

IN THE GENERAL DIVISION OF THE HIGH COURT OF THE REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE

Case No.: HC/S 413/2021

Between
MOHAMED MUSTAFA MAHMOUD HELMY
(FIN No. G3363781R)
...Plaintiff
And
NANYANG TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY
(Singapore UEN No. 200604393R)
...Defendant

STATEMENT OF THE CLAIM

By Plaintiff

Mohamed Mustafa Mahmoud Helmy
(FIN No. G3363781R)
Self-employed researcher, MD, PhD
10 Jurong Lake Link, #15-39, Singapore 648131
Litigant-in-person

Defendant being

Nanyang Technological University
(Singapore UEN No. 200604393R)
Company Limited by Guarantee
50 Nanyang Avenue, Singapore 639798
Represented by Timothy Ang Wei Kiat and Zhu Ming-Ren Wilson
at Rajah & Tann Singapore LLP
9 Straits View #06-07 Marina One West Tower Singapore 018937

Hearing

Pre-Trial Conference, 1 July 2021, 9.00 AM

Tuesday 25 May 2021

1. The Plaintiff's employment was terminated by the Defendant after the Plaintiff refused to obey and engage in illegal work-related instructions and activity, and after the Plaintiff followed policy to report the same.
2. The Defendant threatened and harassed the Plaintiff, and made false statements, to silence him and stop him from meeting his legal obligations, and put in the Plaintiff fear of being in an illegal position.
3. As a Research Fellow employed by the Defendant (Nanyang Technological University, henceforth, 'NTU'), the Plaintiff (myself) was being threatened with termination and bullied to engage in illegal animal experiments and unethical research by his then-Reporting Officer, Assistant Professor Rupshi Mitra (henceforth 'RM').

4. I had no option but to lodge a report at NTU so as not to engage in illegal animal experiments and unethical research.
5. Procedures for investigation at NTU were not followed. My contract was terminated for no apparent reason or for a reason obfuscated by NTU.
6. I wrote a report analysing the work output of RM and that of her spouse, Associate Professor Ajai Vyas (henceforth, 'AV'), and which shows systemic and prolonged research and academic misconduct by RM and AV at NTU. Subsequently, I wrote a report collating evidence which suggests that RM and her spouse may be acting in the context of wider and systemic suspicious activity of a research consortium in Singapore.
7. At no point of time did NTU give the impression that the evidence I submitted in my elaborate reports was taken seriously and comprehensively. Indeed, NTU did not address any evidence whatsoever despite several obfuscated claims by NTU that an investigation or investigations was or were carried out. These investigations consisted of a dismissal in a few derogatory lines. The whole process was lacking transparency, there was no hearing, any arguments refuting my claims were not made available to me.
8. During my employment at NTU and after termination of my employment, NTU claimed investigations carried out were shared with me, which is false, and at the same time stated that NTU is not obliged to share such an investigation or investigations with me.
9. **Excellent performance on first work task despite interference by Reporting Officer:**
 - 9.1. On arrival in Singapore in March 2020, I spoke with my then-Reporting Officer, RM, and offered to work on a review and/or grant proposal during stay-home notice and circuit breaker. RM instructed me to write a review of her work, which I did. She then instructed me to write a summary of my review of her work, which I did. She then instructed me to write a proper review (not focused on her work only) for publication in a reputable scientific journal as I had initially offered, and which I did.
 - 9.2. I independently generated text and graphics for the review I was tasked to write, to be published in a reputable scientific journal, and despite extremely unscientific, obstructive, and occasionally nonsensical instructions and feedback from RM.
10. **Acknowledged expertise and task to build setups for animal experiments:**
 - 10.1. I was tasked to design, coordinate, and take responsibility for the procurement, construction, and implementation of novel setups for the purpose of animal surgery and live animal (*in vivo*) neuroscience animal experiments. These setups were to be used by both the RM and AV labs.
 - 10.2. In addition to my responsibility to build the setups, I was requested by AV to train his staff members on animal surgery. I happily agreed to do so and offered to set up up live animal experiments to be conducted in his lab and to train his staff members on the same. I indicated that my contribution to AV's staff training and lab work was to be conducted outside working hours, for no monetary reward, and I did not request to be acknowledged in work to be published by AV to which I had contributed my expertise.
11. **Turning point in employer-employee relationship:**
 - 11.1. Between August and September 2020, RM:
 - i. Kept on postponing or ignoring my repeated requests to meet for planning experimental work and my repeated offers to meet her at the time and place of her choosing. I pleaded to meet with her, including near her place of residence and during weekends or after working hours, since she is rarely at the lab or office due to allergy;
 - ii. Apparently cancelled the research project I was working under and assigned me to another project, and threatened to terminate my contract or placed it in a precarious position several times, and in several contexts including meetings and communications with others at NTU;
 - iii. Berated me for *carrying out her orders* to consult with a world-leading authority on an outdated method she insisted on using. She sent an unusually bizarre email containing nonsensical references, and to which I responded politely and professionally.

- 11.2. During a meeting with RM which she finally arranged, she told me that all of the following is "...none of your concern...", which fully contradicts my legal obligations, duties, and responsibilities as a worker in Singapore, a Research Fellow in biomedicine, and a member of the academic community:
- i. Research question, objective, plan, protocol, and expected outcome. Indeed, anything to do with the work would be 'none of my concern';
 - ii. I asked about my role in the research project I had apparently been reassigned to, namely work contribution, acknowledgement, grant and research allocation, and was told it is 'none of my concern';
 - iii. She took from me the review I had written for submission to a reputable scientific journal and told me she would submit it to the publisher online within a few hours. I did not receive notification from the publisher. She told me that henceforth the review I had written was to be 'none of my concern';
 - iv. I asked politely about an incorrect lab protocol to carry out an experiment. I was told it was 'none of my concern', I was to follow these unscientific instructions given to me by the Research Assistant, Ms. Shruti Suresh;
 - v. I asked politely for more specific instructions regarding a novel review I was to write in collaboration with others, since instructions I had received were so ambiguous so as to allow the review to be about any topic in a broad field. I asked if I may coordinate with the putative co-authors of the review, one of whom I had never met. RM expressly prohibited me from liaising with any person for any work. I was to follow instructions and everything else is 'none of my concern';
 - vi. I asked why I am not allowed to use computer software provided free of charge by NTU to analyse then-ongoing experiments. The software allows analysis of animal behavioural experiments at the site of experiment, is completed in a few moments, and accurately provides any number of experimental outcomes. I was told it is 'none of my concern'. I was to follow instructions and manually analyse behavioural videos of experiments using a stopwatch and paper-and-pencil, a procedure which is very outdated, inaccurate, laborious, requires weeks or months to complete analysis of a batch, and for only one experimental outcome at a time.

12. I do not engage in illegal animal experiments and research misconduct at the RM lab, NTU:

- 12.1. I am instructed to kill dozens of genetically modified animals, without anaesthesia, and for no apparent and scientific reason. These animals did not belong to RM, they belonged to another Principal Investigator at NTU.
- 12.2. I demand to see the Animal Use Protocol which I am working under, and in line with the Animals and Birds Act and NAACLAR Guidelines regulating animal research activity in Singapore.
- 12.3. On reading the relevant Animal Use Protocol I discover that false statements are made in the document, in several practical, ethical, scientific, training-related, factual, and financial regards.
- 12.4. Puzzled by instructions I received including illegal animal experiments and the falsified Animal Use Protocol, I review *relevant* past experimental records on the laboratory common folder.
- 12.5. I discover that past experimental work at the RM lab is inadequate and not in line with basic scientific standards.
- 12.6. Furthermore, methods not in line with policy were apparent in record data, including what appears to be a cross-over or multiple use of datasets in work by RM and AV.
- 12.7. I send an email to RM asking for clarification *on future experiments* so as not to violate the Animals and Birds Act and to engage in research activity ethically. I do not receive a reply.

13. Attempt to disengage from illegal and unethical research activity in a confidential and sensitive manner:

- 13.1. On 9 September 2020 I speak in person with my then-Human Resources Business Partner, Ms. Oh Seok Fen, and the Chair of the School of Biological Sciences at NTU, Professor Lars Nordenskiöld. I request:
- i. To be moved to another position within NTU where I am not ordered to engage in illegal activity;
 - ii. That research and academic activity by RM is looked into quietly and in the meantime the implication of further involvement of others is considered, notably bachelor degree students.
- 13.2. Professor Nordenskiöld's exact words were to me were: "If you do not report the misconduct, I will, and if I have a reason to terminate you, I will." In other words, I was forced to report the matter officially.
- 13.3. I casually meet AV immediately after my meeting with Professor Nordenskiöld, and ask about our plans to build setups for animal surgery and live animal experiments, as well as my role in training his staff. He indicates that these plans will no longer be pursued.

14. First submission to NTU Leadership and blocked IT access:

- 14.1. On 11 September 2020 I send a report to NTU Offices of Ethics and Compliance, Human Resources, and Legal and Secretarial (henceforth, 'NTU Leadership').
- 14.2. The report was submitted under the Animals and Birds Act, Guidelines on the Care and Use of Animals for Scientific Purposes (National Advisory Committee for Laboratory Animal Research, 2004), the Singapore Biosafety Guidelines for Research on Generically Modified Organisms (GMAC Singapore, 2020), as well as policies in place at NTU including Research Integrity Policy, Responding to Allegations of Research Misconduct Procedure, Anti-Harassment Policy, Anti-Harassment Procedure, Framework for Investigation and Disciplinary Proceedings, the University Code of Conduct, and other policies in place at NTU.
- 14.3. The report details evidence that I am bullied into research misconduct.
- 14.4. After my first submission, my account in NTU intranet was altered and my access to the laboratory common folder was blocked. Despite my follow-up with NTU IT Helpdesk, this issue was never rectified during my employment.

15. Meeting with NTU Research Integrity Officer:

- 15.1. On 15 September 2020 I meet online with Associate Professor Roderick Wayland Bates (henceforth, 'Bates'), the Research Integrity Officer at NTU.
- 15.2. Bates instructs me to present evidence of misconduct *in publications*. He explains that as far as he is concerned, if it is not published, it is not misconduct.
- 15.3. I ask if video evidence of research misconduct is admissible and Bates replies that it is his responsibility to investigate this.
- 15.4. I mention falsification of the relevant Animal Use Protocol and illegal experiments I had been ordered to engage in, and Bates instructs me to mention this in the report.

16. Second and third submissions to NTU Leadership:

- 16.1. On 21 and 25 September 2020 I send reports to NTU Leadership detailing:
- i. Fabrication, falsification, and misrepresentation in the research activity of RM in publications;
 - ii. RM's unscientific, obstructive, and unprofessional communication bullying me into illegal activity and research misconduct.

17. False and paradoxical statements by NTU Human Resources and Bates, threat of retaliation, and fourth submission to NTU Leadership:

- 17.1. On 6 October I meet at NTU with Human Resources staff Ms. Shin Kay Chong, Ms. Oh Seok Fen, and an intern whose name I could not spell.
- 17.2. In this meeting, Ms. Shin Kay Chong:

- i. Claimed that I had alleged harassment by RM against myself *and the research assistant*. This is false as evidenced in my first submission to NTU Leadership;
 - ii. Claimed that my allegations were being looked into “...holistically and seriously...” and at the same time that my claim that ‘*I was being bullied into research misconduct*’ was new information or a new allegation. This is false as evidenced in my first submission to NTU Leadership;
 - iii. Despite Ms. Chong’s claim that a ‘holistic and serious’ approach was taken, she asserted she had not read my previous submissions because they were difficult for her to read;
 - iv. Claimed that ‘harassment’ is the absence of vulgarity;
 - v. Threatened me with retaliation. She argued that since RM had not replied to my email to RM in which I requested information so I may meet my duties and responsibilities and in a legal manner, I therefore did not have ‘approval’ to continue with the work I was engaged in (writing the novel review) and therefore my contract should be terminated.
- 17.3.** On 9 October 2020, I sent my fourth submission to NTU Leadership in which I point out paradoxical and false statements made by Ms. Shin Kay Chong and explain how I am being bullied into illegal activity and research misconduct by RM. I believe my submissions to NTU, notably the first, can be understood fairly easily by anyone fluent in English and with a secondary school-level understanding of biology. Nevertheless, I complied with Ms. Shin Kay Chong’s request and my fourth submission was written without any scientific terminology.
- 17.4.** After I asked NTU Leadership why I am threatened with retaliation by Ms. Shin Kay Chong, I received communication from Bates in which he asked if RM is aware of my allegations. RM should have been informed of my allegation *already* on 11 September 2020 as the formal Respondent in the inquiry or investigation to be held, and had NTU Framework for Investigation and Disciplinary Proceedings been followed.
- 17.5.** I received an email from RM strangely with a Ms. Gwendolyn Chua Xin Ni cc-ed, a member of NTU Human Resources staff previously unknown to me. RM ignored my request for information so I may meet my duties and responsibilities without engaging in illegal activity and unethical research. I replied to Ms. Gwendolyn separately so as not to compromise an investigation by disclosing information to persons potentially not qualified to receive it. The reply I received from Gwendolyn was reassuring, in retrospect falsely.
- 17.6.** While Ms. Shin Kay Chong, and later her superior Mr. Kevin Goh, consistently and falsely claimed that the matter was addressed ‘holistically and seriously’, and required ‘coordination by several teams’, Bates consistently denied any involvement in any proceeding other than research misconduct, and consistently claimed other issues would be addressed ‘separately’ without this apparently having been the case.
- 18. Fifth submission to NTU Leadership and repeated request to not be bullied into illegal activity:**
- 18.1.** On 26 November 2020 I sent a synopsis of a report on systemic research and academic misconduct at NTU by RM and AV to Offices of Human Resources, Ethics and Compliance, Legal and Secretarial, as well as Offices of President, Provost, Dean, and others.
- 18.2.** On 1 December 2020 I sent a request to Chief Human Resource Officer and Deputy President and Provost reiterating my request to be reassigned or relocated at NTU so that I am not bullied into illegal activity and research misconduct.
- 19. Misconduct and bullying reports dismissed and termination of Employer-Employee relationship for obfuscated reason(s), November – December 2020:**
- 19.1.** I received communication from Ms. Chong in which she:
- i. Demanded several times I attend a meeting for unknown reasons;
 - ii. Refused to share findings of any investigation into my report detailing my being bullied into illegal activity and research misconduct;

- iii. Finally and summarily dismissed my report on bullying in a few derogatory lines;
- iv. Falsely claimed I had been absent from work, and therefore effectively demanded I engage in illegal activity and research misconduct under RM's supervision;
- v. Sent several paradoxically 'final' warnings effectively demanding I return to work, to engage in illegal activity and research misconduct under RM's supervision.

19.2. I received communication from Bates in which he:

- i. Falsely claimed that my report on research misconduct by RM regarded duplication;
- ii. Summarily and derogatorily dismissed all evidence in my reports without presenting any evidence whatsoever.

19.3. I received a letter by email and hard copy delivered to my place of residence which stated that my employment had been terminated according to Clause 5.1 of the Letter of Appointment which does not state a reason for termination. At the same time, I received an email from Ms. Oh Seok Fen stating that my employment had been terminated because I was absent from work.

20. Post-termination period:

- 20.1. NTU attempted to prohibit me from reporting illegal activity and misconduct at NTU to anyone, presumably including designated authorities, or else my salary would be withheld.
- 20.2. NTU threatened me in writing in severe language and under threat of prosecution should I speak with anyone at NTU about anything – I was prohibited from communicating with *anyone* at NTU (supposedly in a professional capacity), and I was prohibited from being found on any NTU campus. However, I was to speak with Ms. Oh Seok Fen immediately and arrange my departure.
- 20.3. NTU falsely and repeatedly claimed that my Short-Term Visit Pass is not issued by the Ministry of Manpower in *pdf* form.
- 20.4. NTU communicated my status as a legal resident in Singapore in the last minute, in a falsified form as mentioned above, and put in me the fear of being in an illegal position.
- 20.5. In telephone calls with an IRAS tax-clearance Officer, and confirmed by another IRAS Officer, I discover that false statements had been made by NTU to IRAS regarding my salary and tax-return.

21. Inconsistent and false statements made by NTU during the mediation process at Tripartite Alliance for Dispute Management (TADM), Ministry of Manpower:

- 21.1. Regarding a putative NTU inquiry and/or investigation into research misconduct by RM, referred to by NTU Human Resources staff and representing NTU Mr. Kevin Goh (henceforth, 'Goh') as "...NTU Investigation (Research)...":
 - i. That I received the investigation into misconduct from Bates. This is false, as mentioned above;
 - ii. That a putative investigation was somehow 'shared' with me. This is false, I was not included in any investigative proceeding at NTU other than that one online meeting with Bates in which I was instructed to present evidence of misconduct *in publications*, as well as a brief email query he had sent;
 - iii. That NTU is not obliged to share with me the outcome of NTU Investigation (Research).
- 21.2. Regarding a putative NTU inquiry and/or investigation into bullying by RM, not explicitly named by Goh and which may, by extrapolation, be assumed to be an 'NTU Investigation (Harassment)':
 - i. That the investigation was somehow 'shared' with me. This is false, I was never included in any investigative proceeding at NTU other than that one meeting with Ms. Shin Kay Chong (mentioned above);
 - ii. That Ms. Chong wished to inform me of the outcome of such an investigation. This is false.

- iii. That Ms. Chong informed me of the outcome of such an investigation. This is false, Ms. Chong merely dismissed my report on my being bullied into illegal activity and research misconduct while demanding that I re-engage in the same;
 - iv. That NTU is not obliged to share with me the outcome of NTU Investigation (Harassment).
- 21.3.** Regarding the reason or absence of a reason for termination of the Employer-Employee relationship, Goh claimed at various points of time during mediation and in correspondence:
- i. That my contract was terminated due to absence from work. This is false, I was never absent from work. In the mediation process, I was required to present evidence that I was *not* absent from work, which I did;
 - ii. That my contract was terminated due to Clause 5.1. or 5.1.2. of the Letter of Appointment;
 - iii. That my contract was terminated for no specific reason.
- 21.4.** Regarding my salary, Goh claimed that a tax-declaration with breakdown is provided by IRAS to the employee, but IRAS informed me the tax-declaration with breakdown is only provided to the employer and the employee can only be informed by phone.
- 21.5.** That a "...People Manager..." is responsible for duties assigned to the Reporting Officer. Goh claimed that the term 'People Manager' is well-defined in the NTU domain. I asked for the references and did not receive them.
- 21.6.** Goh requested TADM to 'urge' me to expedite the mediation process while *at the same time* requesting more time to respond to my prompt replies, and more time to 'prepare responses' which eventually proved to be simply dismissive. This includes dismissing my offer with a comprehensive research proposal to be reinstated in an open position at National Institute of Education, Nanyang Technological University. Mr. Christopher Lim's (mediator at TADM) urged Goh to arrange an interview for consideration of the same; apparently Goh ignored Mr. Lim's advice.
- 22. Termination of the mediation process at TADM and unsubstantiated threats of prosecution:**
- 22.1.** On 18 February 2021 (effectively coinciding with termination of mediation at TADM) I received an email from NTU Office of Ethics and Compliance, as well as a letter delivered to my place of residence. This letter claimed that my report on systemic misconduct by RM and AV at NTU had been investigated and no misconduct was found. This consisted of two derogatory lines. This was claimed without presenting any evidence whatsoever.
- 22.2.** On the same day, shortly after I received correspondence from the Office of Ethics and Compliance, I also received a 'cease and desist' email and letter from NTU Legal and Secretarial Office. Since I had been meeting my legal obligation to Singapore and my ethical obligation to the academic community by informing designated authorities and colleagues of illegal activity and misconduct at NTU, NTU was threatening to sue me.
- 22.3.** I continued to meet my legal obligation to Singapore and my ethical obligation to the academic community after I received these letters from NTU. Subsequently, I received two (2) Letters of Demand from NTU's lawyers in which I was threatened with prosecution within a period of time, and that I must retract all my allegations against NTU in the specified period. I do not retract my report on misconduct in Singapore institutes of research and higher education, including illegal activity at NTU. I was not sued, not after the 'cease and desist' letter from NTU, nor the first nor the second Letters of Demand from NTU's lawyers.
- 22.4.** I continue to meet my legal obligation to Singapore and my ethical obligation to the academic community by publishing online my reports on illegal activity and systemic misconduct at NTU, as well as misconduct elsewhere. Further investigations are on-going.
- 23. Inconsistent and false statements made by NTU at Employment Claims Tribunals, State Courts:**
- 23.1.** In the Pre-Trial Conference at the Employment Claims Tribunal, Goh repeated previous claims on sharing the NTU Investigation(s) with me, which is false.

- 23.2. In the Pre-Trial Conference when asked to elaborate on why I was told and it was argued at TADM that my contract had been terminated because of absence of work, for no reason, or due to a clause in the contract, Goh said that there was no cause for termination, even if I were informed and it was argued that I had been absent from work. Merely that a clause in the employment contract states that the contract can be terminated so it was terminated. I asked Goh if this would not be retaliation according to NTU whistle-blowing and related policies. Goh referred to an email I had received from Ms. Shin Kay Chong after she threatened me with retaliation, and in which she had pasted in a section from the relevant policy which states that there will be no retaliation to reporting misconduct and bullying.
- 23.3. In the Pre-Trial Conference when asked to elaborate on why my application for an open position at the National Institute of Education, NTU, was not considered (after Goh had apparently deceivingly and in writing indicated that such reinstatement was a possibility requiring time for consideration), Goh did not give the same answer as previously at TADM, which was for reasons of 'fair consideration'. Instead, Goh said my reinstatement would have to be as Research Fellow, and so the research proposal I had submitted in my application at National Institute of Education is not applicable. At this point, I said I am ready to be reinstated as Research Fellow, or any other suitable research or teaching position, or administrative position for a period of time. I also said I am ready to be reinstated in RM's lab as long as I only engage in writing tasks as any practical work with RM will be illegal and I do not wish to be fined nor go to jail.
- 23.4. NTU argued at Employment Claims Tribunals that 'relationships had soured' and so 'reinstatement was impossible'. I argued that:
- i. 'You went and told everyone I did something bad, so now we can't be friends anymore' is behaviour appropriate to a school-yard and not a top-ranking University;
 - ii. NTU is a large institute and my application was to an open position at National Institute of Education (under NTU). There would be no need for interactions between myself and those I reported for illegal activity and misconduct;
 - iii. That I had exhausted all options for a confidential and amicable resolution, starting with *speaking* to the Chair of the School of Biological Sciences, NTU. At no point in time did NTU return my trust and good faith. Instead, over a period of time, I was ignored, dismissed, deceived, humiliated, threatened, lied to, harassed, and made to be afraid of being in an illegal position.
- 23.5. Goh repeated statements he made at TADM concerning my tax declaration, salary, and accommodation and which are false and/or in contradiction to information I received from IRAS.
- 24. Relevant processes at bodies other than NTU, and with executive power to regulate work activity at NTU, including:**
- 24.1. Due to the quantity and quality of evidence of illegal animal research activity at NTU, regulation by Animal and Veterinary Services (AVS), NParks, is not apparent. I submitted my report on illegal animal research activity to AVS. In a meeting with AVS in which I was asked to present a summary of the report:
- i. AVS staff member Grace Yam Tsing Yee said she has no research experience and denied knowledge of basic scientific terminology, and therefore is obviously not qualified to conduct an investigation into animal research misconduct, even if the evidence in several instances requires only the ability to read English and a school-level understanding of biology. During the meeting, Grace did not indicate she followed nor that she was interested in any scientific evidence presented;
 - ii. Grace was not concerned about illegal animal experiments, she did not address any related content. Grace appeared concerned to show that my report is the intellectual property of NTU and that the report was somehow 'made' in revenge for previous employment at NTU;
 - iii. AVS staff member Cheryl Daludado Germono informed me that no oversight is regularly conducted for animal experiments at NTU. This seems to imply that AVS are lacking any practical control function, against what should be assumed from the Guidelines in place;

- iv. Grace recently sent me an email dismissing my report on illegal animal research activity at NTU. I lodged a police report against AVS the same day.
- 24.2. I lodged a number of police reports on theft, cheating, mischief, forgery, extortion, harassment of my person at my place of residence, and other matters. Not one was investigated. Instead:
- i. I was shouted at by an Investigating Officer Darrell: "You must leave Singapore this is our warning to you!";
 - ii. I was prohibited from lodging police reports on several occasions;
 - iii. I was prohibited from stating the crime in police reports on several occasions;
 - iv. My wording was significantly altered in several police report drafts and I had to insist the draft be torn up and re-written with my own words;
 - v. Investigating Officer Si Kang Bee Yan informed me that she would have the outcome of an investigation into illegal activity including financial at NTU *before* she received my report detailing the evidence;
 - vi. I was repeatedly and absolutely prohibited from submitting the evidence of illegal activity and systemic misconduct at NTU to Singapore Police Force Commercial Affairs Department since Investigating Officer Si Kang Bee Yan refused to do so;
 - vii. I eventually received a letter from the Police stating that there will be no investigation.

25. **Remedy claimed:** I humbly pray for reinstatement or damages.

M. Helmy
25.5.2021
Singapore

Mohamed Mustafa Mahmood Helmy

Mohamed Mustafa Mahmood Helmy
(FIN No. G3363781R)
Self-employed researcher, MD, PhD
10 Jurong Lake Link, #15-39, Singapore 648131
Litigant-in-person