

## My Perspective

I want to take a moment to offer something I have yet to reveal: my perspective. I have documented, reported, disclosed, and articulated... now let me speak for a moment. The NIH appears to have sided with me—not Johns Hopkins University. I mean... it makes sense that the NIH did not side with Johns Hopkins. In fact, it has restored my belief that the federal oversight structures we have implemented are working exactly as they should.

My case is so extreme because that this whole year-long, coordinated, misconduct campaign was totally one-sided. I would have lost faith in the federal oversight structures had the NIH endorsed Johns Hopkins behavior. I think the NIH saw that I was just trying to complete my F32 award and maybe write a few books and papers on the side, but apparently that was not acceptable to Johns Hopkins University. As absurd as it sounds, this description is exactly what happened. Yup, that's why there is no documentation of misconduct or retaliation from me part. I gave them chance after chance, and they chose this fate every time... what a pity.

Even more striking was their total incapacity and unwillingness to self-correct at any moment in the last year. Instead of self-correcting, they became increasingly aggressive and belligerent. Even to my surprise, even knowing that the NIH and OIG watching had no effect on their conduct at all. In fact, Johns Hopkins became more aggressive when the NIH entered the scene with the forged leave of absence. Dear reader, the audacity and arrogance it takes to defraud OSF by defaming me just to suppress my completed, compliant, federally funded deliverable WHILE knowing the NIH was in the middle of their investigation and the OIG was notified too? I truly cannot think of anything more disrespectful to the federal government and oversight. Can you?

In my opinion, it is exactly this type of behavior and situation that warrants several federal oversight actions, including a comprehensive Corporate Integrity Agreement. Given the scope, publicity, and implications of this case it seems like it is only a matter of time before my documentation and story enter global discourse. As of right now, this case does not have much mainstream attention because... I am not currently pushing for it. However, *The Case File* and *The Takedown* are all over the world and being discussed in dozens of countries, according to Google Trends. I have no plans to publicize this case at the moment—I would not want to risk the integrity of the federal oversight investigations after all. However, the risk that someone else, someone more outraged than me, someone outside the system, someone with no connections to the United States, could launch this case into global discourse grows each and every day. I would hate for everyone to be totally unprepared for when it happens. It seems like it could just be a matter of time, and if it does, people will want to see justice and corrective actions.

I think another appropriate action would be an immediate suspension of specific federal funding related to fellowship awards (Fs, Rs, and Ks) and, at a minimum, at the Bloomberg School of Public Health specifically. My case is the exact type of institutional behavior and situation that warrants a mandatory appointment of an independent monitor with full access to all university operations because I am very confident that, based on the ease, delight, and intoxication off institutional-immunity I witnessed in the

staff, faculty, and leadership at Johns Hopkins University that I am just a single case in a decades-long, unbroken chain of coordinated misconduct.

We must remember how individuals at all levels-Deans, faculty, staff, IT, legal, HR, and leadership-were able to so easily coordinate unethical acts, policy fabrications/violations, felony-level misconduct, cover-ups, obstruction of justice, and then spit in the face of the federal government while they were watching. It was as if they said to the federal government, "we know you won't actually do anything about it," and I hope they are wrong.

I wish you could have seen their faces when they participated in this misconduct. You can hide the experience of retaliation and misconduct in emails and texts, but to see it unfold in person is a very different experience. This misconduct was not a "maybe" or an "oopsies." No, it was a "we do this all the time, get away with it all the time, and it works every time" smugness that can only come from an institution and people that believe they are immune to and above being held accountable. It is unmistakable.

As such, I believe that a comprehensive forensic audit spanning financial records, research protocols, and administrative practices going back decades would reveal this long-standing pattern. If you just look at all the leave of absences, the RPPRs, the Fitness-for-Duty exams (especially this one), the "terminations," the "paid administrative leaves," the cease-and-desist-looking emails, the Behavioral Health "Crisis Support" Team call logs and clinical documentation, the protected disclosures that should have gone to Human Resources but ended up at the Office of Institutional Equity, the IT support monitoring and account lockout history, etc. I am confident that you will find exactly what you suspect you'll find, and it won't be subtle.

Further, there are almost certainly potential criminal referrals for a range of the misconduct. There are clear felony-level crimes here, such as repeatedly submitting a leave of absence without my knowledge or consent, suppressing a completed, compliant, federally-funded manuscript, weaponizing false mental health narratives and repeatedly breaking HIPAA to do so, coordinated retaliation after federal protected disclosures, and perhaps most striking, a clear cover-up of misconduct and obstruction of justice from grant-level staff, through their General Counsel, and all the way to the tippy-top with their President's Office... this was no misunderstanding.

I also think that a mandatory repayment of all the misused funds with substantial punitive damages would be warranted; otherwise, I am not sure they will ever be motivated to change or stop this coordinated misconduct. Again, they are so used to institutional-immunity that they always behaved as if they would never be caught, and certainly never be held accountable. They were so confident that the NIH would do nothing that they repeatedly submitted a forged leave of absence *after* I told them TWICE that I made a protected disclosure to the NIH and I was waiting for their leadership.

They even acted as if the OIG would never do anything to hold them accountable to my utter bewilderment. Even after I told them I submitted two OIG complaints, they continued their egregious behavior including false mental health narratives, family harassment, and suppressing a completed, compliant, federally-funded manuscript... almost as if to say, "go ahead, the OIG won't do shit about it either." Of course, they did not say that, but it

is clear to me that their behaviors indicated such attitudes, whether they spoke such statements aloud or even with words is irrelevant to their conduct. Just look at their actions after any of my protected disclosures.

I am confident that, at a minimum, a public disclosure of findings is warranted. I waved confidentiality on all my OIG complaints, so they have my full permission to release their findings; that is, if the OIG decides to open a formal investigation. I think at a minimum there should be potential debarment from future federally-funded fellowship contracts and awards. Although they claim to support budding talent and young professionals in their marketing and advertisements, their behavior clearly shows the opposite story... it shows that they will coordinate misconduct across departments to suppress any developing talent that they find threatening. They have clearly demonstrated their ease and willingness to sabotage young professionals.

I am confident that their whole infrastructure is compromised. Even the lead of their General Counsel and their President's Office could not defend or even comment on the actions of their faculty and staff. Thus, a mandatory restructuring of the governance systems would be appropriate, including requiring extensive compliance training and reporting requirements.

They clearly do not care about accurate reporting or grant compliance. You should go back to the RPPR they were preparing to submit for me before I intervened. It was a total fabrication of my actual progress, making it look like I had done nothing for my first year on the F32 award. This action makes it clear that they do not really care about the progress of the federally-funded fellows; rather, they care more about whichever narrative serves their need for control best, even when they are so bad at writing them. For them, it appears that grant compliance is, at worst, an annoyance, and, at best, another tool they weaponize at their disposal. They showed a total and absolute disregard for the accuracy of the RPPR and then tried to leverage it to sabotage my F32. How do you fix these attitudes and behaviors?

Depending on the findings of any investigations I think a potential, temporary loss of accreditation would be warranted until they show major compliance changes; otherwise, I genuinely worry about the integrity of federally-funded work at Johns Hopkins University in the future. They have made it clear time and time again that they cannot be trusted to do the right thing or act with any integrity. When they do decide to do the right thing, such as unilaterally relinquishing my F32, they do so only to avoid further accountability and liability, which is nothing more than self-preservation.

After two years at Johns Hopkins University, I have yet to find any genuine, good-faith actors in leadership positions. Even my F32 mentors, the Office of Institutional Equity, and Student Well-Being, the three people/departments you would think would be good-faith actors were, in fact, some of the most frequent and aggressive participants in the coordinated misconduct. There is no safe place on campus with good-faith actors. Now... that is not the same as me saying there are no good-faith actors on campus; there definitely are... it is simply a logical necessity that there are good-faith actors on campus. However, can you retain a good-faith status if you do nothing to prevent harm and just follow orders from the bad-faith actors?

See... the reason so many staff-level, good-faith people are implicated in this misconduct campaign is they certainly did not decide to participate in the misconduct. These people with good-faith dispositions turn in bad-faith actors out of fear of retaliation and being targeted next. I mean... just look at what happened to me? Who would willingly choose to become the next target by persisting with good-faith actions when it is much easier and safer to follow bad-faith actions. The solution is simple: in an institution with this design, one that has calcified after decades, the effective intervention comes from external accountability. They are incapable of self-correction.

I understand that these potential actions are severe and would have long-lasting implications for Johns Hopkins University but at the same time what alternative exists? If the federal government created these system-level correction mechanisms and does not use them in situations with this exact this type of behavior, documentation, and opportunity than why do we have them at all? Still, this spiel is just my opinion, not my job, but I appreciate you reading all the way to the end ☺ I trust that the NIH and OIG know what they are doing and will take the appropriate actions to ensure the safe and effective use of federal funding at Johns Hopkins University. Yet, no matter what happens, no matter what comes of this situation, or who gets blamed, at the end of the day... **it is an unfortunate outcome to see such a formerly-respected institution chose this route... isn't it?**