC SCIENTIFIC NOTATION for 'per. '/'

Blanche: well, electricity is with respect to time isn't it. (Silence)

Ext: but that's not per second, are you dividing by seconds?

Blanche: sorry, that's per.per.per second

Ext: per second?

Blanche: per second, that line, / is also used for per second

Ext: yea but , V x A over S?, is watts ?

Blanche: volts, watts is Volts x Amps and that is with respect to time. Per second, yea

AFTER THIS EXCHANGE THE INTERNAL EXAMINER INTERJECTS TO SAVE HIS COLLEAGUE FROM ANY FURTHER EMBARRASSMENT DUE TO HIS LACK OF EXPERTISE.

(Ext doesn't know basic notation and electricity energy to power relationships. Does not know scientific notation, forward slash is used for the word 'per', as well as 'divide', does not know basic notation, doesn't understand that electric charge is with respect to time, this is very well documented in my thesis, hasn't read most of it and definitely doesn't understand electricity processes with respect to time)

c)

The energy applied as altered the state of the atoms and has not been diminished and is obeying the 'Conservation of Energy'. Energy is transferred as THE definition of 'The Conservation of Energy'.

$E_{\text{photon}} = \phi_{\text{ion}} + KE_{\text{electron}}$

$h\nu = \phi_{\text{ion}} + e^{-} \quad (4)$

where does this formula come from? give a reference or evidence to support the correctness of the equation. what ...

ch is regarded as ...

Box Caption above is a supervisor comment.

It is the formula for the photoelectric effect written by Albert Einstein, to define an electric field charge, Einstein used Max Planck's 'h' constant for energy in his theory (*Max Planck won a Nobel Prize for this constant). Einstein won the Nobel Prize for the photoelectric effect! Mr Blanche eventually wrote a chapter on the photoelectric effect to be told it was irrelevant! Fraud and a misrepresentation of the truth, not academic judgement, they were not experts in electromagnetism or quantum mechanics.

* Max Planck's discovery of energy quanta earned him the 1918 Nobel Prize in Physics. The Planck constant continues to be a fundamental constant in our understanding of the universe. The Planck constant says how much the energy of a photon increases, when the frequency of its electromagnetic wave increases by 1 (In SI Units). It is named after the physicist Max Planck. The Planck constant is used to define the kilogram (the SI unit

of mass) and plays a crucial role in quantum mechanics, including the quantization of energy levels and the behaviour of particles.

Quantum of Action: Max Planck introduced the Planck constant as the “quantum of action.” It signifies the smallest indivisible unit of action in the quantum world. It relates the discrete nature of energy changes to the fundamental granularity of the universe. In summary, the Planck constant underpins the fundamental principles of quantum mechanics, shaping our understanding of the behaviour of particles, waves, and energy levels at the atomic and subatomic scales.

[Planck constant - Wikipedia](#)

Photons and electrons are both fundamental particles, the former of [electromagnetic waves](#) and the latter of atoms. Together, they can cause the flow of electricity.

[Electrons & Photons - Meaning, Definition, Formula & Difference \(byjus.com\)](#)

DEFENCE

Introduction and Summary

1. The Claimant is a former student of the University who has brought this claim following the decision, in 2022, to suspend a decision on the Claimant's viva voce pending re-examination following re-submission within 12 months. The Claim Form states it is a claim for "Gas-lighting, Defamation, Discrimination, bullying, academic misconduct, scientific fraud, procedural fraud, forgery, withholding documents, withholding information to commit fraud and forgery, An abuse of their power."

Correct

2. The claim is a re-iteration of a complaint made to the Defendant, which has been considered as both an academic appeal and complaint. Those challenges have been carefully considered and rejected.

False statement The claim is a re-iteration of three internal procedures. The claim is governed by their own rules. The claimant did not see fit to overburden the court with all material rules or exhibits at the beginning the claim, as the defendant already had all the details in their files. The claim became enlarged during each university procedure, due to fraud in each department, by not following their rules and making false statements, document evidence is available.

3. The premise of the case is fanciful. At its core, the Claimant alleges that he has made a scientific discovery – the "Endometric Electric Effect" – which is akin to Albert Einstein's identification of the Photoelectric Effect. This claim has been roundly rejected by the Claimant's academic supervisors, including the Exam Board. Further, the claim raised is fundamentally an issue of academic judgment – and not one on which it is open to the Court to adjudicate: *Clark v University of Lincolnshire and Humberside* [2000] 1 WLR 1988; *Abramova v Oxford Institute of Legal Practice* [2011] EWHC 613 (QB) (Burnett J (as he then was) stating that as a result "most claims brought in contract which amounted to a challenge to academic process would be struck out".

Misleading the court. The case of R (Gopikrishna) v The University of Leicester and The Office of the Independent Adjudicator [2015] EWHC 207, was found in favour of the claimant due to the university abandoning its rules and regulations.

Dishonesty, irrationality and procedural unfairness by a University can be determined by civil law, without even considering academic judgement. In this case it is fraud, misrepresentation of the truth. Discrimination, Defamation.

[Gopikrishna, R \(on the application of\) v The Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education & Ors \[2015\] EWHC 207 \(Admin\) \(06 February 2015\) \(bailii.org\)](#)

4. The claim as pleaded is vague and difficult to understand. The Defendant has responded to the allegations to the extent it is able. However, the Defendant maintains that the Claimant's Particulars of Claim (the "POCs") fail to state a case of fraud, misconduct, defamation, discrimination, or breach of contract. As such, it intends to apply to strike out and/or dismiss this claim.

Parties

The claim is precise, this is a false statement by the defense. The claim does contain enough detail to enable the other party to prepare to answer it, from a legal perspective. It is the claim and not the evidence after all. As we see from this defense attempt, they resort to misleading and misrepresentation of the claims to try and deflect their wrongdoing. The defendant is going to rely on "academic judgement immunity" to try and fight the claims. The claims are concentrated on "Not following due process", although there is a large number of false statements made by the examination board and supervisors that amount to defamation, misrepresentation of the truth and discrimination, and this is justly made in the claims. It is noted that the examiners along with the supervisors try to dictate what Mr Blanche's research can and should be about, to suit the university's false narrative. i.e. 'limited to presentation and explanation of the temperature-dependent battery performance could potentially meet the requirements of an MSc'

5. The Claimant is a former student of Swansea University (the "University" or the "Defendant").

6. The Defendant is a public research university located in Swansea, United Kingdom.

The defendant is a corporation with public service duties.

7. The Claimant was a student enrolled on a research course, the MSc Electronic and Engineering Course, at the University. The University's Standard Terms and Conditions applied to his enrolment.

The defendant discarded and breached any contract by not applying their own rules, due process.

Factual Background

8. In October 2019, the Claimant commenced an MSc in Electrical and Electronic Engineering.

Mr Blanche did not engage in a taught masters, Mr Blanche's masters is self-lead research, by his choice of subject which the university accepted from the outset, they agreed to the contract, and to carry out their public office duties to a set of rules. (See exhibit 36), where Z Zhou raises some comments, but his understanding was lacking in the very title of the proposal, Experimental and Theoretical Electricity Physics. This was then a continued theme by the university staff, not understanding the research to intentionally reject the research of electromagnetism; to claim the research is a battery investigation.

Mr Zhou had integrity and quite openly admitted his lack of theoretical physics knowledge to Mr Blanche in conversation. Mr Zhou also admitted to Mr Blanche, Mr Blanche's observation was adding to the knowledge of renewable energy, he declined interview with Billy Seagrim.

9. In August 2020, the Claimant submitted a first draft of his thesis to his supervisors.

Exhibit 44

10. Following this, the Claimant's supervisors identified an issue with his reliance on the work of Joseph Wesley Newman. They made it clear they did not support the inclusion of his work in the Claimant's thesis.

Misleading They made these claims under false pretences, it was a misrepresentation of the truth and to the evidence supplied to them. The student challenged them, but they refused to intellectually engage on the raised points of historical knowledge, it was not academic judgement in question as claimed by the university, it is a misrepresentation of historical facts. i.e the truth, the supervisors did not respond to email. Mr Blanche was not relying on the work of Joseph Newman, Newman's Generator is an endothermic energy generator by design. There are other examples relied upon in the thesis to the theory, such as demonstrated in exhibit 7.

- A) `chapter 8: Tuneable Endothermic Plateau at High Temperatures A study by Chih-Chung Lai et al / Nano Energy 25 (2016) pages 218–224 [72], showed how a tuneable endothermic plateau can enhance energy storage efficiency up to 21% at specific identified temperatures using binary metal alloys.**
- B) Chapter 19.2 Self-Charged Graphene Battery Harvests Electricity from Thermal Energy of the Environment
Zihan Xu1†*, Guoan Tai1,3†, Yungang Zhou2, Fei Gao2 , and Kin Hung Wong1 1 Department of Applied Physics and Materials Research Centre, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, tion Hung Hom, Kowloon, Hong Kong SAR, China 2 Pacific**

**Northwest National Laboratory, P.O. Box 999, Richland, Washington 99352, USA 3
The State Key Laboratory of Mechanics and Control of Mechanical Structures,
Nanjing University of Aeronautics and Astronautics, 29 Yudao St., Nanjing, China]**
C) Chapter 4, NASA endothermic charge of an electric field using an adiabatic system.

> MSC meeting with Ge... 23/03/2021
No preview is available.

Zhou Z.
masters 04/03/2021
i see i accidentally missed a meeting, ...

g.blanche.946484@swansea.ac.uk; N...
> Council Tax A/C: 6614... 07/02/2021
No. I am looking for work and receiv...

Zhou Z.
> January 2021 MSc pr... 20/01/2021
Lets be clear about this, a wave of el...

Zhou Z.
GDPR certificate 18/01/2021
No preview is available.


dataprotection
> gdpr certificate 18/01/2021
Please find attached my gdpr certifi...


2020
Engineering Postgraduate Research ...
> Outstanding meeting 08/12/2020
Hi I do not have a meeting schedule...

> From: BLANCHE G. (946484) <946484@swansea.ac.uk<mailto:946484@swansea.ac.uk>>
> Sent: 18 January 2021 14:29
> To: Zhou Z. <Z.Zhou@Swansea.ac.uk<mailto:Z.Zhou@Swansea.ac.uk>>
> Subject: Re: January 2021 MSc progress meeting
>
>
>
> Hi
>
> Can we meet Wednesday 2pm.
>
> I would require written confirmation explaining the objections you gave to parts of my work and why it should be removed and why you will not support publishing. where it is wrong?. I have analysed your comments and the science, and there is no science presented to me to show i am not correct, yet you just throw past bogus fraud by NBS that has no basis in science when applied to the newman generator. NBS made basic errors of analysis as i have already pointed out. If you can show me any different then i am prepared to look. This will have to be backed up by analysis to show the NBS experiment is legitimate as i believe this to be scientific fraud. To not want to support my work due to past bogus science is unacceptable and this attitude as no place in British university science. I will not accept being abused in this way and unless you have a valid argument which i dont believe you have, this matter will need to be resolved before i can go forward with this supervisory group.
>
> Regards
>
> G Blanche
>
> _____
>
> From: Zhou Z. <Z.Zhou@Swansea.ac.uk<mailto:Z.Zhou@Swansea.ac.uk>>
> Sent: 17 January 2021 21:25
> To: BLANCHE G. (946484) <946484@swansea.ac.uk<mailto:946484@swansea.ac.uk>>
> Cc: Kalna K. <K.Kalna@Swansea.ac.uk<mailto:K.Kalna@Swansea.ac.uk>>; Egwebe Augustine.
<Augustine.Egwebe@Swansea.ac.uk<mailto:Augustine.Egwebe@Swansea.ac.uk>>
> Subject: January 2021 MSc progress meeting
>

The supervisors would know:

The special taskmaster stated to the court after thoroughly examining Newman’s machine, he recommended the patent office to award Newman a patent (direct evidence). The supervisors acted knowingly of this, with an omission of the truth.

The supervisors would know NBS changed Newman’s design to the detriment of the function and results of Newman’s machine, after being informed by Mr Blanche’s research as-well as by their own investigation, the Newman’s machine had been ‘tampered with’ and altered in design by NBS, rendering the test NBS performed for the court case, a false representation of the machine, the court then ruled in favour of the Patent office. These facts were exposed at the time, in 1988, by Newman. (Direct evidence, exhibit 7, chapter 3, pages 25-29, Reference 42, page 328)

The supervisors knew Mr Blanche’s and NASA’s experiments demonstrated that an open circuit electric field charge is, endothermic before becoming exothermic, which is a gain in energy from the material and surroundings. These observations in electromagnetism are governed by the already defined laws:

- a) The Boltzmann/Planck constant:
- b) Maxwell's 4th equation within electromagnetism
- c) 1st and 2nd laws of thermodynamics
- d) Mr Blanche demonstrates this in his experiments using and applying these laws, (as-well as NASA doing similar, application of gas laws),

These being observations in electric field charge theory. The application of this phenomenon is exactly what Mr Blanche demonstrates in his thesis, and the supervisors and PGR were aware of this. An endothermic reaction in an open circuit electric field charge is a displacement current, and Maxwell's 4th equation which in electromagnetism was demonstrated and written IN 1864, James Maxwell – Maxwell/Ampere 4th equation. (direct evidence), (Exhibit 22) (exhibit 7, page 82, 12.1, Maxwell's equation of free electricity, reference 47 (which is exhibit 22), pages 1-10)

2. The supervisors **should know** James Clerk Maxwell unified electromagnetism by adding the displacement current to open circuit electric field charge, Maxwell's 4th equation.

3. Mr Blanche included and referenced an 'Independent validation test' on Newman's machine in his thesis, the supervisors and the examination board were aware of this (exhibit 1) (direct evidence), contrary to the claims made by the supervisors, and in the reports by the examination board. The Newman machine is an endothermic energy generator by 'design'.

4. The supervisors acted to deceive with targeted malice and bad faith towards Mr Blanche, with the suggestion of failure if he kept what was branded 'the disputed work' in his thesis. This was orchestrated by the PGR who the chairperson is responsible to, the directing mind and will.

5. Mr Blanche asked the supervisors for confirmation of their comments from exhibit 18, with evidence, but this was never forthcoming.

11. On 31 March 2021, the Claimant's supervisors responded to a Notice of Intention to Submit the Claimant's thesis by making clear that his thesis was going against the advice of his supervisors.

The supervisors acted with malice and discrimination against the research the student was pursuing. They suggested the student would fail if he went against their ill-founded advice. The threat was carried out, the PGR office coerced the examiners and wrote most of the reports to fail the students work. The supervisors never submitted any documents at appeal, this part of the threat was hollow. The chairperson failed to write a report for the appeal, against the rules and the defense party misled the court by quoting half a rule. The external examiner did not author or write any report.

12. On 22 April 2021, Dr Zhongfu Zhou was stood down as a supervisor for the

Claimant.

Dr. Zhongfu Zhou had previously given Mr Blanche a very good reference in March 2020 (see below), (exhibit 51), it would not be advantageous for Mr Seagrim during the complaint investigation to interview or analyse this reference, because it contradicted the examination board claims. The reference states Mr Blanche as the ideal candidate for PhD study at Swansea, and how reliable his data is due to the excellent design of his electronic data collecting circuit. This reference was given before Mr Newman was included in Mr Blanche's thesis and before covid. It was after the implied malice by the supervisors and Mr Blanche's objections and demanding further evidence of the supervisors' false claims that omitted the truth about Newman, did Mr Zhou resign or was he pushed? Mr Zhou displayed academic integrity to Mr Blanche. Mr Zhou had also agreed, and stated to Mr Blanche in conversation, that Mr Blanche had indeed discovered new knowledge within electromagnetism with the possibility of renewable energy production benefiting from this.

These are reasons why the university did not want Mr Zhou involved and why Mr Seagrim is very comfortable with no participation by Zhou in his cover up, there was no investigation by Billy Seagrim, just some polite virtue signalling by the Corporation's employees.

13. On 5 May 2021, Professor Paul Rees agreed to become one of the Claimant's supervisors.

Mr Rees, and Mr Summers, are bio-medical professors, and would oppose any alternative narrative on the experimental covid jabs being dangerous and killing people as this would go against the safe and effective narrative being promoted by their funders, Mr Blanche evidenced the yellow card scheme reports to the university, which they ignored.

14. On 10 September 2021, the Claimant submitted his thesis, entitled “An Investigation of the Photoelectric Effect to the Endothermic Electric Effect During the Electric Field Charge.”

18 March 2020



Swansea University
Prifysgol Abertawe

Subject: Reference letter for Mr Geoff BLANCHE

Date: 18/03/2020

To Whom It May Concern:

Swansea University

I am writing to recommend Mr Geoff BLANCHE for applying for studying PhD at Swansea University.

Mr Geoff BLANCHE is currently a MSc student (research) at Swansea University in 2019/20 academic year and currently under supervision of Dr Augustine, Dr Batcup and me. He is currently engaging research in the area of Lithium Ion battery charging/discharging for endothermal analysis of Lithium Ion battery. He built an excellent laboratory power supply-based battery charging circuit and Arduino microcontroller-based temperature and voltage measurement circuit as well required data acquisition software for his research purpose. Based on the developed circuit he has obtained very good measurement results. He has shown strong interests in exploring new technology particularly in the physics of battery charging/discharging process various battery charging techniques. He is also a hardworking student and always try his best to achieve his research target.

I strongly believe he is suitable to studying PhD course at Swansea university. If you need any additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me at the following address.

Sincerely yours

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Zhongfu Zhou'.

Dr Zhongfu Zhou

Lecturer in power Electronics
College of Engineering | Coleg Peirian
Swansea University | Prifysgol Abertawe

The title and the abstract describe the study, a study in electromagnetism, and not about “batteries” as the PGR office falsely claim. Batteries were used as a part of the system, which allowed Mr Blanche to study open circuit electric field charge reaction behaviour governed by the defined laws of electromagnetism. Mr Blanche used batteries in his experiments which feature in 3 out of twenty-four chapters of research. The examiners are supposed to examine the abstract according to the rules, this was ignored.

15. His viva voce took place on 30 May 2022, in person at the University. The Claimant’s viva voce took place before an Exam Board comprised, as per the University’s rules, of an independent Chair (Prof Huw Summers), an internal examiner (Prof Lijie Li) and an external examiner (Dr Dhamikka Widanalage).

Correct

16.

On 30 May 2022, the Exam Board confirmed the result of the Claimant's viva voce, namely that the result was suspended pending re-examination following resubmission within 12 months. On the same date the Claimant was provided with the "Report and Result Forms" (or the "R and R Forms").

False statement. The examination board did not produce an R and R forms on the day as expected to the rules, the claimant was NOT provided with a "Report and Result Forms" on the day. The R and R form was produced on the 9th of June 2022. Between the 6th and 9th of June the PGR office claimed to be waiting for the "Report and Result Forms" from the examiners, which was exposed as a lie by the external examiner, in emails 9, 10 and 11 on the 6th and 7th of June 2022.

The examiners' R and R 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 the University on the outcome of the examination process. The R and R Forms confirmed that a decision on his thesis was suspended pending re-examination following re-submission within 12 months, and the Addendum to the R and R Forms identified the requirements for resubmission. The Joint Examiner Comments and Requirements for Resubmission provided:

"The thesis presents an experimental study of temperature -dependent battery characteristics and claims that the results validate the theories developed by Joseph Newman in regard to his energy machine.

False Statement: The Thesis does NOT present an experimental study of temperature - dependent battery characteristics and claims that the results validate the theories developed by Joseph Newman regarding his energy machine.

Batteries were part of the system used to analyse the electric field charge in electromagnetism that has defined laws and included in three chapters out of twenty-four. Mr Blanche analyses the phenomenon in 3 other chapters, which is verification of the reaction from other researchers into endothermic reactions.

Batteries were not the subject of the research, this is misrepresentation of the truth, not academic judgement.

The thesis explores electromagnetism and electric field charge and comes to the conclusion that the first reaction in an electric field charge is endothermic, and that is why Newman is correct in his claims of over 100% efficiency of his device. There is no theory relied upon By Joeseeph Newman. Science facts are developed on experimental observations, and this is what the observations tell us. The PGR office is misrepresenting the truth whilst relying on "academic immunity" to censor this thesis.

These theories are open to debate, have not been independently validated in a scientifically rigorous manner, and are not accepted by the mainstream research community.

False claim, poc 27.

Section 3 of the R & R form is a joint report and should be written on the day, directly after the oral exam is completed and before the examination result is given to Mr Blanche when he re-enters the room (per the rules). Both examiners would know Mr Blanche raised independent validation on Newman's endothermic energy machine twice during the viva, VT time 12mins 20 (see voice recording (exhibit 12) and transcript part 2(exhibit 5, page 207 VT time 2hr 28mins)), and as-well as it being included in chapter 3, pages 20-22 of thesis exhibit 7. They intentionally would not discuss this independent validation during the examination, although the external examiner did acknowledge the independent validation by Naudin,

External examiner: it's not your work either,

Blanche: no, it's background research,

The R & R and Addendum report stated there was NO independent validation (see exhibit 1, 85 pages where Naudin in 1998 over a period of one year, builds a Newman Machine, tests it for efficiency, makes modifications to the machine, re-tests the machine for efficiency with entropy tests, i.e., temperature testing for an endothermic reaction during the electric field charge).

To quote Mr Billy Seagrim, (Bs) from his complaint investigation outcome:

Prof. Summers openly states that he copied and pasted the signatures. Prof. Summers states that he did so as he was collating the report and this is what the different individuals said: it is normal practice. I accept such unhesitatingly. The only fraud or forgery would be if the individuals had not said what Prof. Summers put in the report and then Prof. Summers put their signature on the bottom of the page, as if they had.

This demonstrates either:

- a) The examiners falsely report about there being no independent validation, or,**
- b) Someone else wrote these comments onto the Reports, we know it was Mr Summers who wrote the reports (exhibit 3, 4, 33, 41, 53). There is no evidence in any documents (or recordings) that the examiners wrote or said, there is 'No independent validation'.**

This was authored by the chairperson which is demonstrated in exhibit 55.

Any evidence presented to support these theories must therefore be extensive, accurate, repeatable and clearly related to the specific claims made. The work presented does not meet these requirements. The experiment data has limited accuracy and the format of the investigations allows multiple interpretations of the results.

FALSE CLAIM see exhibit 51. The conclusions are clearly related to the specific claims made. See Dr Z. Zhou reference (exhibit 51), in this reference Dr Zhou praises the design of Mr Blanche's data collecting system. This is a false statement by the Chairperson to deceive and mislead the reader. Defamation. Mr Blanche included other peoples research to verify the work, see above.

Various scientific theories are presented but then applied in error to unrelated phenomena. In its present form the thesis is scientifically incorrect and does not meet the MSc by Research standard. A complete re-writing of the thesis is required. 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 within a 12 month period." [Annex A – R and R Forms]

[The thesis was not submitted formally until 1 October 2021 as the Claimant needed to update the declarations in connection with his MSc programme.]

Misrepresentation of the truth and Censorship of the research is demonstrated in the comments by non-experts, requirements of re-submission.

17. The form went out to set out the requirements which must be met on resubmission (in the Addendum to the R and R Forms).

Misrepresentation of the truth and Censorship of the research is demonstrated in the comments by non-experts, requirements of re-submission is not what Mr Blanche is researching.

18. On 30 August 2022, the Claimant lodged an academic appeal against that decision. An academic appeal is distinct from a student complaint.

It Is distinct and has a set of rules (exhibit 13). These rules were not followed, they were abandoned. POC 41-50. Mr Seagrim excluded this set of rules from his non-investigation to protect Paul Boyle's office, academic services.

19. On 1 September 2022, the Claimant provided an "Examination Rebuttal Report".

Correct

20. On 29 September 2022, the Claimant's appeal outcome was rejected; this decision was taken by the Filtering Committee.

False Claim, there was no filtering committee, the nominee acted as the filtering committee, Gemma Wilkins wrote the filtering committee document that has blacked out boxes to hide the identity of the initials in the boxes. Mr Boyle or Huw Summers withheld a document in an FOI request. Gemma alluded to a filtering committee making the decisions, but there is no filtering committee. Poc 3,43,44,45-47

This was because the majority of the issues of which the Claimant complained were ones of academic judgment.

False Claim, Majority? the fake filtering committee identified 10 points of rule breaking and then ignored this in an outcome of applying the rules? This is not academic judgement, this is misrepresentation of the truth, considered fraud by law.

The University defines academic judgment as “the experience and knowledge of a student, the student’s performance and whether he/she has reached the required academic standard, and an awareness of best practice in her education are combined to allow an examiner to make an academic judgement on the ability of a student”. The appeal was re-classified as a complaint.

Misleading. The examiners failed to reach GCSE standard (evidence in transcript), they failed to carry out their procedural duties and application of the rules and duties correctly. This is not academic judgement; this is a failure of due process done intentionally. See emails and Blanche 4 document that exposes their intentions. They ignored their rules and fraudulently re classified the appeal as a complaint.

21. On 9 October 2022, the Claimant provided an Addendum to his Examination Rebuttal Report. On 20 October 2022, the Claimant applied for a Final Review of the Appeal Decision.

The claimant also provided Academic Services with a pre protocol action on the 18th November 2022. The claimant wrote to the director of Academic services pointing out a certain rule, but this was ignored and not applied.

22. On 19 December 2022, the Claimant’s application for a Final Review of the Appeal Decision was dismissed. The decision-maker, Natalie Wathan, explained that “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 Appeals Procedure and had been reasonable on the evidence provided to the Filtering Committee”.

False Claim and a misrepresentation of the facts. The fake filtering committee identified 10 points of rule breaking and then Natalie Wathan ignored this to protect her colleagues. Poc 47-50.

23. On 9 February 2023, the Claimant agreed to his complaint being considered under the complaint process.

The claimant allowed the corporation one more chance to put right their wrongdoing. This then became an attempt to smear Mr Blanche by Billy Seagrim. His investigation is devoid of any facts or application of rules that governed the previous procedures. It is just defamation and denial of any wrongdoing; it is not a defence to the rules that govern their actions.

24. On 20 April 2023, an investor, William Seagrim, Senior Lecturer, Hillary Clinton School of Law, was appointed to conduct the Claimant's complaint against the University. His report was issued on 22 June 2023 (the "Complaint Report") [Annex B – Complaint Report]. As to that report:

24.1. The Claimant refused to participate in the investigation. [Complaint Report §9]

Mr Blanche foresaw the cover up.

24.2. The Claimant's complaint was described (**Erroneously By Billy Seagrim, not by the claimant**) as:

"There was a university wide conspiracy to dishonestly fail Mr Blanche's thesis and then cover-up that dishonesty, motivated by: (a) a desire to silence Mr Blanche's uncovering of historical crimes against Joseph Westley Newman; and/or (b) discontent towards Mr Blanche in light of his stance towards the University's COVID-19 pandemic restrictions policies; and/or (c) some other malign intent to protect the University's interests."

Mr Seagrim mentions covid 19 vaccinations in point 17,19, 26, 30, and 44. As the defense make this an issue in their defense, Mr Blanche will now claim because of his objection to covid 19 vaccines, this is a reason why they censored Mr Blanche's thesis and failed his work.

24.3. The following specific allegations were identified:

"2) Mr Blanche's dissertation supervisors (Dr Augustine Egwebe, Dr Zhongfu Zou, Prof. Karol Kalna) made false claims regarding Joseph Westley Newman to dishonestly censor Mr Blanche's thesis.

Mr Seagrim does not challenge any documents or staff conduct other than agreeing with their actions. Mr Egwebe will not comment on the dishonesty about Newman's machine, see email 20 exhibit 5.

3) Mr Blanche's supervisors ... used 'gaslighting' to further the attempt to dishonest censor Mr Blanche's thesis.

Mislead Mr Blanche with misrepresentations of the truth about Newman.

4) Mr Blanche's viva voce was conducted improperly (including by failing to minute the viva, refusing to share examiner or Chair's notes (Prof. Huw Summers), and by the examiners having a lack of expertise)), and the examiners committed fraud, motivated by an agenda to fail Mr Blanche. This was in breach of the Guide to the Examination of Research Students, paragraphs 1, 13, 16 and 17.

The chairperson kept minutes for around half the time of the viva, but later claimed in email 6, that these notes were to help him with 8 tick boxes that he should have been completed on the day of the exam.

5) Following the viva voce, the examiners, the Examination Board, the Chair of that Board (Prof. Huw Summers), and professional services staff (including Mrs Sara Kane, Mrs Zoe Perry) acted dishonestly to further an agenda to fail Mr Blanche, including forging signatures, improperly completing the R and R form, and by way of the Chair of the Examination Board, Prof. Huw Summers, lacking independence. This was in breach of the Guide to the Examination of Research Students, paragraphs 13, 15, 16, 17 and 19.

Falsely states when the R & R form was produced. There were other rules breached. Sara Kane had nothing to do with it.

6) The University failed to fairly conduct Mr Blanche's appeal against his examination decision. This was part of an agenda to fail Mr Blanche and cover up the dishonest actions of the University and its agents. This included the actions of the "Filtering Committee", if it exists, and Prof. Paul Boyle.

What the claimant will present is beyond reasonable doubt, it's a sure thing. Mr Seagrim identifies the standard of burden of proof, but then closes his eyes, does not apply rules to any claims. Claims he read the evidence. Mr Blanche demonstrates evidence of the wrongdoing in his investigation, Mr Seagrim a barrister fails to identify any wrongdoing and instead invents Mr Blanche is a conspiracy theorist and wants to draw the reader to irrelevant points as-well as inventing misleading arguments.

7) Academic fraud has been committed by the University and its agents,

including Mr Blanche's supervisors ..., the internal examiner (Prof. Lijee Li), the Examination Board, the Chair of that Board (Prof. Huw Summers), various professional services staff (such as Mrs Zoe Perry, Mrs Michelle Rees, Mrs Sarah Kane), and the Vice Chancellor, Prof. Paul Boyle, and the external examiner (Dr Dhammika Widanalange).

Claims to have read rules but fails to identify the 'rules of appeal' (exhibit 13) as there were allegations made on the appeal process in the complaint. This is misleading the reader. Identifies wrong members of staff. Mrs Michelle Rees, Mrs Sarah Kane were not involved in the deceit.

8) Misconduct in public office has been committed by numerous University employees, including the Examination Board, the Chair of that Board, Professor Huw Summers, and the Vice Chancellor, Prof. Paul Boyle."

24.4. The Complaint Report summarised the overall tenor of the Claimant's documentation (submitted in support of his complaint) as follows:

"a. he is the victim of criminal conduct, i.e. a fraud (academic, scientific and procedural), to censor his thesis, which itself uncovers a scientific lie.

b. the University has a vested interest in continuing and protecting that lie.

c. there has been "misconduct in public office" and more fraud to ensure that Mr Blanche's thesis has been failed. That failure has also been influenced, to some degree, by Mr Blanche's exposure of the University's wrongdoing concerning, inter alia, COVID-19 vaccinations.

d. there was an agenda to fail Mr Blanche and individuals at all levels of the University, including the Vice Chancellor, have worked together to ensure that came to fruition and then cover it up." [Complaint Report §20]

Correct

24.5. The Complaint Report found that the complaint "suffers from an acute lack of any evidential basis": Complaint Report §23.

This is now just a complete attempt to gaslight the reader, with defamation to the evidence. Do not look and you will not find. Exhibit 2,5,6, 13

There was "no actual evidence of a conspiracy to fail Mr Blanche and/or of dishonesty towards Mr Blanche or his work": Complaint Report §36.

Mr Blanche had the same evidence available to him as Mr Seagrim; Mr Blanche's work was failed. Mr Blanche was never studying batteries. In the Addendum report it is quite clear that this research is forbidden. The evidence is beyond reasonable doubt.

(Exhibit 4, 12). *"Any material in the thesis relating to other areas of science, unrelated to endothermic properties of batteries must be removed"*

(Exhibit 4, 2). *"A chapter on the relevant standard models of battery operation (what happens at the anode and cathode during a charge or discharge), how a battery generates heat as irreversible and reversible heat and the temperature effects, should be presented so that the experimental data can be assessed in reference to accepted knowledge of the device under study".*

3. A ~~summary chapter on the of~~ relevant standard models of battery operation (what happens at the anode and cathode during a charge or discharge), 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.

THE ABOVE (Exhibit 4, 2) IS FATAL TO THE DEFENSE CASE.

The Claimant was not failed – he was given permission, and time, for re-submission and re-examination, which is telling evidence that there was no such conspiracy:

Complaint Report §§36; 38.

POC 20, Not studying Batteries.

We must seem credible in our arguments; underhanded cheating needs to be presented in this way to legitimise censoring. Again, Mr Seagrim has no hesitation in disregarding whether the rules were applied or if there is any evidence to the allegations. Mr Blanche had a "fair shot"!

There was no evidence of collusion between the range of actors identified, including the external examiner. Complaint Report §39.

The evidence is in the documents and the paper trail as-well as the incoherent story in the emails gives away the fraud. Mr Seagrim, a barrister, did not read the evidence because it was too voluminous. He did not investigate, intentional attempt to cover up the fraud.

(Complaint report 15, *Mr Blanche's documentation is therefore the best evidence of his complaints. This report cannot consider all of Mr Blanche's comments, they are too many.*

Mr Seagrim admits the task to examine the evidence is either too big a task for him, or there is too much for him to consider in making a professional investigation. There was no time restraint and no pressure from any direction not to make a methodical examination to the serious allegations he has identified. He chose not to, and gives no reason why, other than there being too many comments? Mr Blanche conducted his investigation thoroughly. The same time was available to Mr Seagrim.

Complaint report 16. For a full appreciation of Mr Blanche's complaint, the reader should read the ERR itself

Mr Seagrim tells the reader to read the evidence to the allegations themselves, rather than analysing the evidence to the rules.

24.6. Further, it would be anathema to the University to cover up a scientific discovery, in the manner alleged: Complaint Report §§42-3.

That is exactly what they did. They are acting as a corporation and not a university in the true understanding of what a university should mean, a seat of learning and discovery. The reasons are for corporate control of energy to keep people buying electricity with their invested products. Mr Seagrim's cover up will fool no-one due to a complete non investigation, just gaslighting.

24.7. The Claimant's supervisors acted appropriately towards him [Complaint Report §51].

False claim.

24.8. As to the conduct of the Claimant's viva voce:

"I find that Prof. Huw Summers arranged and conducted the viva and Examination Board in a fair manner, conducted with due process, and with a motivation of ensuring that Mr Blanche had every opportunity to defend his thesis. There is nothing in the Regulations that requires the viva to be minuted, and nothing that compels the examiners or the Chair to share notes with Mr Blanche. Failure to do so is not a breach of the Regulations per se. As already outlined, there was no agenda to fail Mr Blanche, and therefore that was not an underlying motivation of those involved."

[Complaint Report §53]

FALSE CLAIMS. POC 13,14,15,16,21,22,23,24,25,26,

Complaint Report §54. Paragraphs 1, 13, 16 and 17 of the Regulations have not been shown to be breached. 55. Allegation dismissed.

FALSE CLAIMS. All these rules were breached and more.

An examiner should have specialist knowledge as stated in the rules, exhibit 2, rule 1.3.2. The examiners should also address the abstract (rule 13.1). The examiners were not specialists in electromagnetism, they did not know what the displacement current was (abstract), or the difference between a physical and chemical reaction (GCSE STANDARD). See transcript exhibit 5.

16. Conduct of the Examination - *The external examiner should complete Section 1.1 of the Report form (External Examiner's Report on Thesis) and take the whole form to the oral examination.*

This Did not happen; section 1.1 was produced on the 9th of June. The university confirmed on 23rd August (poc, 12) all documents were given to Mr Blanche. Some Faculties/Schools may permit an electronic copy to be sent ahead of the examination, yet this was not supplied, so one must assume it did not exist. The Chair of the Examining Board should arrange for the internal examiner's report to be typed in, or otherwise attached to, Section 2 (Internal Examiner's Report). See poc 25, 35. The R and R forms were produced on the 9th of June which is outside the rules. This was to intentionally deceive the student. Mr Widanalage did not author 1.1, where is the evidence? This has already been agreed and admitted by the PGR office. They tell us they write the R and R form on June 9th from a document created by Clare Goss at 11.10am. The signatures were pasted on that day, so how could there have been a completed 1.1 section brought to the exam on the 30th of May, 11 days previously?

17. *Conduct of the Viva Voce* The Chair of the Examining Board must ensure that the oral examination is conducted in an open and **fair** manner in accordance with the University's regulations.

Rules 17.4, 17.5, All the above rules were Breached by the examination board and not enforced by Academic services or Mr Seagrim.

Complaint Report § 58. Paragraphs 13, 15, 16, 17 and 18 of the Regulations have not been shown to be breached.

They were all breached, here are some of the rules:

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.

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.

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)[2].

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.

18.6

The examiners should then arrange with the Chair of the Examining Board for the completion and signature of the final form (Result Form). The appropriate recommendation option should be indicated by means of ticking the relevant box. If corrections are required, the external examiner will normally be required to scrutinise the corrections on behalf of the Examining Board unless otherwise indicated. The examiners and the Chair of the Examining Board should sign the Result Form and the Chair should ensure that the form is dated.

24.9. As to the documentation which followed the Exam Board:

“Mr Blanche seems to me to be fixated on how the R and R Forms were signed and that such was a form of ‘forgery’, thus proving a conspiracy.

First, there was no conspiracy. Second, there was no forgery. Prof.

Summers openly states that he copied and pasted the signatures. Prof

Summers states that he did so as he was collating the report and that this is

what the different individuals said: it is normal practice. I accept such

unhesitatingly. The only fraud or forgery would be if the individuals had

not said what Prof. Summers put in the report and then Prof. Summers put

their signature on the bottom of the page, as if they had. That is plainly

not what happened.

None of the actions of the professional services staff are relevant to the

contents of the report. I find, considering all the evidence I have seen,

that they were simply trying to deal with queries. They are not part of a

conspiracy, there was no conspiracy.”

FALSE CLAIMS. The process of production of the Rand R forms is well defined in the rules, Mr Seagrim is fixated on misleading the investigation in favour of the university and staff. Research support lies and misleads Mr Blanche on waiting for R and R forms, when they were being produced in-house and not per the rules, see emails 1,2,5,6,7.8.9.10.11.15. Expert editor Clare Goss is the author of the R & R report. Adrian Novis a DMW, ignores the rules at appeal, when Mr Blanche points out to the director that the chairperson should write a report for an appeal (see exhibit 14, civil claim pre protocol action), he ignores this and so do both the nominees ignore the rule. Gemma Wilkins invents a filtering committee and Natalie Wathan does the same. Now it's Mr Seagrim who does not apply the rules to the evidence.

24.10. The Complaint Report did not address matters of academic judgment:

Complaint Report §§3; 48; 51.

Misleading, it was misrepresentation of the truth and facts, not academic judgement. Mr Seagrim does not challenge any staff about conduct to the rules other than agreeing with their actions. He does not apply the rules of exam, to their actions and responsibilities. This investigation report is just a cover up attempt.

24.11. As the allegations around "academic fraud"; "scientific fraud" and "procedural fraud", the Complaint Report stated:

"63. First, if there was conduct that could also be categorised as criminal, e.g. fraud by false representation, contrary to Fraud Act 2006, s.1, I would have no hesitation in finding such, regardless of the identity of the actor.

False statement, the document evidence demonstrates the actions of staff to the rules was fraud and forgery. The pleadings from direct evidence demonstrate dishonesty.

Billy Seagrim ignores :

- 1. the evidence,**
- 2. did not look for any evidence,**
- 3. and does not read the rules of academic appeal.**

This was not an investigation; it is more akin to a protection scheme.

64. Second, and importantly, the conduct that is alleged by Mr Blanche to amount to "fraud" has already been considered by me above. The label of "fraud" is just a framing of these alleged acts in a criminal manner. For the reasons explained above, I have not found the acts alleged to have happened.

False statement, the evidence of the actions of staff to the rules demonstrated, fraud, forgery. Billy Seagrim does not examine the evidence, ignores the evidence, and does not read the rules of academic appeal or apply the rules exhibit 2, Guide to examination.

65. Third, in any event, it is unnecessary to establish the extent to which any act that Mr Blanche contends is 'fraud' is criminal fraud, over and above considering the conduct alleged. This is not a criminal investigation, as I explained to Mr Blanche in one of my first emails to him dated 2 May 2023 This benefits Mr Blanche. Matters he alleges do not need to be proved to the criminal standard. Mr Blanche does not need to prove the exact elements of the criminal offence alleged, e.g. fraud, under the Fraud Act 2006. We do not need to delve into, for example, the criminal definition of dishonesty or whether an individual sought to make a gain or cause a loss by a false representation, and all the complications regarding the mens rea of any respondent. **What matters are the facts, and whether Mr Blanche has proved any of the facts he asserts entails the academic, procedural, scientific, or indeed any other type of alleged fraud. This allegation is unnecessary to consider as I have considered the underlying conduct.**

Fourth, and finally, regarding Mr Blanche's claim of 'academic fraud' or 'scientific fraud', an element of that claim patently relies on a challenge to the academic view taken by those supervising and examining Mr Blanche. As explained to Mr Blanche on several occasions, challenging academic judgement is not available within this investigation."

False statement, Mr Seagrim's objective was to cover up the wrongdoing and not to examine the facts, see exhibit 5, he proves this in his statement, "the comments were too many," or, "read it yourself."

24.12. The Complaint Report found that as there was no "misconduct" there was no misconduct in office: Complaint Report §68.

False statement, Mr Seagrim was in no way going to examine the facts, he proves this. See exhibit 5, emails 1,2,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,15, Blanche 4

24.13. The appeal was conducted **fairly**: Complaint Report §60.

Exactly what the University has done incorrectly according to Mr Blanche is a little unclear. I think it is that they have reached a decision against the wishes of Mr Blanche. If the appeal is because they did not overturn the Examination Board, that relies on challenging academic judgement and is not allowable. If it is because the appeal was transferred to a complaint, i.e., this complaint, those rules appear to have been fully explained and fairly applied (see Annexes 6 and 9). No evidence of any failure has been produced.

False statement, It seems if they say the word “fairly”, then not analysing to see if they applied their rules, no longer matters. They did not apply their rules in exam, appeal, final review and defamation and bare faced denial by Billy Seagrim who read the evidence it seems with his eyes closed. Invented a filtering committee see poc 41 -50;

24.14. The complaint was found to be unsubstantiated.

Agenda to fail

25. On 3 August 2023, the Claimant’s file was closed, as he had not requested a Final Review of the decision within 14 days.

Mr Blanche had now been through three internal procedures which resulted in more fraud and avoidance of their own rules. It was now time to look for some impartiality through the civil court.

26. The Claimant did not comply with the pre-action protocol, or otherwise notify the University of his intention to file a civil claim against it.

False Claim, the university were given a pre action protocol before their final 2 investigations, and the claimant gave them the necessary time to do this, to make their defense. The university’s outcomes were un-satisfactory to the claimant and therefore the claimant went ahead with his civil claim that he had previously announced.

Fraud

27. The Claimant has made a number of allegations which amount to fraud or dishonesty:

MISLEADING THE COURT. Earlier in this defense document (point no’s. 3 and 4), the defense party complained that the fraud claims were vague? The bare faced denial does not question due process, and cannot comment on academic judgement but now their entire defence is based on academic immunity? Swansea staff rely on academic immunity to misrepresent the truth in historical facts, and science facts.

[Gopikrishna, R \(on the application of\) v The Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education & Ors \[2015\] EWHC 207 \(Admin\) \(06 February 2015\) \(bailii.org\).](#)

27.1. The Claimant alleges that University wanted to conceal and censor the content of his research in renewable energy physics, and that they failed him as a result [POCs §§18-19; 54]. On a related point, he alleges that the examiners made false statements about the state of scientific knowledge during his exam [POCs §§26-28],

Correct, this is based on science facts and not an opinion, academic judgement was not in question, it was the misrepresentation of the truth that is in question. The supervisors misrepresented the truth to discriminate against Mr Blanche's investigation into electromagnetism, because he included Newman's energy machine as an endothermic generator. The examiners should have specialist knowledge as stated in the rules, exhibit 2, rule 1.3.2. The examiners should also address the abstract (rule 13.1). The examiners were not specialists in electromagnetism and did not address the abstract. Their science knowledge was lacking in many areas, see exhibit 5, Ch. 5 and 6. They did not know what the displacement current was (abstract)(see exhibit 5, page 38 point 31), or the difference between a physical and chemical reaction (GCSE STANDARD). See transcript exhibit 5, page point 33.

27.2. The R and R Forms and the Addendum to R and R Forms are fraudulent [POCs §§4; 9].

Defendant acknowledges fraud and forgery, defamation, and discrimination in their claims. The defendant fails to address 35 claims.

27.3. The Chair wrote the two examiner's reports and then presented them as the work of the two examiners [POCs §§10; 21].

Correct.

27.4. The references to the Filtering Committee in the appeals process was incorrect because there was no filtering committee [POC §44].

Correct

27.5. The Claimant says that the University has acted fraudulently because the impact of his research "would conflict with the Corporations business model for solar panels, heat pumps, etc, Swansea University Corporation are part of a larger corporate community, and their intentions are to control the energy market for profit on energy supply to the public, from conception to final products, 24/7 free energy production using endothermic energy generators does not fit their business model" [POCs §52].

Correct. Mr Paul Boyle is the vice chancellor

27.6. The Claimant refers to the actions of the National Bureau of Standards in the 1980s, and others in the United States. These allegations are not relevant here, where the claim is about the actions of his academic

supervisors between 2020 – 2022.

The supervisors used a misrepresentation of the truth to discriminate, as this area of research is not allowed and censored. These allegations are relevant as the supervisors then discriminate on false statements.

28. As to this:

28.1. No cognisable claim for “fraud”, including for deceit, dishonest assistance, conspiracy, breach of fiduciary duty or breach of contract, has been pleaded or in any way made out.

FALSE STATEMENT, it seems the defendant and defense party are prepared to say anything. The claims are not the exhibits. The defense have ignored withheld documents, shared with them in 19th December 2023.

28.2. The “fraud” claim is additionally flawed for its failure to specifically set out these allegations of dishonesty pursuant to Practice Direction 16,

paragraph 8.2. **FALSE STATEMENT. THE CLAIMS ARE NOT THE EVIDENCE, there is enough said. The defense are trying to influence the court by quoting cp. Rules to defend an indefensible case instead of presenting conflicting evidence to support their case. 8.2 – false claim by defense , highlighted many times in the POCs. i.e. 1) any allegation of fraud;(2) the fact of any illegality;(3) details of any misrepresentation**

28.3. The claims regarding “academic fraud” and “scientific fraud” (paragraphs

27.1 and 27.5 above) involve matters of academic judgment and are not justiciable; paragraph 3 is repeated **(false statement, these academic judgement remarks are misrepresentations of the truth which are verified from evidence and a different claim to academic judgement, that is different to someone’s academic judgement.**

Academic judgement is as described by the defendant “to allow an examiner to make an academic judgement on the ability of a student”. Mr Blanche also has academic judgement; he is a Bachelor of Science. (See above 27.1). The examiners did not meet GCSE standards, evidence in the transcript and all documented in exhibit 5) Mr Blanche’s ability was of a higher standard than the supervisors and examiners in his research field of electromagnetism. The evidence demonstrates this, see exhibit 5, 18, 22 and 44. Academic judgement is not in question, it is misrepresentation of the truth.

(Further, as explained in the Complaint Report, there is no reason why the University would seek to conceal any scientific discovery made by the Claimant, and paragraph 24.11 is repeated.

FALSE STATEMENT, why did they ignore their rules?

28.4. It is denied that the R and R Forms, and the Addendum to the R and R Forms (which set out the requirements for re-submission), are fraudulent

(paragraph 27.2 above). This matter was considered in the Complaint

Report and there is no evidence in support of this allegation; paragraph 24.9 is repeated.

FALSE STATEMENT, The evidence is conclusive and was not investigated by Billy Seagrim, see sar 076 Decisions_revisions_required_DW, this document tells us there was a withheld document that was written by the PGR office, authored by Huw Summers. as above.

Billy Seagrim did not investigate the documents or apply the rules to the facts exposed in evidence, he relies on liking the professors, and says

“Prof. Summers was an impressive and credible individual. I have no hesitation in finding he was both truthful and accurate.”

The only fraud or forgery would be if the individuals had not said what Prof. Summers put in the report and then Prof. Summers put their signature on the bottom of the page, as if they had. That is plainly not what happened.

Mr Summers did exactly what Mr Seagrim states, he should not be writing the reports.

See sar 076 Decisions_revisions_required_DW, (exhibit 33), this document tells us there was a withheld document that was written by the PGR office and authored by Huw Summers. This document is the first draft of the Addendum. This document was then sent to the external examiner on 4th or 5th of June 2022, who then modified the document, this document was then sent back to chairperson who then created a new version (exhibit 53) which he modified and then apparently sent back again to the external examiner, The second modifications by the external examiner (exhibit 41) never made the final report, he was not the lead on this document. This could be an attempt to cover up the wrongdoing by the chair.

Rule ; 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

28.5. As to the appeal (paragraph 27.4), a **fair** process was followed; paragraph

24.13 above is repeated.

Did not apply their rule exhibit 13, rule 4.1. This was ignored by Mr Seagrim and the defense party. Poc 43, False statement, they did not apply their rules and invented a filtering committee

<https://myuni.swansea.ac.uk/academic-life/academic-regulations/assessment-and-progress/academic-appeals/#confirmation-of-procedural-regularity-contents> ,

, withheld Gemma Wilkins word document. Poc 3,46

Pursuant to paragraph 5.4 of the Guidance on Academic Appeals for All Taught and Research Programmes of Study, the Filtering Committee may reject any appeal where **there is no evidence to support the appeal**. Here, in summary, the Claimant's appeal involved matters of academic judgment or was appropriate for consideration as a complaint, rather than an academic appeal.

False statement, see above 28.5, also poc 44, 45,46, points raised by fake filtering committee. The reports were filed out of time. Exhibit 5 accompanied the appeal, highlights extensive wrongdoing. No chairperson report written for appeal; appeal nominee ignored rules.

Misconduct

29. The Claimant makes the following allegations of misconduct:

29.1. The chair of the Examining Board was not independent and intentionally deceived the Claimant by asserting he was, and that he had the intention of applying the University's rules and regulations [POCs §5].

Correct

29.2. The R and R Forms should have been filed with academic services on the day of the viva voce [POCs §7].

Correct

29.3. The Addendum to the R and R Forms was filed four days late [POCs §9].

Correct

29.4. The External Examiner refused to share his notes with the Claimant [POCs §11].

Correct

The notes which were produced later were not contemporaneous [POCs §37].

False statement. There were no original notes, so how could this be true? How can you make a comparison?

29.5. The Chair failed to obtain the Claimant's signature for the witness being present [POCs §16].

Correct, stated in rules.

29.6. The Claimant's supervisors instructed him to remove the references to

Joseph Newman from his research between 2020 and 2021 [POCs §18].

Correct. Misrepresentation of the truth.

29.7. No pre viva reports were produced [POCs §23].

Correct, see poc 25

29.8. The Claimant was incorrectly told he could not liaise with the examiners [POCs §30].

The claimant was told nothing of the sort. Evidence please, and what rule states this?

29.9. The Chair failed to write a report, as he should have done because an appeal as to the examination result was lodged [POCs §42].

Did not follow the rules

30. As to this:

30.1. To the extent that the Claimant claims that the University, or its employees, committed offence of misconduct in public office, that is a criminal offence which cannot be brought via a civil claim.

False claim. The claimant is bringing a claim for a financial loss, and not a criminal case. It is up to the police, cps, and court to bring a criminal case.

30.2. To the extent the Claimant argues that the University, or its employees, have engaged in the tort of misfeasance in public office, or alternative engaged in conduct which was in breach of the contract between the University and the Claimant, this is denied. It is not necessary to explore the individual elements of each of these offences. The short answer to each claim is that there was no misconduct, nor is there any evidence that the Defendant's employees acted with malice or bad faith. As to the specific allegations of the Claimant:

False Claim see exhibit 5. The chair wrote the two reports and withheld a document when it was requested in FOI request. Poc 10,11,12, Mislead the claimant in pre viva meeting, he knew the rules and impressed this on the claimant then did the opposite. POC 5.

Dishonesty is misconduct. Acted with discrimination to the research then acted with malice and bad faith, (see email 16 A, Blanche 4)

False claim the evidence speaks for itself. The defense is relying on the NON INVESTIGATION BY BILLY SEAGRIM, WHICH IS A BARE FACED DENIAL THAT EXPLORES NONE OF THE DOCUMENT EVIDENCE. See Mr Blanche's witness report.

30.3. The Chair was independent (paragraph 29.1); paragraph 24.8 is repeated.

False Claim see exhibit 5. The chair withheld a document he should not be writing when it was requested in FOI request, did not follow rules and regulations.. Poc 10,11,12, Email 9.

30.4. The R and R Forms were properly completed including the External Examiner's Report on Thesis (1.1); the External Examiner's Report on the Oral Examination (1.2); External Examiner's Report on matters of general concern or interest (1.3); the Internal Examiner's Report (2); the Joint Report by External and Internal Examiners (1.4); and the Report by the Chair (4). The R and R Forms were timely sent to academic services, as was the Addendum R and R Form (setting out the requirements for resubmission).

False statement, poc 10,11,12,22-27, exhibit 2, rules 17,18,19,9,13,

30.5. There was no obligation to obtain the Claimant's signature for the witness to be present; the witness attended at the Claimant's request (paragraph 29.5)

False statement, poc 16, During the oral exam, the chairperson was supposed to obtain Mr Blanche's signature for the witness being present. This the chairperson did not do as there was no original R & R form produced on the day as per the rules. (Exhibit 3 R and R forms section 4. Exhibit 2, rule 17.5)

30.6. There was no obligation for the examiners to share their notes with the Claimant (paragraph 29.4); paragraph 24.8 is repeated.

False claim poc 24, see front page of Rand R forms.

30.7. The allegations regarding the removal of references to Joseph Newman concern matters of academic judgement and are not justiciable, paragraphs 3 and 28.3 are repeated.

False statements, this is misrepresentation of the truth and not academic judgement. The university defined academic judgement. They discriminated against the claimant for investigating "DISPUTED WORK".

30.8. There was no requirement to produce a pre viva report. Section 1.1. of the R and R Forms was completed by the external examiner prior to the oral examination, on 20 April 2022.

False statement. The R and R form was created on 9th June 2022, the signature was pasted then, impossibility to have been completed as stated by defense. Poc 30-36. exhibit 2, rule 16

30.9. The Claimant was not to liaise with the examiners individually either before or after his viva voce; the Claimant appears to confuse this requirement with a separate requirement, under the Freedom of Information Act 2000, for public authorities to provide certain information on request.

False statement poc 30 and 31. the research support lead (Zoe Perry) said, "At the end of the viva when informing the student of their result, please can you make it clear that they can liaise with their supervisor as much as they want with regards to their corrections however there can be no liaising between the examiner/s and student." This being contrary to the rules and regulations, where does she get this rule from, it does not exist? this is intent to deceive Mr Blanche.

30.10. There was no requirement for the Chair to write a further report (paragraph 29.9). The University's "Guide to the Examination of Research Students" provides that "the Chair is required to provide a written report on the conduct of the examination as necessary" (paragraph 13). Here, that was not "necessary" because it was determined (within the outcomes of Claimant's academic appeal and related final review) that the Claimant's complaint about his examination needed to be fully investigated in accordance with the University's Complaints Procedure, and such investigation was then carried out by an independent investigator.

False claim, used half a sentence of rule 13 to mislead the court.

Rule 13. Says:" 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".**

30.11. Further, it is denied that the types of administrative issues that the Claimant highlights, such as minor delays, could give rise to a breach of contract or the misfeasance in public office.

False statement, It was intentional breach of contract, rules not followed. . Poc 10.11,12

Defamation

31. The Claimant maintains that the R and R Forms were submitted with the intention

to defame the Claimant [POCs §9],

Correct, intentionally deceived the claimant whilst abandoning their rules.

32. No other allegations of defamation are made. In these circumstances, there is no cognisable claim for defamation to which the Defendant can respond. For completeness, it is denied that the Defendant defamed the Claimant, or that the R and R Forms were submitted with the intention to defame the Claimant. The R and R Forms assessed the Claimant's work; and were not defamatory of the Claimant.

All reports are defamation to a correct new theory of electric field charge within electromagnetism. Everything was wrong and nothing was correct.

Discrimination

33. The Claimant has stated that his claim includes a claim for discrimination, but no such claim is articulated in the POCs, nor has the Claimant explained on which protected characteristic he relies, under the Equality Act 2010. For the avoidance of doubt, the Defendant denies that it has acted in breach of its obligations under the Equality Act 2010.

DISCRIMINATION TO STUDY ELECTROMAGNETISM DUE TO NEWMAN'S MACHINE WITH MALICE BY SUPERVISORS POC 17,18, 19 , EMAIL 16A

Misleading Statement

Particulars of Loss or Damage

34. The Claimant states:

"The rest of my career, I planned to write a PhD in my specialist subject area, and work as a professor in my specialist subject. I expected I would be in demand as a professor of renewable energy as I would have added to the knowledge of electromagnetism and renewable energy generation, written in a Master's of Science by Research. I cannot say how much I expect to recover." [Claim Form]

Correct

35. The Claimant went on to value his claim at £10,000,000. He asserts he is entitled

to £200,000 for four years' salary whilst pursuing an MSc, and £818,019, for nine years salary as a professor teaching a specialist subject. [POC, p.2]

Correct

36. The assessment which the Claimant received on his dissertation, and viva voce, was entirely due to his own failings.

False Statement as demonstrated by applying an investigation, the fraud and forgery was exposed, the corporation's staff lived up to their moto, "we work together".

The basis on which the Defendant took that assessment has been upheld on a number of occasions, taking into account the complaints made (then and now) by the Claimant. Further, the Claimant was given an opportunity to re-submit his thesis. Accordingly, it is denied that the Claimant is entitled to the relief sought or at all. It is specifically denied that Defendant is liable to the Claimant for lost wages as a professor and potential prize money.

False Claim.

Jennifer Thelen

15 January 2024

39 Essex Chambers

STATEMENT OF TRUTH

The Defendant believes that this Defence is true. I am duly authorised to sign the Defence on behalf of the Defendant.

Name: Deborah Howell

Signed:

Position held: Interim Head of Legal and Compliance Services

Dated: 15th January 2024

Jennifer Thelen does not sign the statement of truth. Who is Deborah Howell and how can she verify the statement?

The facts stated by the claimant in this claimant statement are within my own knowledge, and I believe to be true.

Regards

**Geoff Blanche
07429 925970**