

November 15, 2006

California Institute of Technology
Attn: General Counsel's Office
1200 E. California Blvd.
Pasadena, CA 91125-0002

Dear General Counsel of the California Institute of Technology:

The Project On Government Oversight (POGO) is overhauling and renewing its Federal Contractor Misconduct Database (www.pogo.org/db/index.cfm), a compilation of information from public resources regarding government contractors, including the California Institute of Technology. On January 18, 2006, we sent you information regarding findings relevant to the California Institute of Technology, which I have enclosed for your reference. As of today, we have not received a response from your office.

A written response is certainly in the best interest of everyone involved. It is the best way for your company to go on record regarding this process and the instances identified; your letter will be posted in its entirety on the database. Several companies have already responded and have expressed appreciation for the opportunity to express their views. POGO would prefer to receive a response by November 30, 2006 to ensure it is included with the launch of our new database.

If you have any questions, I can be reached at (202) 347-1122. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Scott Amey
General Counsel

Enclosure

Instances

No instances of misconduct

Pending Case:

1.

Moore v. California Institute of Technology Jet Propulsion Laboratory (False Claims Act)

Date: 01/04/2002 (Date of Initial Ruling)

Misconduct Type: Labor

Contracting Party: N/A

Court Type: Civil

Amount: \$0

Disposition: Judgment Against Defendant

Synopsis: Michael Moore filed suit against California Institute of Technology's Jet Propulsion Laboratory under the False Claims Act False Claims Act, 31 U.S.C. § 3729, et seq. and the Major Fraud Act 18 USC § 1031, et. seq. As an employee at the laboratory, Moore had noted problems on several antennas being sold to the Department of Defense. Upon acknowledging these problems, Moore was threatened with demotion and ultimately resigned. The initial court ruling was summary judgment on behalf of the defendant, but the 9th District Appeals Court reversed and remanded the decision.

Document(s):

Opinion