

Witness statement (5) to bring contempt of court Proceedings made by

Geoffrey Blanche

30 Clos ynysddu

Pontyclun

CF72 9WQ

Scientist status: 2.1 Honours (BSc) Renewable energy Systems

My Reference: Blanche 13

Case No. K19ZA750

Mr Geoffrey C. Blanche (Claimant)

Versus

Swansea University Corporation (Defendant)

For Hearing being held at:

Cardiff Civil Justice centre 6<sup>th</sup> December 2024

## Contents

(A1)	Today the court should strike out any defense by the defendants for many reasons..	2
(A2)	What are Statements of Truth.....	3
(A3)	Defense Document (DD) false statements.....	5
	<b>ELC 01</b> - Beth Cara's Statement of Truth to the court.....	19
	ELC02.....	21
(A4)	Lord Reed, president of the supreme court said in a speech in 2012,.....	21
(A5)	Deborah Howell and Jennifer Thelen ignore exam procedure per the rules and contradict themselves and lie about the R and R Forms, claiming R and R form was produced on the day of Exam .....	22
(A6)	Huw Summers abandoned the rules and continuously lies. Billy Seagrim does not investigate the documents and is used by the corporation to cover-up the misconduct.....	24
(A7)	Billy Seagrim lies in Complaint Investigation.....	26
(A8)	The Handwritten Date on Section 3, Jennifer Thelen, Deborah Howells and the named defendant's state: " <i>30.4. The R and R Forms were properly completed</i> ". Firsthand Knowledge or verified by documentary evidence is required by the rules.....	28
(A9)	Deborah Howell and Jennifer Thelen state in (24.9) "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." .....	29
(A10)	Beth Cara tampers with her client's statement of truth, to hide a lie in their defense document statement of truth; then submits this as her statement of truth in her ELC02, to pervert the course of justice. ....	31
(A11)	The Non-existent Filtering Committee.....	32

(A13) The pre action protocol was referred to 3 times by barrister Billy Seagrim. Swansea was lying to stop any default judgement against them. Beth Cara asked the court to set aside the default judgement with a statement of Lies..... 33

(A15) On 20th October 2022 I had made Adrian Novis aware that during the appeal by Gemma Wilkins, rule 13 was relevant to the appeal. .... 34

(A16) Beth Cara tells us in her ELC 01 she is aware there were internal procedures .... 35

(A17) Beth Cara’s ELC 01 point 33, (DD 26)- A PRE ACTION-PROTOCOL WAS GIVEN TO THE DEFENDANTS ON 18TH November 2022. .... 36

(A19) Beth Cara lies, it was a barrister who dealt with the third internal procedure. “On a very basic level, the complaint was dealt with internally by Swansea by its Education Services Department”. .... 38

(A20) Billy Seagrim ignored the facts; Huw Summers admitted he should be independent during the exam; I had given (BS) the evidence. This evidence was all available to Beth Cara immediately ..... 38

(A21) Academic fraud not Academic Judgement ..... 39

(A23) Directing Mind and Will (DMW). The Postgraduate committee and Professors .... 41  
Interests by Academics Outside of Swansea University Fellows - The Learned Society of Wales 42

(A24) The Supervisors and Examiners did not have expertise in Electromagnetism..... 43

(A25) The Corporation wanted to cover-up deaths by Experimental Covid 19 vaccines 43

(A26) My Conclusions ..... 45

**Key to Abbreviations** Academic judgement = (AJ). particular of claims = (poc’s). abandoned rules =(AR). Huw Summers =(HS), Dhamikka Widanalage = (DW). Lijie Li = (LL) Zoe Perry = (ZP). Adrian Novis =(AN). Gemma Wilkins = (GW). Natalie Wathan = (NW). Billy Seagrim =(BS). Beth Cara = (BC). Statement of truth = (SoT). Statement of case = (SoC). Deborah Howell = (DH). Jennifer Thelen = (JT). Defense document = (DD). Exhibits = (EX). Barbara Down = (BD). Agustine Egwebe =(AE). Karol Kalna=(KK). Zhonfu Zhou = (ZZ). Paul Boyle=(PB). Academic Services = (AS). Jane Lewis Normand =(JLN). The National Bureau of Standards = NBS

**(A1) Today the court should strike out any defense by the defendants for many reasons.**

This is a witness statement made by Geoffrey Charles Blanche, I the claimant. The defendants abandoned their rules (AR) (EX2, EX13) to impose a political stance and agenda on my research. My research was rejected by Swansea University Corporation on the misrepresentation of the truth to censor the fraud NBS committed against Newman (poc,22); as-well as, their involvement in experimental covid 19 vaccinations that demonstrated in September 2021 (MHRA data via the yellow card scheme), to be killing people and causing severe adverse reactions in the thousands and millions respectively. The supervisors had no expertise in my specialist subject of electromagnetism, this was found out and is demonstrated from their comments on draft reports. (Blanche 5, pages 65 to 70) (EX18pages 3 and 4). The examiners had no expertise in my specialist subject, (EX 5 chapter 5 and 6) The chairperson, Huw Summers (HS), who committed fraud, withheld documents, falsified documents, acted dishonestly, was their main player. The defense Barristers and solicitor

produced 72 lies in four documents backed with statements of truth. (see A1 to A26 below) (poc's 1 to 55).

I Know exactly what I am up against bringing this case forward. Swansea University are entwined with other corporations; British and Welsh Government are highly involved in this case. For instance, barrister Jennifer Thelen is a junior member of the Attorney General's A list. British government set policy which impacts on higher education and corporate power. The focus is now on the Judiciary to maintain a compliance with rules to maintain the rule of law in our society. Swansea University Corporation had a corporate/political agenda whereas I had a science research agenda. These are two worlds apart. I didn't expect to be starting a career as an investigator, solicitor or acting as a barrister. Instead, I expected to be following an illustrious career as the scientist who wrote the first theory on endothermic electricity whilst adding to the knowledge of my subject, electromagnetism; then working as a professor whilst writing a PhD (EX51). But this was stolen from me by Swansea university corporation, using their staff against me. There was two motives Swansea had for censoring and failing my work. They abandoned their rules to stop my MSc by Research being known to the scientific research community.

This application for permission for Contempt of court proceedings must be brought against the defense lawyers and defendants named in this witness statement who caused the false statements. The defendants defense must be struck out according to Lord Reed, president of the supreme court (see A4).

The rule of law must be obeyed by compliance with rules; the application made July 12<sup>th</sup>, 2024, (Blanche 9 is (SoC)) and a re-application on the 27<sup>th</sup> of September was made due to the dissatisfaction of Judge James's order of September 17<sup>th</sup>. Initially, Judge James rejected the application; Judge James now sits to vary this application. Today I will plead the case for contempt of court proceedings to be initiated and to strikeout any defense.

As a general rule,

CPR 32.2, (1) the general rule is that any fact which needs to be proved by the evidence of witnesses is to be proved:

- (a) at trial, by their oral evidence given in public; and
- (b) at any other hearing, by their evidence in writing.

I submit this witness statement as evidence in writing along with (WS 1,2,3,4, WSBD and supporting exhibits (already filed with court)) for permission to bring contempt of court proceedings against the named persons who demonstrate contempt for Judge James and CP rules, it is beyond reasonable doubt, they lied in their submissions.

## (A2) What are Statements of Truth

I found out that any document endorsed with a statement of truth is a serious statement to make. You could call it a solemn declaration of truth, with legal consequences if it's not the truth. Jennifer Thelen, Deborah Howell and Beth Cara who produce the statements of truth are not experts in the subject discussed and will need to quote from documents any claims made by supervisors or examiners with the evidence to back up these claims; this they fail to do and any of their claims made without reference to evidence must be struck out. Penalties must be imposed for lying in statements of truth or there is no rule of law, and the judiciary would have not complied with the rules to meet the overriding objective (CPR 1.1(g)). Changes have recently been made to the template wording of statements of truth (SoC page 31, point 13). In this case, the defense document is signed with the wrong statement of truth. They're not just words, the wording is intended to bring home the seriousness of what is said in the document to be signed.

I give you some case law, an example of the interference with justice:

**Stanic v. Stanic (2018)** In a divorce case, Mr. Stanic breached a court order by failing to disclose financial information. The court found that Mr. Stanic had intentionally withheld information, showing a blatant disregard for the court's authority.

**Contemptuous Behaviour** *By intentionally withholding information required by the court, he interfered with the administration of justice. This behaviour prevented the court from making informed decisions in the case, undermining the integrity of the legal process. Mr. Stanic's actions show a clear disregard for the court's authority and the importance of transparency in financial matters.*

**Penalty** *The court imposed a 3-month imprisonment sentence for the breach.*

The above case shows the extent to which the courts are prepared to impose custodial sentences on witnesses who lie, and that there are strong public policy grounds for doing so. The key questions for the court to consider are:

Whether the statement in question was false; Whether the false statement interfered or was likely to interfere with the administration of justice in a material respect; and whether, when the false statement was made, the maker did not honestly believe in its truth and knew of the likelihood that making that statement would interfere with the administration of justice.

The message from the case-law is clear: making false statements to the court will be treated seriously and custodial sentences are imposed. It is crucial that clients and their solicitors consider all statements made to the court to ensure the client believes that they are true. They should also be aware that their statements, even in pre-action correspondence, will be scrutinised, and in an adversarial system a statement which is known to be false is likely to be uncovered as such quickly on cross examination.

**In this case K19ZA750, I have found there to be a total of 72 false statements in the four documents the defendant relies on; ELC01, defense document (DD) with annex B, and ELC02. These statements of truth are statements of lies with a total of 18 people involved in causing these statements of lies.**

The changes (6 April 2020) to the wording of statements of truth have not come out by mistake. A litany of cases has passed through the courts in recent years citing litigants' and witnesses' propensity not to tell the truth. Now the consequences of not telling the truth are more apparent by the change of wording, by the reference to contempt of court. The change of wording probably also means that the courts will and should be **far less reluctant** to impose penalties for the contempt caused by:

- making up allegations of fact to support a case when they just didn't happen.
- manufacturing evidence to support a case.
- third parties enticing, inducing or otherwise playing a part in witness making a false witness statement,
- intentionally doing the wrong thing.

[CPR 32.14](#) sets out the consequences of submitting a false statement of truth - notably that a party can make an application for proceedings for contempt of court against an individual who makes, or causes to be made, a false statement in a document that has been verified by a statement of truth without possessing an honest belief in its truth. CPR 81 are the relevant rules. CPR 81.3(5)(6) defines the process, with the sitting judge required to adjudicate on the evidence. The Criteria for an application should demonstrate a strong prima facie case that the statement relied upon was false, known to be untrue or made recklessly and without regard to whether it was false, and that the false statement was known to likely interfere with the course of justice. This I present in this witness statement as-well as the SoC; There is sufficient public interest to allow committal proceedings; and the proceedings are proportionate. I found

someone signing a statement of truth to confirm facts in a document(s) are true, should be a straightforward process. However, the consequences, of failing to tell the truth can be severe. When you verify a document with a statement of truth, it is then your document once you sign it or put your name to it. These matters are not just matters for solicitors and lawyers: it is the person who caused the statement of truth to be made and the person(s) that verifies the document with a statement of truth that is responsible for it, they are now “on the hook”: whether they: write it or not; they’ve read it or not; understand it or not. If the person who is to sign a statement of truth doesn’t have an honest belief in the truth of what is said, they shouldn’t sign it.

If Beth Cara, Deborah Howell and Jennifer Thelen did not have firsthand knowledge of the facts within the documents; they must check carefully and verify the facts from THESE documents; to ensure that the factual case which is being advanced by the defendants is true. Instead, they relied on false information given to them by the defendant’s staff. Overall, statements of truth are very simple. All you need to do is tell the truth in your statement about the document your statement of truth is verifying. But not telling the truth in a document supported by a statement of truth can make a bad situation worse. Much worse. **This is not fanciful or without merit, this is a COMPLIANCE WITH RULES THAT MUST BE MAINTAINED, this is A RULE OF LAW.**

The new wording of statements of truth (included in statement of case) (from 6 April 2020) has been made for reasons that include:

1. the fundamental importance that courts place on statements of truth
2. the increased danger that false evidence and allegations of fact bring to the outcome of legal cases,
3. the interference with the proper administration of justice that false statements of truth bring, it undermines the integrity of the legal system.

Statements of truth were introduced into legal proceedings to stop:

4. cases based on false statements of fact or unsupported by evidence
5. cases which were structured in the hope that evidence would turn up at disclosure, or evidence manufactured at trial that would set a litigant up to win the case
6. allegations which are untrue or which the party **is unable to say are true.**
7. untruthful or fictitious claims

So, it’s important that those signing statements of truth know exactly what a statement of truth is and the legal effect that it has.

### (A3) Defense Document (DD) false statements

**I found a total of 72 false statements in 3 statements of truth with Annex B attached to (DD). They were in:**

ELC 01	12 false statements
Document to the defense (DD)	30 false statements
ELC 02	6 false statements and one act to pervert the course of justice.
Complaint Investigation. annex B to (DD)	24 false statements

	<b>Staff of Swansea</b>	<b>Number of false statements they caused the making of.</b>
1	Paul Boyle (PB)	<b>8</b>
2	Huw Summers. (HS)	<b>19</b>
3	Perumal Niathiarasu. (PN)	<b>4</b>
4	Augustine Egwebe (AE)	<b>7</b>
5	Paul Rees. (PR)	<b>4</b>
6	Zoe Perry. (ZP)	<b>8</b>
7	Adrian Novis. (AN)	<b>9</b>
8	Gemma Wilkins. (GW)	<b>9</b>
9	Natalie Wathan (NW)	<b>9</b>
10	Billy Seagrim (BS)	<b>33</b>
11	Deborah Howell. (DH)	<b>30</b>
12	Jennifer Thelen. (JT)	<b>30</b>
13	Elizabeth Cara (BC)	<b>19</b>
14	Karol Kalna (KK)	<b>7</b>
15	Zhongfu Zhou (ZZ)	<b>7</b>
16	Jane Lewis Normand (JLN)	<b>4</b>
17	Lijie Li (LL)	<b>11</b>
18	Dhammika Widanalage (DW)	<b>13</b>

**Table 1:** Staff of Swansea who caused the making of false statements and the approximate number of false statements they caused the making of.

- 
- 1) Deborah Howell and Jennifer Thelen do not believe the defense is true, and because of this, they intentionally used the wrong statement of truth.
  - 2) The Statement of Truth That should be used is:

[The defendant believes] that the facts stated in this [Defense document being verified] are true. [I understand] and [The defendant) understands] that proceedings for contempt of court may be brought against anyone who makes, or causes to be made, a false statement in a document verified by a statement of truth without an honest belief in its truth.'

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**

**(DD)** (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.*

SoT Offender(s) (DH & JT) (ZZ, AE, KK, DW,LL, HS)

Evidence: a) (case law Blanche 4, page 5,) Case law tells us that the case between R (Gopikrishna) v University of Leicester and The Office of the Independent Adjudicator [2015] EWHC 207, the Administrative Court, in allowing the application, held that it had been open to the defendant to look critically at the assertion that the decision had been immune from review as an academic judgement, and to not consider the university’s failure to take relevant matters into account. The University must follow its own procedures. It was found in favour of the claimant due to the university failing to apply their procedures when new evidence had been submitted, they just refused to look at the evidence and then make a false claim of ‘Academic Judgement’.

[High Court Judgment Template](#)

b) The defendants abandoned their rules at examination and during their internal procedures, (HS) falsified documents (EX 3, poc’s 25). This is not fanciful or without merit, but fraud over many years (AR, EX2, EX13) (WS2,3,4). The supervisors try to impose a political agenda on my research despite the scientific evidence of fraud against Newman by NBS (see A 21), whilst my theory is my own theory not Newman’s, and the theory is supported by NASA experiments and others. The internal examiner tried in the exam to rubbish the very extensive NASA experiment, (EX5 page 152). The supervisors refuse to discuss fraud and act with malice (see A21 below). My theory was rejected on misrepresentation of the truth whilst abandoning their rules, to censor the NBS

fraud committed against Newman, this misrepresentation had been made knowingly whilst avoiding the true facts, they acted recklessly and lied about the truth. The supervisors had no expertise in my specialist subject, electromagnetism (EX48 page 3), and this was found out from their comments. (Blanche 5, pages 65 to 70.

- c) The examiners had no expertise in my specialist subject, (EX 5 chapter 5 and 6) The chairperson, Huw Summers (HS), who committed fraud, withheld documents, falsified documents, acted dishonestly (EX 11, Blanche 4, pages 5 to 34), and was their main actor. The defense claim is false, this was not about (AJ), it was fraud to cause a loss. (Exhibit 5 and 6, FRONT COVER – SCIENCE FRAUD chapter 5 and 6) (poc's 17,18,19),
- d) The second motive was due to their involvement in pushing experimental covid 19 jabs as safe and effective; it was demonstrated in September 2021 via the MHRA data through the yellow card scheme these experimental covid 19 jabs were killing people and causing severe adverse reactions.
- e) (AR) (PR and AE knew the rules had been abandoned at exam with the rest of the named, they planned the fraud. Or are we to believe these people are so bad at their jobs, they cannot implement a simple set of rules? (EX 2, EX 13)
- f) (Supervisors will not comment on their own false claims, EX 5, emails 18, 18A, 19, 20,21, 22) Supervisors respond to (EX19 page 43,b) with email (Blanche 4, 16A) (see A21)
- g) fraud by (HS, DW, LL) (Blanche 4 pages 5 to 34,) (EX 33,41,53,3,4) (see A23 below)

(4) *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.*

Offender(s) (DH & JT) (HS, DW, LL, ZP, AN, GW, NW by AR with dishonesty; BS by dishonesty)

Evidence a) I would remind the defendant of Beth Cara's statement dated 19<sup>th</sup> December 2023 in ELC 01, nearly a month before (4) in (DD), *"The Claimant claims £10M from Swansea and makes extremely serious allegations in relation to its conduct, including fraud, forgery, defamation and discrimination as well as abuse of power"*.

This is another False statement contradicting their previous observations, THEY WILL SAY ANYTHING RATHER THAN ADMIT MISCONDUCT.

- b) (withholding documents, exhibit 75 shared with (BC) on 17<sup>th</sup> December 2023) (Withholding documents, Blanche 4 page 18 - 31)
  - c) (WS 2) (EX5 emails 5 to 11) (relied on (BS) fake investigation who ignored (EX 33,41,53,) Fraud (PoC 12, 13 ,17,18,19 to 55)
  - d) (Discrimination) (EX 4, point 12, and paragraph 3)
  - e) (Breach of contract, -They abandoned their rules (AR) (EX 2, EX 13), see (WS ,2,3,4)
- (10) *Following this, the Claimant's supervisors identified an issue with his reliance on the work of Joseph Wesley Newman.*

Offender(s) (DH & JT) (ZZ, AE, KK)

Evidence a) JT and DH are not experts and make a false claim whilst commenting on expert reports. The research WAS NOT RELIANT ON the work of Joseph Wesley Newman. I developed my own theory with many examples of the endothermic electric effect (EX 7, chapters 3,4,7,8,9,10,11,19.2). Joseph Wesley Newman's work is inspirational and is just one example of the reaction discovered.

- b) The supervisors wanted me to remove Newman due to the fraud committed by NBS; they had a political agenda; they acted with Malice and made fraudulent claims about Newman. I had made them fully aware of the fraud committed on Newman (A21). The supervisors discriminated against my research into electromagnetism, they were not experts in this field as seen from their comments. (EX 55, pages 18 to 26) (EX 18, pages 3 and 4)
- C) The supervisors retreated to a position of "NO Comment" when Newman was mentioned. See (EX 5, emails 18, 18A, 19, 20,21, 22)
- d) the supervisors relied on bullying and acting with malice, they replied to (EX19 page 43,b) with (Blanche 4, email 16A),(poc's 17 and 18) (Exhibit 7, chapter 3, pages 25-29, Reference 42, page 328)
- e) My Title of thesis (EX 5 and 7) demonstrates a study of electromagnetism. Yet the supervisors persistently wanted my study to be about batteries, this was their angle to commit fraud, which was continued by the examiners, (see EX5 chapter 14). (EX 55 pages 18 and 19, 27) (see exhibit 36, research objective). (EX19 page 66, email before viva, A21)
- (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").*

Offender(s) (HS, DW, LL) (DH & JT)

Evidence a) No R and R forms were produced on the day as expected to the rules. (Blanche 4, Emails 5 to 11, WS BD.) (AR, EX 2, rules, 9,18,19) (poc's,21,22,23,30) (See A8 below)

b) *"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. 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."*

(HS) wrote this quoted text above, in his withheld document that preceded (EX33), not the examiners, this was not written by the examiners on the day. (poc's, 27). The external examiner confirmed he knew about independent validation (EX1). I 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.

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

Offender(s) (GW) (NW) (AN) (PB) (DH & JT)

- Evidence a) There was no filtering committee (See A11), The filtering committee was: (GW) and an unidentified member of staff. Paul Boyle and Adrian Novis withheld a document (EX 8) (WS 3) (poc's 2,3) (EX 75, point 3), they withheld the word document of (EX8) as it was modified by someone, they did not want to reveal the identity of.
- b) See (A11) (GW) authored and supplied the filtering committee notes on 28/04/2023, (EX 21) (EX 19 page 40 3E, page 49, m, page 55, 4E, page 57, 4G/H/K) (abandoned rules (EX 13 rule 4.1). There was no filtering committee.

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*

SoT Offender(s) (GW) (NW) (AN) (PB) (DH & JT) (JLN)

- Evidence a) There was No filtering committee, as above , (EX 8 and 9) (WS 3) (poc's 2,3) (EX 19 page 40 3E, page 49, m, page 55, 4E, page 57, 4G/H/K) (EX 21) (abandoned rules (EX 13 rule 4.1) (EX19 page 41,2a)

24.12 *The Complaint Report found that as there was no "misconduct" there was no misconduct in office*

The third internal procedure (Annex B of defense, with 16 annexes) was investigated by barrister Billy Seagrim May to June 2023. (BS) has been serving as a barrister since 2007 at Cardiff, Park Place, and I would expect him to be known to Judge James. There is dishonesty by BS in his Investigation report (ANNEX B to (DD)). (JT) and (DH) claim the investigation by Billy Seagrim to be true and include these claims in their statement of truth and therefore verify the whole of the (BS) Investigation Report (EX47) as a fixture of truth in their statement of truth.

Offender(s) (BS) (DH & JT) (PB) (HS) (DW) (PN) (AE) (PR) (ZP) (LL) (GW) (NW) (AN) (JLN) (KK) (ZZ)

- Evidence When examining the rules for a face-to-face oral exam, it is quite clear what the procedure is and how the examination board should apply these rules (EX2, rule 10 which brings in rules 18 and 19 apply). They (AR), (BS) was dishonest, (see A5, A7 and A9). When examining all the documentation evidence, these are the only conclusions to be drawn, (EX 2, EX13, EX 33,41,53) (EX 5,6,11)

**False statements from (ANNEX B);**

7 *Several of the University's Regulations are relevant to Mr Blanche's complaint. I have read them carefully.*

False claim, (failed to include and discuss rules that govern appeal (EX 13). Wrongdoing and (AR), see (WS 2,3,4), (BS) did not investigate, it was a cover-up. The examiners reports were filed late, fraudulently produced. (HS) and (PB) withheld documents, The chairperson (DW) (LL) (ZP) (Abandoned rules EX 2).

23 *Mr Blanche's complaint suffers from an acute lack of any evidential basis.*

False claim, (WS 2,3,4) (EX5 and EX6 page 14, EX11) (Blanche 4 pages 5 to 34) (EX 33,41,53)

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”*

a) (WS2 1.1.15) The chairperson was not independent of the examining process, he writes the reports, the external examiner tells us this in Exhibit 5 email 9. (rule 1.2) The chairperson produces the reports from, (Exhibit 33,41,53,) see (EX 28), and does not follow the due process set out in (EX 2 rule 9,18,19) (See Blanche 4 POINT C, pages 18 to 34)

(WS 2 1.1.16) The chairperson did not obey (rules 18 and 19) and in the complaint procedure he gaslights the investigation with the barrister Billy Seagrim agreeing with him without examining the rules. See (Blanche 4. See EX 2 Rules 1, 13, 16, 17, 18. Rule19 states: *After the oral examination is completed and all sections of the Report and Result Forms have been signed, the Chair should ensure that the original Report and Result Forms are sent to Academic Services immediately.*

(WS 2 1.1.16.1) The Chairperson did not write a report for the appeal (rule 13). See Exhibit 16 (annex 4 in court file) read, Geoff Blanche To: Adrian Novis Thu, 20 Oct at 22:19. Mr Novis was told this before final review and after 1st appeal but ignored the request.

(WS 2, 1.1.16.5) (Email 5,6,7), (poc’s 27), ((WS2 points 1.6.7 to 1.6.7.8) preceding withheld document to (EX33) (AR EX2) (Exhibit 6, pages 9,10,11, EX 7, prologue),

26 *COVID-19 was not discussed during the viva and has no relevance to his conduct towards Mr Blanche; (WS 2, 1.1.10)*

**b) False claims** Just before the exam and in the examination room before the examiners arrived, the chairperson made comments that covid19 vaccines would not be discussed. (HS) said this after seeing a newspaper on the table, (see EX 6 page 11). What is to be discussed by the examiners during the exam is not in the power of (HS) to decide. He had obviously coerced the examiners not to discuss covid vaccinations as the external examiner steers away from this subject in the exam (Exhibit 5 page 22). (WS BD). (ZP) tells the chairperson to instruct the examiners not to communicate with the candidate after the viva which is a false representation of the rules (PoC’s 24). The R and R form written by (HS) on 9<sup>th</sup> of June 2022, negatively makes a comment about covid (Annex A, section 1.3 to (DD, a section which (HS) put the wrong date on). They had coerced the examiners what to say and how to behave, the evidence tells us this.

30 *“to organize the viva and ensure it was fair, including to ensure there was a robust and sensible examining team.”*

*“they did organise a viva and a very fair set of examiners”*

*“viva’d in a fair manner”*

False Statements by (PR) They (AR) (EX2) (WS2) (poc’s 26,28,29) (EX 5 chapter 5 and 6) The DUE PROCESS was abandoned to commit fraud. The examiners were not experts (EX 5, page 151), they (AR) and lied several times (EX 5 chapters 5 and 6). The examiners didn’t know basic physics and chemistry,

did not meet GCSE standards (poc's 28,29). Examiners did not know the difference between a physical reaction, a chemical reaction or a chemical re-arrangement, did not know amps per second! (EX5 page 152) (EX55 pages 49 to 55)

- 33 *Dr Egwebe was a member of the supervisory team; he denied any conspiracy; and he described arranging the external examiner. This person was not someone he knew and based on their expertise*

(WS2), (Examiner was not an expert in electromagnetism, EX5 ch,5 and 6, VT: 2 HOURS 25 MINS Examiner doesn't know what a physical reaction is. As a comparison, it is like a car mechanic not knowing what a spanner is! Read it yourself:

*Blanche: it's not chemical reactions though, it's an electric effect, it's ah, it's a physical reaction, you don't, define the difference between a physical reaction and a chemical reaction please.*

*Ext: Physical reaction I do not know what you mean by that*

*Blanche: you don't know what a physical reaction is?*

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

(emails 5 to 11), (chairperson withholds document preceding EX33) (PB) withholds document in FOI request (EX8 word document) (EX50 word document)(ZP) invents rules (WS2, 1.1.1 to 1.1.7) ((AS) invent a filtering committee), (EX 8 and 9) (WS 3) (poc's 2,3, 41 to 50)) (EX 19 page 40 3E, page 49, m, page 55, 4E, page 57, 4G/H/K) (EX 21) (abandoned rules (EX 13 4.1)

- 38 *Mr Blanche was not actually 'failed'*

*I have no hesitation in finding that the viva was conducted fairly and gave a fair shot to Mr Blanche to defend his work.*

False claims, (EX 4, paragraph 3 and point 12) (AR) (WS 2,4)

- 39 *Where is the evidence?*

False Claim, (AR) (EX2, EX13) (WS 2,3,4) (EX5 and 6) (EX33,41,53) (EX3,4) (See A23)

- 42 *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 claim (EX 18 pages 3 and 4), (EX19 page 43,b with Blanche 4, email 16A) (A21 below) (poc's 17 and 18) (Exhibit 7, chapter 3, pages 24-29, Reference 42, page 328)

43. *it is unfathomable that the University would not celebrate and champion Mr Blanche's work. such as pushing for publication in Nature*

**False Claims**, Nature censor science that disagrees with the corporation's agenda. (Blanche 5 page 50),

- 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*
- False claims, See A7 below, (EX 6)
- 45 *albeit he was not failed, of course. outlandish and unsupported by evidence. Those claims include matters relating to 9/11*
- False Claims, (EX 4, paragraph 3. point 12,) (Blanche 5 page 58) (EX7 page 15 and 25)
- 46 *There is not a shred of evidence of any conspiracy against Mr Blanche. I dismiss Allegation 1.*
- False claims, (WS2,3,4) (A7 below) (A23 below) (Blanche 5 pages 63 and 64) (EX18)
- 47 *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.*
- Defamation by Billy Seagrim, he is a desperate man resorting to insults.
- 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*
- False claim, I did not rely on any theory by Joseph Newman, (EX 18), (Blanche 4, email 16A) (Blanche 5 pages 63 and 64) (poc's 17 and 18) (Exhibit 7, chapter 3, pages 23-29, Reference 42, page 328),
- 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.*
- False claim, chairperson claims to have kept no minutes only notes for around half the time of the oral exam, to help him tick 8 boxes which should have been completed on the day (EX2 section 4) (email 6) (poc's 24) (AR) (WS 2) (EX30)
- 54 *Paragraphs 1, 13, 16 and 17 of the Regulations have not been shown to be breached.*
- False claims, (AR EX 2) (WS2) (see A5)
- 56 *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.*
- False claim, chairperson lies and claims to have kept no notes (email 6) (poc 27) (Blanche 4 pages 6 to 34), (see A6 and A9)
- 58 *Paragraphs 13, 15, 16, 17 and 18 of the Regulations have not been shown to be breached.*

False claims. (AR) (see A5) (WS2 )(EX33,41,53) (Blanche 4 pages 6 to 34) (SoC pages 5 to 31)

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.*

False claim (see A7 below), (Blanche 4 pages 6 to 34)

64 *The label of 'fraud' is just a framing of these alleged acts in a criminal manner (See all the above and below)*

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.*

False claim, (AR) (WS 2,3,4) (dishonesty, Falsification of documents, withheld documents) (See A21)

68 *it is difficult to frame the University's employees or Examination Board as a 'public body' in the sense meant under this offence in the criminal law.*

False Claim, (Exhibit 6, page 5:-*"Misconduct in a public office is a common law offence: it is not defined in any statute. It carries a maximum sentence of life imprisonment. The offence requires that: a public officer acting as such; wilfully neglects to perform his or her duty and/or wilfully misconducts him or herself; to such a degree as to amount to an abuse of the public's trust in the office holder; without reasonable excuse or justification".*)

69 *For the reasons set out above, I find that none of the allegations by Mr Blanche have been proved and dismiss every allegation. As I have not found any of Mr Blanche's allegations proved, there are no grounds to support any of the outcomes sought by him, and I therefore will not consider them.*

*Signed .....William Seagrim..... Date .....22 June 2023.....*

False claim, (emails 5 to 11) (withheld documents), (Discrimination (EX 4,point 12, paragraph 3) (EX33 41,53, 3, 4, (ZP) inventing rules, abandoned the rules.) (WS 2.3.4) All the above and below. Invented filtering committee ( see A11(GW)).

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

SoT Offender(s) (DH & JT) (BS)

Evidence Repeat All above and below, false claims.

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

SoT Offender(s) (ZZ, AE, KK,PR) (DH & JT) (BS)

Evidence Discrimination (see A21 below), told to remove my research into electromagnetism by non-experts in the subject matter *"Secondary Supervisors need not necessarily be experts on the research student's particular topic of research to the same degree as required of the Primary/First Supervisor."* There was never a first supervisor who was expert in electromagnetism within electricity, see their comments. (EX 55 pages 19 to 26) (EX48 page 3) (EX 18), (Blanche 4, email 16A),(poc's 17 and 18) (Exhibit 7, chapter 3, pages 25-29, Reference

42, page 328) (Title of thesis (EX 5) a study of electromagnetism.) (see exhibit 36, research objective).(Blanche 5 pages 65 to 70)

- 24.8 *As to the conduct of the Claimant's viva voce*  
SoT Offender(s) (BS) (HS) (DH & JT)  
Evidence (poc's 24, 25) (AR) (EX2)(WS2) (EX30) (As above 53).  
The due process,
- 24.9 "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.  
SoT Offender(s) (BS) (HS) (DH & JT)  
Evidence False statement, Falsification of documents, forgery.  
See, A6, A8, A9 below
- 24.11 *As the allegations around "academic fraud"; "scientific fraud" and "procedural fraud", the Complaint Report stated*  
SoT Offender(s) (BS) (HS) (DH & JT)  
Evidence Dishonesty by (BS) (see A7 below), (See all the above and below), Fraud act 2006, (Blanche 4 page 4, Forgery act 1981) (Emails 5-11), no Filtering committee (WS 3), withholding documents, not (AJ), (AR)
- 24.13 *The appeal was conducted fairly: Complaint Report §60.,*  
Offender(s) (BS) (GW) (NW) (AN) (PB) (DH & JT)  
Evidence (see A15 below) (EX 8 and 9) (WS 3) (poc's 2,3) (EX 19 page 40 3E, page 49, m, page 55, 4E, page 57, 4G/H/K) (EX 21) (abandoned rules (EX 13 4.1) (AR) at appeal (SoC No chairperson report rule 13) (see A11)
- 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.*  
Offender(s) (DH & JT) Dishonest  
Evidence I delayed filing poc's to fully investigate the fraud, discrimination and defamation and to allow Swansea the same privilege, I did comply with pre action protocol, I filed poc's, later than anticipated but I was true to my word. Swansea failed to respond to the Pre action protocol until 22<sup>nd</sup> June 2023. This was 7 months after being served pre action protocol, rule CPR pre action protocol 6(b) applies). (EX16) (EX47) (see A13,A15,A16,A17 below)
- 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.*  
Offender(s) (DH & JT)  
Evidence Dishonest claim (poc's 3, 4, 5, 6, 7,8,9,17,18,19.....and all the other poc's) See all above and below)

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.*

Offender(s) (DH & JT) (BS) (HS) (GW) (NW) (AN) (PB) (PN) (DW) (LL) (ZP) (KK) (ZZ) (AE) (PR)

Evidence False statement, these academic judgement remarks are misrepresentations of the truth which are verified from evidence and a different claim to academic judgement (see A21 below), 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. 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, chapter 5 and 6) (read EX 55 page 61, examples 1 to 6), (Blanche 5 page 65. Academic judgement is not in question, it is misrepresentation of the truth, they were not experts, and the supervisors had a political agenda, A21 below) (AR) (WS 2)

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*

Offender(s) (DH & JT) (BS) (HS,DW,LL) (ZP)

Evidence False claim, R and R forms and Addendum were fraudulent.  
(Blanche 4 pages 6 to 34) (poc’s 6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,16, 20, 21,23, 25, 27, 35,36,37,38,) withheld doc preceding (EX33,41,53) (EX3,4) (Beth Cara was made aware of withheld documents EX75 on 17<sup>th</sup> December 2023), (see A6,A8,A9)

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

Offender(s) (DH & JT) (BS) (HS) (GW) (NW) (AN) (PB) (JLN)

Evidence False claim THE DUE PROCESS WAS ABANDONED. (AR) at appeal, invented filtering committee. No chairperson report, rule 13, (EX 8 and 9) (WS 3) (poc’s 2,3) (EX 19 page 40 3E, page 49, m, page 55, 4E, page 57, 4G/H/K) (EX 21 and 28) (abandoned rules (EX 13, 4.1) (EX 2)

30 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.*

Offender(s) (DH & JT) (BS) (HS) (GW) (NW) (AN) (PB) (PN) (DW) (LL) (ZP) (KK) (ZZ) (AE) (PR)

Evidence (AR) (EX 2, EX 13) (WS 1,2,3,4) (EX 5 and 6) (Blanche 4) (Blanche 5 pages 59 to 70)

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

Offender(s) (DH & JT) (HS)

- Evidence (EX 11) (EX 5 pages 54 to 61) (WS 2) (AR) (EX 2) (Blanche 4, pages 5 to 34) (withheld doc preceding EX 33,41,53) (poc's 5,6,7,40)
- 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 re-submission).*
- Offender(s) (DH & JT) (HS) (DW) (LL) (ZP)
- Evidence False Claims see A5, (Blanche 4, pages 5 to 34) (withheld doc preceding EX,33) (poc's 7,8,9,10,11,12,21,22,23,24,25,26,27,30,31,35,36,38) (AR) (EX 2)
- 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).*
- Offender(s) (DH & JT) (HS)
- Evidence False claim, (poc's 8,16) (EX 3, section 4)) (EX 2, rule 17.5) (Soc page 32 point 16)
- 30.6 *There was no obligation for the examiners to share their notes with the Claimant (paragraph 29.4); paragraph 24.8 is repeated.*
- Offender(s) (DH & JT) (HS) (DW) (LL)
- Evidence False claim, (poc's 24) (EX 3) (EX 2)
- 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.*
- Offender(s) (DH & JT) (ZZ) (KK) (AE)
- Evidence False claim, based on fraudulent report by NBS not (AJ). The supervisors represented a political agenda on behalf of Swansea University Corporation's business interests (they would not be able to own a patent, EX54) and wanted to censor the fraud by NBS against Newman. I made the supervisors aware of the fraud committed against Newman. False claims (EX 18), (Blanche 4, email 16A) (See A21 below) (poc's 17 and 18) (Exhibit 7, chapter 3, pages 23-29, Reference 42, page 328) (Blanche 5 Page 63-64)
- 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.*
- Offender(s) (DH & JT) (HS) (DW)
- Evidence False claim, (EX2, Rule 16), there is no evidence section 1.1 was produced before or on day of oral exam. There is no original evidence that (DW) wrote Section 1.1. (DW) stated in email 11 is notes appear as his report; he would not share his notes contrary to the rules (poc's 24). The chairperson wrote section 1.1 information on R and R form on 9<sup>th</sup> June, and pasted signatures and dates to it. (HS) falsified this section of the report to make it look like it was genuine to the rules. i.e. a pre

viva report, the signature tells us this, it cannot be identical on different dates, physical impossibility, The chairman admits this in (BS) investigation but misleads the investigation.

30.9 *The Claimant was not to liaise with the examiners individually either before or after his viva voce;*

Offender(s) (DH & JT) (HS) (ZP) (DW) (LL)

Evidence Dishonesty, there is no rule to this claim by the defendant and goes against their claims in (Blanche 5 page 56 (22) *“enhancing free speech and academic freedom”*)

Transparency at postgraduate is encouraged, and this is stated by Universitiesuk.ac.uk ; who (PB) is: *“ 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;* (Blanche 5,page 47 and 56) *“Our policy work has been influential in shaping developments across several areas, including: enhancing free speech and academic freedom”*. My research did not fit with their research policies and corporation profits.

(ZP) (DW) (LL) and (HS) are dishonest, (WS 2, points, 1.1.6 to 1.1.7.2)

The rules clearly state Rule No. 15 (EX 2) *Report and Result Forms 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. (see EX 3 front page).*

There is no rule a candidate cannot contact an examiner or how this must be done, why should there be?

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).*

Offender(s) (DH & JT) (HS) (AN) (GW) (NW) (PB) (JLN)

Evidence see SoC point 9, See A15 below. (AR) (EX 2) (EX 13)

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.*

Offender(s) (DH & JT)

Evidence Dishonesty, see SoC point 12, Intent to defame, EX 11. Withheld docs. Dishonest in emails. All of the above and below.

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.*

Offender(s) (DH & JT) (HS) (ZP) (DW) (LL)

Evidence A) Reports written by PGR office with Huw Summers to defame (EX 33,41,53,3,4).

B) (ZP) modified (EX4).

C) Huw Summers accused me of being Condescending, Summers wrote most of reports (Blanche 4 pages 5 to 34) (EX4 paragraph 3, point 12).

D) No strengths or knowledge of subject were identified contrary to the rules (EX2 rule 13.1, 16.1. Huw Summers contradicted (EX51 by ZZ) good results were obtained by circuit design but then Huw Summers said different (see A9).

E) In preceding withheld doc to (EX33) there was also independent validation acknowledged by (DW) in exam but (HS) lied and contradicted the truth (poc 27).

F) Examiners misrepresented the truth in Science (EX 55 example 1 to 6) (poc's 26,27,28,29) (Blanche 5 page 60) (EX 5 chapter 6).

33 *The Claimant has stated that his claim includes a claim for discrimination.... For the avoidance of doubt, the Defendant denies that it has acted in breach of its obligations under the Equality Act 2010.*

(Email 16A, Discrimination to follow my study into Electromagnetism due to including Newman's energy machine as an example of an endothermic energy generator. I define James Clerk Maxwells 4<sup>th</sup> equation as an endothermic reaction and add to the knowledge of electromagnetism (EX22). (EX 7 pages 82 to 90) (poc's 17,18,19,20) (EX 4 Paragraph 3, point 12) (EX 55 pages 18 to 27)

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

Offender(s) (DH & JT)

Evidence False Claim, all the above and below.

### ELC 01 - Beth Cara's Statement of Truth to the court

Beth Cara made 12 false statements, points (1,10,15,21,22,30,31,32,33,34,38.3,39)

IN REPLY TO POINTS IN ELC 01:

1 Swansea is a corporation.

- Senior Leadership Team
- University Governance
  - The Council
  - The Court
  - Ordinances
  - Charter, Statutes and Ordinances
  - Corporate Information
  - University Chancellor
  - Senate
  - Governance Vacancies



Swansea University operates within a constitutional framework established by its Charter and Statutes.

The University is an independent corporation, whose legal status derives from a Royal Charter originally granted in 1920, granting the authority to teach, conduct research and to award degrees and other qualifications. The University's objects, powers and framework of governance are set out in the Supplemental Charter, the latest amendments to which were approved by the Privy Council in 2007, and its supporting Statutes. The Statutes lay down a number of high-level rules, which in turn, are supported by more detailed Ordinances.

10 Beth Cara and her clients lie from the offset, when they state there is no pre action protocol. This now becomes Beth Cara's problem as she decides to sign the statement of truth. Barrister Billy Seagrim refers to the pre action protocol three times in his complaint investigation, which was their final completion of their internal procedures. Yet they fail to comply with *CP pre action protocol 6(b)*. Beth Cara would know this and tells us there were internal procedures in point 31 although she lies about the level of investigation "*On a very basic level, the complaint was dealt with internally by Swansea by its Education Services Department*"; A barrister Billy Seagrim was responsible for their Investigation report (EX47). This is not an accidental omission of the truth; Beth Cara did not have firsthand knowledge of the case and would need to investigate to confirm her client was not lying to her.

15 Swansea had defended themselves for one year prior to the PoC's being filed and there was already a defence made by a barrister on their behalf. The claim by Beth Cara that I only gave her 24 hours to make a defence is fiction. I asked her to confirm if there was any agreement by her client with the PoC's in an email dated 14<sup>th</sup> December 2023.

21 The case I have is full of MERIT, anyone who says different is lying, Beth Cara refers to the internal procedures in point 32. Swansea knew exactly what had happened. There had been three internal procedures over one year. I gave them every chance possible. The seriousness of their crime is why they refuse to admit guilt and now other people get dragged into their mess. At full trial they lose heavily; their behaviour is criminal, although this is a civil case. There are at least 72 false statements in their submissions to the court.

22 Complete and utter lies. Damn Lies. Swansea had a further two procedures to set out their case, which they did. They deny everything when the evidence against them is beyond reasonable doubt. (repeat point 10 above).

30 Swansea had dealt with the complaint in three internal procedures, The only person who is misguided here is the defendant and the defense party, the final investigation was carried out by Barrister Billy Seagrim who was dishonest along with the defendant. They had made their defense and denied all allegations as they still do, as to admit the truth is catastrophic to them.

31 This is a lie. The third internal procedure, a complaint investigation, was dealt with by Barrister Billy Seagrim. This attempt to set aside a default judgement which is claimed will be signed with a statement of truth is in fact, signed with a statement of lies. This is disgraceful behaviour.

32 Beth Cara identifies the procedural outcomes of each process; this confirms she read the documents. She then lies on Swansea's behalf; says they were not aware of a possible civil case. The corporation could have settled this case at any time but chose not to. In a complaints procedure (6.2.2 **Formal Investigation by an Investigating Officer**) it is noted that: "*the conclusion of the investigation and following a review of the evidence received, the Investigating Officer shall provide a decision on the complaint, to include either: Upholding the complaint, in full or in part (and confirming any action to be taken accordingly)*"

As Billy Seagrim stated in Annex B point 41: "*It should be remembered that if these people were found out, they would each likely lose their jobs and reputations.*" "*I will consider the appropriate remedy if I find any allegations proved.*" Billy Seagrim with help from the professors decided to try and cover-up the evidence, their abandoning of the rules, and their dishonesty, with more dishonesty to save their careers. Beth Cara is lying to protect the corporation and their dishonest staff.

33 Swansea was fully aware of the pre action protocol (as Above).

34 Beth Cara identifies the claims which she denies are made in ELC02 point 28. I suppose 2 months is a long time for a liar to remember what they wrote in their previous ELC01. There was no delay due to *“to an administrative issue with the postal system within the university.”*

The university failed to find a representative before Beth Cara, due to their hopeless defense, nobody would defend them, there is no chance of defending their actions successfully.

38.3 The defendant shall pay the claimants costs. I could not agree to set aside a default judgement as the defendants Investigation report (Annex B to (DD)) is a statement of lies, and they know it. All costs shall be covered by the defendant who is intentionally wasting the courts time and public funds whilst lying in statements of truth.

39 False statements. The statement of truth is a statement of lies as demonstrated.

## ELC02

These claims by Beth Cara are a-re-iteration of the (DD) analysed above, and the same evidence applies to these false claims which are:

8. C See above (DD) point 4 above. Dishonest claim (poc's 3, 4, 5, 6, 7,8,9,17,18,19.....and all the other poc's) See all above and below)

8.D See as above (DD) point 3. (A21)

9. I have not received any confirmation from the court that a default judgement as been set aside, and regard this as a false statement. Evidence of rejection? Defense based on statement of lies?

14-16 (see A10 below) Perverting the course of justice, Beth Cara tampers with client's statement of truth, (POINT 15 AND 16 of (DD)) to hide a lie, Kennedys know their client is lying (WS1 Point D).

26 Dishonesty, withheld docs, Fraud, Discrimination, Defamation, (AR) see, (DD) above analysis. (EX75), See as above (DD) point 3. (A21)

27.d False claim, (WS 2,3,4) all of this witness statement is evidence of Dishonesty, withheld docs, Fraud, Discrimination, Defamation, (AR)

28 I would remind Beth Cara of her ELC 01-point 21 statement, *“The Claimant claims £10M from Swansea and makes extremely serious allegations in relation to its conduct, including fraud, forgery, defamation and discrimination as well as abuse of power. This another False statement contradicting her previous claim, (DD) 30) above, (AR), all poc's, emails, Dishonesty, withheld docs (EX75), Fraud, Discrimination, Defamation, lies, damn lies.*

29 False statement, all of this witness statement and SoC, there is discrimination, defamation, fraud with forgery of documents.

(A4) Lord Reed, president of the supreme court said in a speech in 2012, (exhibit 77),

*“A possibility which I sometimes drew to the attention of counsel in commercial cases, and which proved to be an effective technique for achieving a speedy resolution of disputes..... the court can also use its power to punish contempt. ....The judge may decide to punish the party for contempt, or refer the case to the prosecuting authorities, but he or she will nevertheless have adjudicated on the dispute. ....Where on the other hand it is established prior to proof, possibly as the result of an admission or a*

*preliminary proof, or where it becomes apparent during the proof, that one of the parties is seeking to subvert the process of the court by fraudulent means, the court must decide whether the case should be allowed to proceed any further.....It has essentially two choices. It can decide to carry on notwithstanding the party's efforts to subvert the court process, and do the best it can in the circumstances, or it can decide to dismiss the party's case there and then.....What I propose to discuss is how the courts deal with litigants who set out to deceive the court: who produce forged documents, conceal the existence of relevant documents, or give untruthful evidence."*

**These are all acts that have been committed by the defendant.**

Lord Reed went on to say, "A finding at this stage that a document was forged or suppressed, or that a party told lies in evidence, is part of the court's ordinary adjudicative function. One can discern in the case law at least four approaches to the problem of dishonest litigants.

*"One is that the court's power to punish contempt encompasses the power to dismiss the action.*

*A second is that the litigant who resorts to forgery, perjury and the suppression of evidence in order to prevent the court from finding out the truth ipso facto forfeits his right to have the court hear his case.*

*A third is that the court should adjudicate upon the issues between the parties as long as the dishonest litigant's conduct has not rendered it impossible to hold a fair trial.*

*A fourth approach brings to bear the overriding objective of the CPR. It holds that, since a litigant who resorts to forgery, perjury and the like imposes an unnecessary burden on court resources, which may be at least as great as that imposed by a litigant who fails to comply with the rules of court or breaches the court's orders, he too may have his case struck out"*

- (A) I Included this information in (Blanche 10) for the court's benefit. The Defendants have no chance of being successful in defending their actions, the evidence is beyond reasonable doubt.

The defendant has done all the above which Lord Reed highlighted. I set out very clear the procedure for applying for a contempt of court application, in the statement of case that accompanied the application to bring contempt of court proceedings. It is a decision for the court's judge to decide upon; based on the truthfulness of the evidence, which is supplied with the application, in witness statements and in accordance with CP rules.

- (A5) Deborah Howell and Jennifer Thelen ignore exam procedure per the rules and contradict themselves and lie about the R and R Forms, claiming R and R forms was produced on the day of Exam

*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.*

*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).*

These are false statements. Deborah Howell and Jennifer Thelen and the named defendants claim in point 16 of the defense document:

*“On the same date the Claimant was provided with the “Report and Result Forms” (or the “R and R Forms”)*

This is a lie. Deborah Howell and Jennifer Thelen could have easily verified this by reading the emails included in (EX5 (ERR annex 5 of Billy Seagrim’s investigation)). I included this evidence in statement of case filed at Pontypridd County Court on 12 July 2024 pages 6 to 31. Judge James ignored the evidence and made false claims in his order 17<sup>th</sup> September 2024. The examination board were expected by the rules (exhibit 2, rules 9, 18, 19) to produce a R and R form on the day as this was a face-to face-viva (rule 10) but their plan was to commit fraud to censor the research I had made. This information was easily available to verify for Deborah Howell and Jennifer Thelen, but they decided to lie for the defendants.

- A) It is expected the original R and R form is to be completed on the day (Rule 9 and 19), this never happened.
- B) The chairperson should have both 1.1 and section 2 completed before the exam, this never happened. (rule 16)
- C) 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) This never happened. (rule 18)
- D) The external should then, together with the internal examiner, complete Section 3 (Joint Report by External and Internal Examiners). This never happened. (rule 18.2)
- E) The Chair of the Examining Board should complete Section 4 on the day and obtain signatures on the day, (Report by the Chair of Examining Board), commenting on the conduct of the oral examination and noting any procedural issues. This never happened. (rule 18.3)
- F) 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. (Rule 18.6, this never happened)
- G) The student should be invited to re-enter the room, and the Chair should inform the student of the recommendation of the Examining Board. The Chair should explain the implications of the recommendation and clearly indicate any dates for providing corrections or for re-submitting the thesis as well as identifying which examiner will be responsible for approving corrections (if applicable).
- H) *(RULE 19 After the oral examination is completed and all sections of the Report and Result Forms have been signed, the Chair should ensure that the original Report and Result Forms are sent to Academic Services immediately. The viva outcome should also be recorded on the Research Management System. The recommendation of the Examining Board must be presented to the Progression and Awards Board for ratification before a result letter can be prepared. Once confirmation that all conditions have been met is received, the student will be*

*informed by Academic Services of the formal outcome of the examination. This never happened.*

- I) Huw Summers had abandoned the rules, the examiners were coerced and did the same. The chairperson tells us there was no issues with the exam; he kept notes for half of the time of the exam to fill in these 8 tick boxes in section 4, which is a lie; whilst he was pretending he was waiting for the R and R report from the examiners between the 6<sup>th</sup> of June and the 9<sup>th</sup> of June, another lie. The external examiner had told us on Tuesday the 7<sup>th</sup> of June (email 11) he had given the chairperson some notes, another lie. This information was all available to Deborah Howell and Jennifer Thelen in (EX 5).
- J) ALL CONDITIONS WERE NOT MET; ACADEMIC SERVICES COVERED UP THE WRONGDOING IN THREE INTERNAL PROCEDURES WHICH LASTED FROM SEPTEMBER 2022 TO JULY 2023.
- K) I investigated all the documents and came to the correct conclusions whereas Deborah Howell and Jennifer Thelen did not. Deborah Howell and Jennifer Thelen and the named defendants based their defense on their internal procedures. In these procedures Academic services led by Paul Boyle and Adrian Novis, abandoned their rules to protect the examination board and the Postgraduate office from being found out for misconduct in a public office (Witness statement 3, filed 21<sup>st</sup> August 2024). Barrister Billy Seagrim who was a senior Law lecturer and a serving barrister since 2007, handled their final complaint investigation which was no more than a cover-up to the misconduct.
- L) Judge James said on September 17<sup>th</sup>, contempt of court proceedings is totally without merit and there was no interference with the administration of justice. How is it possible judge James could come to this conclusion when having read the SoC?

(A6) [Huw Summers abandoned the rules and continuously lies. Billy Seagrim does not investigate the documents and is used by the corporation to cover-up the misconduct](#)

I believe Deborah Howell, Jennifer Thelen and the named defendants lied in their defense which was verified as the truth with a statement of truth. They and Billy Seagrim had all the same documents available (EX3,4,33,41,53) in their investigation as I did to come to the truth, this is not *he said, she said*. When they said in (24.9) of their defense which was initially written by Barrister Billy Seagrim in (EX 47, point 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 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.”*

The Chairperson, Huw Summers who had abandoned the rules, finally admits to writing the R and R forms on 22<sup>nd</sup> May 2023, so to protect Clare Ellis Goss being involved (poc’s 32,33,34), he falsified the R and R document on 9<sup>th</sup> June 2022 and committed forgery (Blanche 4, point A and B), he is supposed to be independent (listen

to recording, pre viva interview EX 11,12) (Ex 2,Rule 1.2 applies). In his interview with Billy Seagram, he had no choice but to admit to writing the reports as I had exposed the identical copied signatures in (exhibit 6) for the final review (EX9). A week after the oral exam (June 4<sup>th</sup> to 10<sup>th</sup> June 2022) Huw Summers, Zoe Perry and the external examiner tried lying to me in emails (5,6,7,8,9,10,11). First, Zoe Perry claimed there was no minutes, then the notes Huw Summers had kept for around half the time of the 2 and half hour viva, were to help him fill in 8 tick boxes, then in his interview with (BS), it becomes normal practice to write the examiners reports. If the chairperson didn't keep minutes, how did he know what to write on the reports? More lies. The external examiner told me in emails 9 and 11 the feedback was from the chairperson, and he was writing the reports, an admission to the fraud and rule breaking. Later when I brought my final review (EX19, page 9 K); Summers had no choice in (BS) interview but to admit he had written the reports. But now he continues to lie claiming "*it is normal practice*" to not follow your own rules, in fact, he even has the audacity to gaslight us and continue lying even when found out, his lies just keep pouring out. I had accumulated £70,000 of student debt to be cheated by a liar. Huw Summers had a lot to lose; he was highly involved in covid 19 experimental vaccines that were killing people; I had confronted the corporation with the yellow card data in September 2021, the corporation knew the jabs were killing people. This was catastrophic for Huw Summers and his colleagues; since then, we have seen the biggest worldwide cover-up in history which leads directly to the heads of Government; this is still being perpetuated today; I will have all the evidence of the covid vaccination crime at a future trial. Huw Summers falsified the documents committing forgery to try and pass them off as genuine. There is 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 24<sup>th</sup> July 2023. The word document is 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. The internal examiner had written and 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 by Huw Summers to '30 May' on section 2, when he wrote the R & R form on the 9<sup>th</sup> of June, as-well as the signature being changed. Section 2 is the internal examiners pre viva report (rule 16 applies), Huw Summers 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. Huw Summers never intended to follow the rules; he had an agenda to stop my research being known. In the withheld document he authored (preceding EX33), he wrote, "*Any material in the thesis relating to other areas of science, unrelated to endothermic properties of batteries must be removed*". (This is point 13 in exhibit 33).

The chairperson confirmed he used exhibit 39 to produce the R & R and Addendum reports (confirmed by Lisa Hughes, Statement of case page 15). The date on section 2 was altered with intent to deceive me by the chairperson from the original date. I believe this date was written differently and, in this style, compared to the 7 other dates on the R & R form, to intentionally pass the R and R form off as genuine to the rules. 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 (poc 25). The chairperson was inventing an alibi through pronunciation if it was ever questioned. Billy Seagrim was used to cover up the fact they had abandoned their rules, with himself and Huw Summers agreeing nothing was wrong. Now Jennifer Thelen and Deborah Howell use these lies to lie again on behalf of the defendant. I included the definition of forgery in the (reply to the defense Blanche 4, page 4)

Huw Summers the chairperson of my oral examination, 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 was chosen to cheat and be dishonest against me because I opposed the covid 19 vaccinations. In his interview with Billy Seagrim he tries to distant himself from covid vaccinations (so does Paul Rees) (EX46 and 52). The corporation was pushing these experimental jabs as “safe and effective” along with the Welsh government. These experimental jabs are not safe and not effective. The yellow card data told us this in September 2021. By me opposing the covid 19 experimental jabs and a pandemic narrative, is a factor in the defendant’s behaviour towards me and to be dishonest to shut my MSc knowledge down. This development of a specific vaccine product would have taken years of planning; the evidence demonstrates this is the case (EX 6). 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.

## 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: <a href="#">EP/L020734/1</a> GRANT_NUMBER: <a href="#">EP/L020734/1</a> <span style="float: right;"><a href="#">Show less detail</a></span>
<b>Organization identifiers</b> FUNDREF: <a href="http://dx.doi.org/10.13039/501100000266">http://dx.doi.org/10.13039/501100000266</a> Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council: GB
<b>Total funding amount</b> GBP 564,437
<b>Added</b> 2016-01-05

**SEE CONCLUSION OF EXHIBIT 6 PAGE 14.**

### (A7) Billy Seagrim lies in Complaint Investigation

Billy Seagrim’s complaint Investigation Report is annex B to the defence which (JT) and (DH) along with those who caused the misconduct, is a part of their defense and part of their statement of truth.

Billy Seagrim states:

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.*



Close-up of a microneedle (top) compared to a hypodermic needle, showing how microneedles are


From Exhibit 6

This is a lie. In Exhibit 6 which is Bill Seagrim's (annex 7), I included two pieces of evidence about the relevance of covid 19 vaccinations to Swansea (exhibit 6, references 3 and 4). Professor Paul Boyle the vice chancellor is quoted in an interview with universitybusiness.co.uk, stating covid protection is his number 1 priority for 2021. I emailed Paul Boyle and the senior management to warn them of the dangers of covid 19 vaccinations (exhibit 62 and 63). This interview with universitybusiness.co.uk has subsequently been removed from the internet...:

The vice chancellor had stated in an interview in February 2021 by universitybusiness.co.uk [3] when asked:

*"And finally, what are your top priorities for 2021?"*

1. *Well, the top priority still has to be the safety of our staff and our students.*
2. *Secondly, making sure that the education or provision that we provide our students is absolutely top class. And even if we have to provide a lot of that through a blended approach, that that blended approach will be an excellent approach.*



References:

1. [Justice Department Announces Largest Health Care Fraud Settlement in Its History | OPA | Department of Justice](#)
2. [Misconduct in Public Office | The Crown Prosecution Service \(cps.gov.uk\)](#)
3. [Interview: Paul Boyle: 'We've got to make sure that we learn from this experience' - University Business](#)
4. [Swansea University developing world's first COVID-19 'smart-patch' vaccine that will measure effectiveness - Swansea University](#)
5. [Safe & Effective | Oracle Films](#)
6. [Uninformed Consent - Parts 1 & 2 \(boxcast.tv\)](#)
7. [Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council - Wikipedia](#)
8. [The Code for Crown Prosecutors | The Crown Prosecution Service \(cps.gov.uk\)](#)

References from exhibit 6

Billy Seagram continuously lied in his fake investigation. Points:

54. Paragraphs 1, 13, 16 and 17 of the Regulations have not been shown to be breached.

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

These rules were all breached, I exposed this in (EX5 and 6) for the final review in October 2022, but this was ignored by (NW) (PB) (JLN) (AN) and then by (BS), see (WS,2,3,4).

- (A8) The Handwritten Date on Section 3, Jennifer Thelen, Deborah Howells and the named defendant's state: "30.4. *The R and R Forms were properly completed*". Firsthand Knowledge or verified by documentary evidence is required by the rules.

The R & R report was written and produced by the chairperson on the 9<sup>th</sup> of June 2022 outside of the rules, (statement of case, page 7). I asked myself "why would you alter *'the style'* of dating a document"? There being seven dates in total on the R and R form when you were composing the report on the same date?"

- 1 Both examiners failed to produce a pre viva report before the exam.
- 2 The external examiner failed to produce any original copy of his work or share his notes when requested,

3 Lisa Hughes stated on 23<sup>rd</sup> August 2023: *"I can confirm that there are no further documents to provide"* (statement of case page 3).

4 Huw Summers made the R and R form to look like it was produced by different people at different times.

5 The intention was to pass it off as a genuine example of the R & R form (per the rules, 9,10,18,19 and then pretend I was given a copy on the day);

6 their plan was to try and deceive me that the two reports were written by the examiners, and this they pretended was happening during the email exchange the week after the viva, whilst in the background (HS) was writing the outcome that Swansea University Corporation wanted, in collusion with the examiners.

7 I spoilt their plans by catching them lying in emails as-well as recording the oral exam which was something they did not want (email 5 and 6);

8 the R and R document tells several lies about itself. An image of a handwritten date was paste onto the R & R form section 3 (see Blanche 4-page 10, point B), whilst all other dates on the R & R form were typed into the document,

9 section 1.3 (EX 2 rule 18) being given the wrong date per the rules.

10 Huw Summers did this to make it look like the report was a genuine report to the rules with the handwritten date on section 3 being produced on that date, with intent to defraud me.

11 The internal examiner wrote his pre viva report the day after the exam; Huw Summers changed the date Section 2 was produced on the R and R report to pretend the rules were followed (EX35 and 39).

12 How the final reports were made I included in the (statement of case, pages 12-31 and reply to the defense, Blanche 4, pages 5 to 34).

13 The final reports were produced and written by Huw Summers, 10 days later to what this handwritten date was meant to make me believe. ((HS) admits this). The document properties tell us this (EX19 page 46 f), the document tells a lie about itself as all the signatures are identical, (HS) admits this.

14 Jennifer Thelen and Deborah Howell were privy to this information when they wrote the (DD);

15 If Deborah Howell and Jennifer Thelen did not have firsthand knowledge of the facts of the documents which they were verifying, which they did not; they must check the documents carefully and verify what they state is correct, from other documents to ensure that the factual case which is being advanced by the defendants is true. The defendant lied to their defense party.

16 Deborah Howell and Jennifer Thelen relied on the false information of Huw Summers and Barrister Billy Seagrim who conducted the complaint procedure investigation, the defendants lied.

(A9) Deborah Howell and Jennifer Thelen state in (24.9) "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."

- a) This is plainly what did happen. Billy Seagrim lied, and Deborah Howell and Jennifer Thelen would need to verify if this information is true.
- b) Huw Summers withheld a document which was the first draft that the reports would be based on. In this word document that he sent to the external examiner (the external examiner admitted Huw Summers was involved in the feedback (email 9)).

- c) Whilst writing his defamatory reports, Mr Summers wrote: *“The experiment data has limited accuracy”*, obviously Mr Summers was unaware of the reference to me from Dr Zhou two years earlier. Dr Zhou had said (exhibit 51): *“Based on the developed circuit he has obtained very good measurement results”*. This statement by Huw Summers that contradicts Dr Zhou, is found in section 3 of the R and R form (the section with the pasted image of a handwritten date to make you believe it is genuine) and was written by Huw Summers and will be found in the withheld document. This was to defame me. The examiners did not write this.
- d) The examiners never discussed the developed circuit or commented on it. The next point was again invented by Huw Summers and will be found in the withheld document, *“claims that the results validate the theories developed by Joseph Newman in regard to his energy machine. 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.”*

In the PoC's I have:

- (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,  
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 to defame me.

Deborah Howell and Jennifer Thelen would need to verify these claims as fact or not, they did not. They relied on the false information of Billy Seagrim and Huw Summers in their statement of truth. They never investigated Exhibits 33, 41, 53, at least they haven't told us they did; just like the internal procedures failed to mention these documents in their investigations.

- (A10) Beth Cara tampers with her client's statement of truth, to hide a lie in their defense document statement of truth; then submits this as her statement of truth in her ELC02, to pervert the course of justice.

The defense document produced by Jennifer Thelen and Deborah Howell on behalf of their clients includes 30 identified lies. The following false statement observation was included in my (SoC); point 15 and 16 of the defense document, and In Beth Cara's **ELC 02** accompanied with a statement of truth, that accompanies the defendant's N244 application for strike out/ or summary judgement, dated February 16<sup>th</sup>, 2024.

Beth Cara copies point 15 and 16 from the defendant's defense statement of truth which was made on the 15<sup>th</sup> of January, and then re arranges the wording in **ELC02 points 14 to 16** of her statement of truth. Beth Cara intentionally omits a lie from the defendant's statement of truth, **"On the same date the Claimant was provided with the "Report and Result Forms" (or the "R and R Forms")"**. Beth Cara knows this statement is a lie by her client so omits it from her ELC02 whilst adding to her client's statement to make it read as if it was original. Beth Cara changed the wording in her client's statement of truth in ELC 02: *The outcome of the viva voce is recorded on the "Report and Result Forms" (or the "R and R Forms")* **and omitted a lie**. This tampering with evidence is to mislead the court. Beth Cara knows her client lies. This is tampering with her client's statement of truth to defend her client, Deborah Howell and Jennifer Thelen. They lied about the R and R form being given to me on the day to pervert the course of justice to cause me a loss. Huw Summers copied an image of a handwritten date onto section 3 to try and deceive me that the R and R form was written on this date as-well as changing a date to make it look like section 2 was produced on this date as per the rules require. Huw Summers wrote most of the reports himself later (EX33,41,53).

Elizabeth Cara must be removed from the case.

Kennedys Law firm must be removed from the case. Kennedys are involved in conspiracy to pervert the course of justice. They know their client is lying and there was a premeditated act to omit lies, they are aware of their client's lies and it was a deliberate course of action. Since I filed the contempt of court proceedings, Beth Cara as refrained from signing her letters to the court (July 25th; October 17th). It is now Kennedy's that represent the defendant and have signed their letters. This makes Kennedy's an accomplice to the contempt, this is a conspiracy to pervert the course of justice. They know Swansea are lying in their statements of truth.

Beth Cara has showed no remorse for her actions and has foolishly denied her actions. This action by Beth Cara is intended to interfere with the administration of justice. Beth

Cara and Kennedy's colluded with their client to conceal a lie by changing and tampering with the defendants' statement of truth evidence from their original defense document dated 15th January 2024. Beth Cara then presented this '**changed and tampered with statement of truth evidence**' in her statement of truth which represents the defendant's strikeout request dated 16th February 2024. **Tampering with evidence to interfere with the administration of justice will be looked upon by the public "with an extremely dim view"**. These types of actions will leave the justice system damaged if unpunished; this is reckless and illegal behaviour by law officers who are sworn to uphold the truth.

The motivation for perverting the course of justice is not a relevant factor in determining their guilt (although in this case it is obvious why). In other words, it doesn't matter why you interfered – **the fact that you did is enough to convict.**

**An example in case law:** *It is also worth noting that an ulterior intention of the defendant in respect of their motives can be largely irrelevant, for example where a person makes a knowingly false statement in pursuance of court proceedings but only does so in order to protect someone else, this will still be perverting the course of justice, the laudability of the motive being held to have been largely irrelevant: Att.-Gen.'s Reference (No. 1 of 2002).*

Perverting the course of justice is regarded as serious, an indictable offence which Judge James and the court will need to apply, to meet the rule of law.

**Sentencing** The Court of Appeal have said on repeated occasions that prison sentences will be imposed in all but the most exceptional cases for example **Att.-Gen.'s Reference (No. 17 of 2008).**

Well-established authority teaches us that lies to the Court can lead to several conclusions. First, and obviously, lies to the Court may lead to the inference that something highly material, and highly adverse is at hand, and in this case the defendant's case is being obscured. Access to justice relies upon the integrity and honesty of individuals and it is essential that the rule of law is upheld; otherwise, we risk the undermining of our entire justice system. It is, after all, a cornerstone of a functioning society. Courts can be tolerant of mistaken recollections and innocent oversights, but not dishonesty and an intention to mislead and deceive. Statements of truth were introduced into legal proceedings to stop cases based on false statements of fact or unsupported by evidence. So serious is making false witness statements, when the document is verified with a statement of truth, punishment includes custodial sentences.

## (A11) The Non-existent Filtering Committee

In the event of an appeal, the first rule that should be applied is (**Exhibit 13**): 4. *Confirmation of Procedural Regularity* 4.1 (SoC page 5) In a freedom of information request on April 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2023, for the filtering committee report that the appeal outcomes are based upon: Lisa Hughes, the compliance officer assistant, states (**EX 19, FOI, 4E**): *Please note that there is no 'report' as such. The attached information contains notes prepared by members of the Filtering Committee.* **EX 21** is a document produced and authored by Gemma Wilkins on 28<sup>th</sup> of April 2023, produced apparently from (**Exhibit 50**) in September 2022: Gemma Wilkins, who is the nominee, and is also acting as the filtering committee whilst

referring to a fictional committee in **Exhibit 8**. This is a fake storyline and considered falsification of a document, there was no filtering committee. Gemma Wilkins refers to a fictitious committee at least 10 times whilst writing the appeal outcome letter (**EX 8, WS3**) based on a fake committee's decision. The comment box of (**EX21**) is blacked out to hide an identity. Gemma Wilkins and Lisa Hughes claim (**exhibit 20 and 21, exhibit 19** page 40 email 3E), in **exhibit 8, this** is what the filtering committee produced as notes, to turn the appeal into a complaint, but there was no committee, only notes by Gemma Wilkins and most of the text in **exhibit 21** belongs to me, except a very little amount written by Gemma Wilkins. There is no time stamp or minutes of any meeting, or members of committee that would confirm these '**notes**' were legitimately written by members of a filtering committee in September 2022 when the filtering committee are supposed (**see exhibit 50**) to have come to their outcome, which both appeal outcomes were based on. Where is the evidence? There is none, they lie. Gemma Wilkins presents her notes with text taken from my (EX 5) and presents it with some comments to turn it into a complaint pretending this was a filtering committee decision, with no evidence that the filtering committee did this as claimed. (**See EX 29 and 32**).

Natalie Wathan states (**EX9**) she assessed whether the Filtering Committee had considered the appeal in accordance with the regulations and procedures of the University. The only available documents to access if this is true would have been, (**Exhibit 21, Exhibit 8 and the withheld word document of Exhibit 8**) There is no committee report, these documents are authored by the 1<sup>st</sup> nominee.

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

To:geoffblanche@yahoo.com; Thu, 3 Aug at 14:08

*Dear Geoff, I write in reply to your request dated 7th July 2023 for your personal data under the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), specifically documents held by members of Academic Services. The University has not included two of the documents for the following reasons: 'The word document made by Gemma Wilkins the PDF was produced from, the appeal outcome letter dated 29/09/2022 with full text' – this document has been modified by a junior member of staff and it would not be in their expectation for their name to be disclosed as part of a SAR Response.*

**It was in my expectation TO NOT HAVE fraud and falsification of documents inflicted on me.**

(A13) The pre action protocol was referred to 3 times by barrister Billy Seagrim. Swansea was lying to stop any default judgement against them. Beth Cara asked the court to set aside the default judgement with a statement of Lies

I requested a default judgement on 5<sup>th</sup> December 2023. This default judgement should not be removed for the very fact that the statement of truth asking to remove a default judgement is a statement of lies. They have no chance of defending this case at trial. Beth Cara was aware of the documents accompanying the internal processes Swansea had carried out. Beth Cara must check carefully as she did not have firsthand knowledge of the case, and her statements of truth must be verified from these documents. This is Beth Cara's duty to perform, as a solicitor of the Superior Courts of England and Wales. I made the court aware of her false statements in the (SoC) application. Swansea had already made a completion of procedures; they knew exactly what had transpired between me and them. They made 3 false defenses for

their examination board and PGR office; to protect their business interests, they abandoned their rules to do this.

Beth Cara lied in her statement of truth (ELC 01) and omitted lies from (DD) in her (ELC 02) to mislead the court; the evidence that demonstrates the lies are in the bundle of documents. Billy Seagrim said there were more documents he did not mention but claims to have read (EX33,41,53) (Annex B point 8). Beth Cara should have presented these documents to support her claims as evidence to her statement of truth as she did not have firsthand knowledge. Even the excuse story about the Poc's being lost in their internal post is far-fetched. It is more likely Swansea could not find anyone prepared to defend them against these claims as the evidence is beyond reasonable doubt. Beth Cara even tampered with her client's statement of truth in ELC02 points 14 to 16; she knew Swansea were lying from the outset but still strenuously denies a hopeless defense.

Swansea had completed a fraudulent complaint process, in this complaint outcome Seagrim states:

*h. Mr Blanche's documents setting out a potential civil claim (Annex 11).*

Beth Cara misled the court 3 times in her ELC 01, stating the pre action protocol did not exist. Swansea did not respond to the pre action protocol for 7 months, failing to comply with practice direction Pre action protocol 6(b)

(A15) On 20th October 2022 I had made Adrian Novis aware that during the appeal by Gemma Wilkins, rule 13 was relevant to the appeal.

Rule 13 had not been followed (I also included this email in the pre action protocol on November 12<sup>th</sup>, 2022 (exhibit 16) (exhibit 19 page 5, point f)). Adrian Novis went on to claim the rules would be followed in a final review, but this was a lie (exhibit 19, page 9-point K). This rule would also need to be followed in a final review, and again, this time, Jane Lewis Normand and Natalie Wathan did not follow this rule. (Beth Cara was aware of this and included the email in her witness statement to court 13<sup>th</sup> February 2024), again Beth Cara knew her client was lying in (DD 30.10, (SoC page 4) Judge James also knew of this which is disturbing. Jenneifer Thelen and Deborah Howell on behalf of the defendants, in their defense document (30.10) made up a lie to try and fool the court saying this rule did not need to be followed. They did this by quoting half the rule (see statement of case page 4 point 9).

Attached to the N244 application for a summary judgement dated 14/02/2024 from the defense, is their ECL 02. This document on page 17 and 18 portrays emails regarding the rule 13. In this conversation it is demonstrated Adrian Novis is made aware of this rule to be applied in the Final review conducted by Natalie Wathan; not in a fictitious complaint procedure Deborah Howell and Jennifer Thelen conjure up is going to take place under their instruction; this is a lie and more deceit to mislead Judge James and the court. I named Adrian Novis on page 12 of statement of case, Adrian Novis and the defense party are fully aware they abandoned their rules to protect the examination board during the two appeals. In the defense document, Jennifer Thelen re-writes rule 13 as explained in statement of case. The defense party lie to the court and their only defense is deceit. If Judge James did not realise this when he made his order on

September 17<sup>th</sup>, I make you fully aware of this now, their tactics is to deceive JUDGE JAMES and the court.

After the final review outcome, I had to pursue the corporation in a further procedure, I GAVE THEM EVERY CHANCE. In the complaint investigation, Billy Seagrim failed to analyse the set of rules which governed the two-appeal processes, these rules are Annex 5 of SoC, (ALSO ex13). In these rules it states:

#### 4. Confirmation of Procedural Regularity

4.1 Prior to the consideration of any appeal, the Director of Academic Services' nominee (thereafter referred to as the nominee) shall establish that the Examination Board was both properly constituted and that its business was conducted in the proper manner (i.e. in accordance with the Academic Regulations). Where meetings have not been properly conducted, the nominee shall make arrangements for the reconsideration of all decisions which may have been affected.

Gemma Wilkins and Natalie Wathan, the Academic Director's nominees ignore their rules and perpetuated the fraud under the instruction of a directing mind and will of the corporation, to cover-up the crimes carried out by the examination board and PGR office WHILST CLAIMING "ACADEMIC JUDGEMENT". This is a deliberate act and an attempt by the defense party and defendant to cover up these actions by misleading the court in their submissions.

If the person signing the statement of truth at the end of a statement of case does not have first-hand knowledge of all facts and matters set out in it, they will need to carry out sufficient investigations to satisfy themselves of the truth of all those matters. A person can be liable for contempt of court, even if they have asked someone else to sign the statement of truth on their behalf.

(A16) Beth Cara tells us in her ELC 01 she is aware there were internal procedures, and a completion of their internal procedures

Beth Cara identifies in her point 32:

*"The procedural outcomes of each process are very different too: the complaints procedure is not a process which allows for 'damages' to be paid to a complainant whilst a Civil claim allows for damages as well as other remedies."*

- 1 This tells me and confirms, Beth Cara had read the documents and was aware of the different procedures that had been completed.
- 2 The procedural outcomes are different for each internal process, but this statement is false by Beth Cara.
- 3 a complaint process does allow for a pathway to damages but not to overturn the examination board whereas an appeal process does (EX13, rule 4.1).
- 4 The reason I lodged two appeals is because I knew they had abandoned their rules and would have expected the appeals team to overturn the examination board as the rules for appeal are a back stop to misfeasance, why else have an appeal procedure? They abandoned their rules at appeal.
- 5 I was after a MSc by research not a fight with a political corporation. But as I found out, the corporation will protect itself as there is a directing mind and will (DMW) controlling outcomes.

6 this DMW being a gang who are members of the Learned Society of Wales,  
and a poignant fact is, the disgraced BBC news presenter Huw Edwards is also  
in this club  
7 these people think they are above the law.  
8 Beth Cara acknowledges Barrister Billy Seagrim's complaint investigation.  
9 Beth Cara knows her clients' procedures and then lies on Swansea's behalf;  
she states Swansea were not aware of a possible civil case.  
10 The corporation could have settled this case at any time but chose not to. Billy  
Seagrim stated in Annex B point 41.

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

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

Billy Seagrim continuously lied in his fake investigation. In points:

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

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

Beth Cara is lying to protect them, as did Billy Seagrim.

(A17) Beth Cara's ELC 01 point 33, (DD 26)- A PRE ACTION-PROTOCOL WAS GIVEN TO  
THE DEFENDANTS ON 18TH November 2022.

1 After I gave them the pre action protocol, I allowed them two further internal  
procedures to put right the crime committed by the PGR office, they decided to  
abandon their rules and commit more fraud.

2 I had no choice but to file the particulars of claim.

3 The corporation were given every opportunity in three internal procedures to  
correct their wrongdoing, instead they doubled down with more dishonesty,  
abandoning their rules to commit a crime against me by fraud, falsification of  
documents, withholding documents, they discriminated against my research  
(poc's 17,18,19) and used defamation to make false science claims.

4 The defendants, including Paul Boyle, Perumal Niathiarasu, Adrian Novis, and  
Huw Summers, and many of the named offenders in this witness statement  
were all served a pre action protocol in November 2022.

5 Swansea knew a pre action protocol had been served, I sent this pre action  
protocol to 12 members of staff and Billy Seagrim wrote about it.

6 Beth Cara misleads the court. There was a bundle of documents from the last  
complaint process, Beth Cara refers to this internal process as: *"On a very  
basic level"* which is not true.

7 Beth Cara refers to a volume of documents. The Billy Seagrim investigation  
takes one hour to read, Beth Cara instead of obeying her solemn oath in a  
statement of truth; shrugs her duty to the court. Beth Cara did not have firsthand  
knowledge of the case, it is her responsibility whilst signing statements of truth  
to: read the documents that the statement of truth depends upon; understand  
the documents; change anything that does not say what she believes to be true  
(she did this in her ELC 02 as she knows her client lies, tampering with their

statement of truth, Beth Cara is dishonest), she should have reference to documentary evidence to support her statements of truth; It is her responsibility to not mislead the court. Beth Cara would know this process and intended to mislead the court on her client's behalf, they knew from the outset they have no case. To admit wrongdoing is the end for these professors.



Geoff Blanche

From: geoffblanche@yahoo.com  
To: Student Cases



Sat, 12 Nov 2022 at 10:53

Hi Kim,


Please find attached documents for your immediate attention.

Regards


Geoff Blanche

> [Show original message](#)

[Download all attachments as a zip file](#)



final review ... .pdf  
887.9kB



N1 apply to ... .pdf  
102.5kB

final review civil court claim.pdf



Geoff Blanche

From: geoffblanche@yahoo.com  
To: Dhammika.Widanalage@warwick.ac.uk, pgr-scienceengineering@swansea.ac.uk, p.nithiarasu@swansea.ac.uk, z.perry@swansea.ac.uk, l.li@swansea.ac.uk, augustine.egwebe@swansea.ac.uk, p.rees@swansea.ac.uk, h.d.summers@swansea.ac.uk, z.zhou@swansea.ac.uk, k.kalna@swansea.ac.uk Hide



Sun, 20 Nov 2022 at 10:32

Hi,

You are being held accountable for your part in fraud against Geoffrey Blanche. Your name is listed, or you might be one of the postgraduate research committee/team.


You are currently being represented by Mr Boyle and student cases, find attached documents with the claim against you and what happens next.

Regards

Geoff Blanche

> [Show original message](#)

[Download all attachments as a zip file](#)



final review ... .pdf  
887.9kB



N1 apply to ... .pdf  
102.5kB

final review civil court claim.pdf

(A19) Beth Cara lies, it was a barrister who dealt with the third internal procedure. “On a very basic level, the complaint was dealt with internally by Swansea by its Education Services Department”.

This is a lie, and not an accidental omission of the truth. Beth Cara was trying to stall a default judgement for her client with lies and this is an abuse of process and contempt of court. The information of the internal procedures was available to Beth Cara from the outset. Beth Cara states they had completed their internal investigations and failed to verify the facts whilst referring to a bundle of documents from the internal procedures by Billy Seagrim, Gemma Wilkins, Natalie Wathan and me. Beth Cara failed to inform the court of this in a proper manner in her statement of truth and then signed a statement of lies. The final complaint process outcome on June 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2023, was dealt with internally *for* Swansea by the barrister Billy Seagrim and was not “*On a very basic level*” as Beth Cara states and misleads the court. Mr Seagrim’s complaint outcome is 22 pages and takes 1 hour to read, has 16 annexes which Beth Cara was aware of, and contains an interview with Huw Summers and other professors. Due diligence requires examining the bundle if you do not have firsthand knowledge of the case.

**Billy Seagrim says in his complaint outcome:** *For a full appreciation of Mr Blanche’s complaint, the reader should read the ERR itself. (annex 5)*

(A20) Billy Seagrim ignored the facts; Huw Summers admitted he should be independent during the exam; I had given (BS) the evidence. This evidence was all available to Beth Cara immediately.

During Billy Seagrim’s complaint investigation he interviews Huw Summers the chairperson of the viva. In this interview, Huw Summers admits to abandoning the university rules but refers to his version of the rules as “a due process” but not “THE DUE PROCESS” according to the rules (EX 2, rules 1.2, 9,10,18,19). Previously (EX 11), Huw Summers demonstrated he knew the rules to exam; I emailed this interview to Billy Seagrim for the benefit of his investigation (Ex19, page 34, 2S). Huw Summers admits to writing the reports but gives a false narrative, intentionally misleading the investigation; the evidence from my 15-month investigation demonstrates exactly what the examination board did, and how they were dishonest to cause me a loss whilst abandoning their rules. This is not a “*he said*” “*she said*” argument. All the evidence of what they did to censor the thesis and fail but “*not fail*” is in the documents. This evidence was ignored by Billy Seagrim, but my investigation was thorough, just how a scientist would make an investigation. The external examiner confirms the chairperson had written the reports in (SoC, emails 9 and 11). Huw Summers and Paul Boyle withheld a document from my investigation during FOI requests (document preceding EX33), and I included this in the statement of case, pages 6 to 31, which it appears Judge James initially failed to acknowledge. Billy Seagrim went on to agree with everything Huw Summers told him in his interview. He went along with what Huw Summers said as if it was written within the rules; he ignored “the due process” and dismissed all allegations, he was dishonest, it was a cover up. (see reply to defence Blanche 4 and 5)

## (A21) Academic fraud not Academic Judgement

> 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  
>




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

- a) On 31/03/2021, the supervisors replied to my email dated 18/01/2021, they responded with malice and threats, but they argue it was advice.
- b) They failed to address the concerns I had with their comments in (EX 18). The 2<sup>nd</sup> supervisory team withdrew to a position of “no comment” when I pursued their position

regarding the Newman machine (See EX 5, emails 18, 18A, 19, 20,21, 22). This was after (ZZ) resigned.

- c) The supervisors did not supply any documents in an appeal as they threatened, this was malice, they had already made their decision to commit fraud if I included Newman's machine in my thesis. The National Bureau of Standards changed the design of Newman's machine whilst testing and recording the experimental data. There was no other evidence given by the supervisors, i.e.: "*Joseph Westley Newman, whose work has been universally rejected by all credible scientific examiners*". This is a false claim, all other scientists as-well as the theoretical laws of science support the Newman machine. i.e. Maxwell's equations, the very foundation of electromagnetism.
- d) Paul Rees and Augustine Egwebe tell us in interview with Billy Seagrim, they arranged the examining board, the examiners would be experts in my specialist subject (EX5 email 49) (EX2 rule 1.3.2) and the exam would be "*fair and transparent manner*". They never kept any minutes, later they would lie about the report production, and they abandoned their rules (AR). The decision whether my work constitutes false claims should be made by an academic with knowledge of the subject in question and with the ability to apply that knowledge to the work, the examiners were not experts in my specialist subject and allowed the chairperson to write their reports whilst ignoring their rules (WS 2,3,4). In this case, the supervisors acted with malice to protect a falsehood. Newman exposed the fraud by NBS at the time (EX7 Pages 23 to 30). The university's view is that the determination always needs to be made by a person with appropriate academic experience and represents an exercise of academic judgment. In this case they ignored the evidence to support a political view, this was not an academic judgement, they simply did not want me researching the observation I had made. When questioned in email, they failed to respond to the allegations they had made (See EX 5, emails 18, 18A, 19, 20,21, 22).
- e) My complaint is about the conduct of the supervisors and of their political views, how the university abandoned the rules at every procedure. Rather than the supervisors applying electromagnetism science to the research, they pretended I was studying batteries, they applied a scam and did not follow the science I was demonstrating from the research which I made. My objective was quite clear from the start (EX36), this is not a complaint which related to a matter of academic judgement. It was one which related to the conduct of the supervisors and other staff, which is a different question. The fact that they were dishonest and abandoned their rules and then claim there was only "*administrative issues and minor delays*" is false. Huw Summers and the supervisors at the PGR office wrote most of the reports (Blanche 4, pages 5 to 34) to "fail but not fail" the thesis to support the political views of the corporation; to bury Newman's machine and the yellow card data.
- f) The claim is related to the conduct of the academics and academic services staff, which is a different question to academic judgement. The case is justifiable, as the root of the corporation's actions are breaches of contract (AR), decisions based on a fraud to science, with criminal wrongs.
- g) Academic services abandoned their rules to cause me a loss, this is misfeasance; and then claimed academic judgement was being questioned. Assessment regulations were not correctly followed and there is evidence of material irregularity. (WS 2,3,4) The appeal and final review (EX 8 and 9) based their decisions on,

*"The following shall not be considered grounds for appeal:*

- Questioning the academic or professional judgement of the examiners
  - A candidate's disappointment with a result where marks have been accurately recorded, assessment regulations correctly followed and where no evidence of material irregularity exists;"
- h) In my view it was open to the defense party who signed the statements of truth, to look critically at the assertion that the decision was immune from review on the grounds of academic judgement. It was open to them to consider the decision was not made on purely academic grounds but rather, a political view leading to abandoning their rules. In doing so, they should have considered such failure by the University to take relevant matters into account as I found by investigation, had occurred. This would involve scrutiny of the fairness of the process, why would the university abandon their rules? Academic judgement was not the reasoning which underlay the decision of the University, although they claim it is. The defense party failed to read all the documents their statements of truth relied upon, although some were withheld from me and probably from them. The defense then went and made false claims to the court, due to their professional failure and lack of thoroughness during their review.
- i) Billy Seagrim would not discuss if the claim of academic judgement was correct or based on a false premise. Billy Seagrim then ignored all the evidence of the fraud; falsification of documents; (AR); discrimination; he then added to the defamation (EX47 point 47). The university's investigator was dishonest.
- j) The internal procedures ignored the fact that the rules had been abandoned by the examination board; they abandoned their own set of rules to inflict a loss, a big loss on me. The DMW of the corporation was in control of the staff.

**(A23) Directing Mind and Will (DMW). The Postgraduate committee and Professors**  
*EX2, Rule 1.2 states: 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.*

- a) The responsible person for the chairperson is Perumal Niathiarasu. Perumal Nithiarasu (PN) is Professor and Associate Dean of Research, Innovation and Impact (exhibit 54) (exhibit 66, page 6) within the Faculty of Science and Engineering, Swansea University. Previously, PN served as Dean, Academic Leadership (2015-2021), Deputy Head of Engineering (2018-2021).
- b) I had unexpected contact with PN through email. (exhibit 5, emails 12, 13). After this exchange I emailed PN a few more times and wanted an interview with him during my investigation, all interviews were declined by Natalie Wathan (exhibit 19, page 38, 2Z). PN never replied to my requests and ignored my emails.
- c) PN is a leader of the IMPACT. IMPACT was officially launched by Mark Drakeford AM, First Minister of Wales, at a special ceremony on Thursday 6th February 2020; PN, Huw Summers and Welsh government actors are directly linked to the development of covid 19 micro needles.
- d) The corporation believe, claiming Academic judgement is "a get out of jail free" card, yet this fraud has nothing to do with (AJ). it is academic, corporate, government fraud with falsification of documents, withholding documents, discrimination and defamation to cause a loss. The professors were protecting their covid 19 vaccination involvement;

these experimental jabs have killed thousands of people around the planet, and they know it. These poisonous jabs are still being rolled out today, regardless of the growing victims and opposition by thousands of doctors, politicians and public.

Interests by Academics Outside of Swansea University

Fellows - The Learned Society of Wales

- I. I found out, the DMW personally know each other and have out of work affiliations and are all members of The Learned Society of Wales. There are ideological agendas through experimental mRNA vaccinations being played out by corporation stakeholders through university staff members. This can cause a conflict of interests when it comes to science research and the truth, which it did in this case.
- II. Mr Paul Boyle – vice chancellor, is the directing mind and will of the Corporation at the freedom of information (FOI), Complaints and appeal office.
- III. Perumal Nithiarasu (PN)- directing mind and will of PGR. **Perumal Nithiarasu** is Professor and Director of Research in the Department of Engineering, Swansea University, and currently holds a position of Dean Academic Leadership (Research Impact).
- IV. Huw Summers - the chair of the examination board is a 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.
- V. 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.
- VI. Huw Summers and Paul Rees are both members of the Awen Institute.
- VII. All are biomedicine/medical engineers except Mr Boyle:

**Professor Perumal Nithiarasu**

DSC CENG FIMA FMECHE FIPEM FLSW



ELECTED: 2018

AREA(S): SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY, ENGINEERING, MEDICINE & MATHEMATICS

SPECIALIST SUBJECT(S): BIOMEDICAL ENGINEERING, ENGINEERING

Associate Dean – Research, Innovation and Impact (RII), Faculty of Science and Engineering & Professor at Zienkiewicz Centre for Computational Engineering, Swansea University; Adjunct Professor, IIT Madras, India



**Professor Huw Summers**

FLSW



ELECTED: 2021

AREA(S): SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY, ENGINEERING, MEDICINE & MATHEMATICS

SPECIALIST SUBJECT(S): BIOMEDICINE, BIOTECHNOLOGY, NANOTECHNOLOGY

Professor of Nanotechnology for Health, Swansea University



## Professor Paul Boyle

CBE FBA FRSE FRSGS FLSW



ELECTED: 2022

AREA(S): INDUSTRY, COMMERCE, THE ARTS & PROFESSIONS

SPECIALIST SUBJECT(S): HIGHER EDUCATION LEADERSHIP & MANAGEMENT

Vice-Chancellor, Swansea University

## Professor Paul Rees

FLSW



ELECTED: 2023

AREA(S): SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY, ENGINEERING, MEDICINE & MATHEMATICS

SPECIALIST SUBJECT(S): BIOMEDICAL ENGINEERING

Professor of Biomedical Engineering, Swansea University.

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.

### (A24) The Supervisors and Examiners did not have expertise in Electromagnetism

- 1 Paul Rees and Agustine Egwebe are the 2<sup>nd</sup> supervisory team. They stated in (email 49) I would face two expert examiners in my oral exam; this was not the case.
- 2 Paul Rees admits in (annex 15 of Billy Seagrim investigation) to arranging the viva and the examining board.
- 3 The external examiner, Dhammika Widanalage and the Internal examiner Lijie Li both failed to meet GCSE standards in chemistry and Physics in the oral exam (EX5 chapter 6) (EX55 Pages 49 to 90). They put up false scientific arguments and misrepresented the truth. They were coerced.
- 4 In defense document point 3, they claim I was questioning academic judgement. It was not academic judgement I questioned; they had none, they were there to cheat, and they were dishonest (AR).
- 5 The supervisors' claims were false, they wanted to portray my research as a study of batteries, this is a lie. They had no expertise in electromagnetism (EX 55 pages 18 to 27) and the same applied for the examiners.
- 6 The examiners used many false arguments, they did not know what a physical reaction or a chemical reaction was. The external examiner said Gibbs free energy theorem applied to my work which was false. All that I claim is easily provable to the non-experts (see Blanche 5, page 63,65-70) (EX55 PAGES 49 to 90) (ERR exhibit 5 chapter 6) (Witness statement 3, page 11, 1.9, WS 4).

### (A25) The Corporation wanted to cover-up deaths by Experimental Covid 19 vaccines

Due to the impact of Covid on my research, I decided to write a prologue on covid from the research I conducted into the matter. My research told me a very different story to the corporations covid narrative. I included the yellow card scheme data which 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. This data is the responsibility of the Medicine Health

Regulatory Agency who we find out through Andrew Bridgen ex-MP is 86% funded by the pharmaceutical companies they must regulate. How open to corruption is that?



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

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
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>1178069</b>	<b>1612</b>

23:15 · 05 Sep 21 ·



Yellow card data From Prologue (Exhibit 7)

(A26) My Conclusions

- a) I found out Paul Boyle the vice chancellor of Swansea University Corporation, is a Board Member of Universities UK (Blanche 5 page 56), who provide leadership and support to executive heads of 133 UK University institutions, as well as Chair of their Research Policy Network; **The corporation group Universities UK, are highly involved in pushing these experimental jabs as 'safe and effective'**. They build and strengthen links with experts, government agencies, professional bodies, industry and commerce, other education sectors and international audiences. **Their Work in parliament is to lobby the UK government. Universities UK maintain close relationships with policy makers in Westminster to make sure their members'**

# Why Ireland Requires a Full Public Investigation into COVID and Not a Simple Inquiry

*Once You Know the Truth, There Is No Going Back!* 30 October 2024

Misinformation – Disinformation – Misleading Information – Half Truths – Conspiracy

*Micheál Martin is quoted saying, 'We need to learn lessons as we didn't get everything right': Micheál Martin on imminent COVID inquiry, Irish Independent Fri 19 Jul 2024.*

Michael Martin    Leo Varadkar    Stephen Donnelly    Dr Billy Ralph    Dr Pat Morrissey



*What Micheál Martin refrains from telling the public is the full facts that the experimental COVID vaccines are not traditional vaccines and have caused much harm to Irish citizens. That they were coerced, which is medically unethical. The HSE website still says vaccines are safe and effective. This is misinformation and misleading. Research and doctor's reports show they are not safe and effective. Evidence provided.*

*Also, COVID treatments have existed since 2020. A few Irish doctors were following the research, and using like Dr Pat Morrissey, and Dr Billy Ralph who told Minister Stephen Donnelly in July 2021 about the evidence but was basically ignored. Why? Dr Morrissey and Dr Ralph used hydroxychloroquine and ivermectin during COVID and found it quite successful in helping to treat and save Irish lives. These doctors are under investigation for doing what was right and voicing their concerns over the vaccines, and attempts have been made to silence them for doing what was right.*

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.

- c) Andrew Bridgen ex-MP (EX67) (EX61) called for a motion in Parliament for the Hallett Covid inquiry in the UK to immediately open module 4 on the safety and efficacy of the covid 19 vaccines. They refused. A lobby of Doctors from the UK have now evidenced their evidence to the Irish people's inquiry. In Ireland, excess deaths were running at 1% between 2015-2020. Between 2021 and now they have risen to 27%. Ireland is even more vaccinated than the UK.

D) Barrister [Una McGurk](#) tells the [#PeoplesVaccineInquiry](#) in Dublin, October 15, 2024, that there were 400 reports of intracerebral haemorrhages following the [#Janssenvaccine](#) and at least 59 people died in similar circumstances.

e) I provide further evidence with these electronic links that must be viewed by the court.

needs are supported by their policies. Their policy work is co-developed with members and wider stakeholders. Due to the funding landscape from their stakeholders, the corporation has a vested interest in pushing the jabs. The chairperson comments on covid vaccines in section 1.3 of the R and R Form. This is the section where Huw Summers put the wrong date on the form. b) In December 2023, Government employee Barry Young 56; a statistician at the top of his profession, was 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. I included this devastating Vaccine data exposed by Barry Young, in the reply to the defense, page 55. The data evidence tells us

PEOPLE'S VACCINE INQUIRY DUBLIN - Press Conference Video

Peoples Vaccine Inquiry – Unveiling the Truth: Immediate Access to Expert Testimony on COVID-19 Vaccines

f) As we can see, the entire system has been corrupted by the corporation.

g) It is clear to me the defendants will never admit their misconduct and they will have to be ruled against by the judiciary to uphold the rule of law; if the judiciary fails to do this- we have no rule of law in our society. The staff of Swansea have clear rules to follow which are unambiguous, they have a duty of care when acting as public servants. Academic services' rules of appeal are there to prevent misfeasance, but these rules were abandoned. They lied, gaslighted to deceive and had a DMW throughout the internal procedures. The defendants lied in emails in June 2022, a week after the viva; abandoned their rules at examination, appeal and final review. Barrister Billy Seagrim's investigation was just a gaslighting cover up attempt as demonstrated in this witness statement. It is clear to me they will continue to lie than admit the truth to what they did as the consequences of being found out are severe. As Barrister Billy Seagrim said *"why would these individuals all lie? It should be remembered that if these people were found out, they would each likely lose their jobs and reputations"*. They have been found out; they did lie. It is clear to me the acts by the named staff in the processes I have endured over 62 months and counting are deliberate, the evidence speaks for itself. The defense party are hired hands, another protection racket, to commit more fraud, and they have been found out. The power structure emanates from the stakeholders, Bill Gates and Hillary Clinton feature at Swansea university Corporation, and in the wider picture, there are more actors. It is yet to be determined whether the UK Judiciary are still independent or are captured by these elite agendas. If the judiciary has joined forces with the defendants as government and industry have, they will also be found out. The public deserve better, and punishment must be the order given. Punitive damages are the only option; to keep a rule of law against these powerful corporations destroying research and truth that does not fit their "profit agenda". People must come first; the truth must come first; justice must prevail.

The full list of the actors who I believe caused the making of these false statements of truth are:

1	Paul Boyle	2	Huw Summers	3	Perumal Niathiarasu
4	Augustine Egwebe	5	Paul Rees	6	Zoe Perry
7	Adrian Novis	8	Gemma Wilkins	9	Natalie Wathan
10	Billy Seagrim	11	Deborah Howell	12	Jennifer Thelen
13	Elizabeth Cara	14	Jane Lewis Normand	15	Zhongfu Zhou
16	Karol Kalna	17	Lijie Li	18	Dharmika Widanalage

I believe the evidence I have given to Judge James and the court is sometimes complex, but it is obvious. It is beyond reasonable doubt and irrefutable. I believe it will be impossible for Judge James to come to wrong conclusions. No judge wants to have his decisions overturned by another Judge in a higher court of appeal. This is a desperate attempt by the defendants and defense party to:


- 1 stop the public from finding out how they censor research students who make discoveries that are beneficial for mankind but not necessarily beneficial to their corporate profits; to keep a control over renewable energy production methods, to increase their investment and profits for their stakeholders.
- 2 to hide past fraud by USA government departments to forward a false narrative and history.
- 3 conceal how they played a big part in trying to fool the public that the experimental mRNA covid 19 vaccines are 'safe and effective'.
- 4 how they used fear, lockdowns and covid passports with their government colleagues to coerce the public into taking their 'for profit' experimental covid 19 vaccine products, despite the risk of death and serious adverse reactions to this experimental gene therapy.

### **Statement of Truth**

I believe that the facts stated in this witness statement are true. I understand that proceedings for contempt of court may be brought against anyone who makes, or causes to be made, a false statement in a document verified by a statement of truth without an honest belief in its truth.

Date: 14<sup>th</sup> November 2024

Regards

A rectangular area containing a handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "G. Blanche". The signature is written in dark ink on a light-colored background.

Geoff Blanche

07429 925970