

# **PUBLIC-INTEREST STATEMENT**

by

**MUTLU (MILTON) SANCAKTUTAR**

Sr Technologist

14 January 2026, London

**Latest Version Available At:**

<http://mayflowercase.uk>

**For Questions / Response / Follow-up:**

mayflowercase@gmail.com

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

PRESS INVITE FOR PUBLIC-INTEREST STATEMENT .....	3
FACT SHEET.....	3
PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND .....	6
PUBLIC-INTEREST STATEMENT .....	7
1. Before Beginning.....	7
2. Preliminary Disclosure & Legal Disclaimer.....	8
3. Introduction and Opening.....	11
4. Request for Treatment with Gravity.....	12
5. Summary of What it is and What Happened.....	13
6. About Government-Issued Laptop.....	18
7. Erosion of Trust with Internal Reviews.....	19
8. Details of Detriment and Harm.....	32
9. Purpose and Goals.....	35
10. Why go to public?.....	36
11. Why should people care?.....	37
12. About the Crowdfunding Initiative.....	40
13. Governance Model.....	42
VERIFIABLE REFERENCES OF INTEGRITY.....	44
Supermarket Analogy for Prices of Values.....	45
Declining a Very Attractive Counter-Offer.....	46
Serving as a Trusted Technical Referee.....	48

# PRESS INVITE FOR PUBLIC-INTEREST STATEMENT

## FACT SHEET

### DATE AND VENUE

Wednesday, January 14th, at 11:00 AM  
Ground Floor, 25 Copthall Avenue, London, EC2R 7BP  
(Registration Required to Secure Access at Entrance)

### SCHEDULE

- |                      |                                      |
|----------------------|--------------------------------------|
| <b>10:30 – 11:00</b> | Media Arrival & Technical Setup      |
| <b>11:00 – 11:20</b> | Public-Interest Statement (Delivery) |
| <b>11:20 – 11:35</b> | Brief Recess / Press Pack Review     |
| <b>11:35 – 11:50</b> | Q & A Session                        |
| <b>11:50 – 12:00</b> | Event Conclusion & Departure         |

### SPEAKER INFORMATION

**Name** Mutlu (Milton) Sancaktutar

**Professional Background**

- Senior Technologist with 25+ years multidisciplinary academic and industrial experience
- Detailed background included on a separate page, but won't be included in the Public-Interest Statement.

**Company** Happy Technology & Business Solutions Limited

**Contact** [m.milton.san@gmail.com](mailto:m.milton.san@gmail.com), [mayflowercase@gmail.com](mailto:mayflowercase@gmail.com)  
07542 610 465

**LinkedIn** [linkedin.com/in/m-milton-s/](https://www.linkedin.com/in/m-milton-s/)

## MAYFLOWER CASE

The name “*Mayflower Case*” is used for ease of reference.

<https://www.mayflowercase.uk/>      [mayflowercase@gmail.com](mailto:mayflowercase@gmail.com)

### Background

- 9+ Months of **consistently recognised, continuously high-performance** service deliveries in a government institution.
- **Abrupt dismissal next working day after sending a Whistleblowing email** via regular line of report, in relation to a series of Protected Disclosures in Public Interest.
- System **accesses cut off mid-meeting** in otherwise a normal and productive day, with **no prior discussion, inquiry or investigation**, and **no payment at all** for services that had been **consistently praised and never disputed** before.
- Two days after dismissal, **unpaid service fees framed as so-called “good will gesture” in exchange for no-contact with the government body**, while the whistleblower was under **expressly-reported, acute financial collapse**.
- “Deal” instantly rejected, choosing dignity over submission under financial pressure, and filed for further legal implications.
- **Devastating degree of foreseeable, well-reported, and ever-escalating harm and detriment** caused – health, financials, etc..
- **Extreme power asymmetry disabled meaningful participation** in the process to **defend personal rights and dignity and to uphold nation-wide public interest at stake**.
- All other avenues consumed, **without any meaningful help for timely securing of procedural reliabilities, evidential preservations, and equality-of-arms reliefs**, as well as pro-bono legal support searches.
- **Limited, controlled publicity focused on a crowdfunding initiative is now being launched as a last resort**.

**Contractual Context** Mutlu (Milton) provided services for a government institution (GI) via a consultancy supplier (S) of GI. This was with an outside-IR35 contract between his private service company and supplier S.



**Individual** Mutlu (Milton) Sancaktutar - <https://www.linkedin.com/in/m-milton-s/>

**Direct Client** Supplier (S)      **End Client** A Government Institution (GI)      **Time Interval** January – November 2025

[1] Mayflower Case, with all my professional experience and expertise (as detailed on the next page), with wholehearted good-faith, and with responsible professional judgement, engages **seriously** with **nation-wide British public interest** involving a **strategic government institution (GI) operating systems of and on Critical National Infrastructure (CNI) and delivering products and services for millions of citizens and clients**.

[2] In such professional capacity, good faith and sense of responsibility, my findings are based on factual observations with traceability to specific evidential records, as has been documented comprehensively with a report called “Mayflower Report”.

[3] In my own views and not to assert conclusions, I have a high degree of confidence that The Mayflower Report is a **fact-based, well-structured and multi-layered analysis of serious strategy–execution gaps** in the **Government Institution (GI) involved**. With depth and breadth, it presents, an **x-ray view of organisational dynamics, significant governance flaws and systemic issues** bearing **serious public-interest concerns at national scale**, engaging **potential accountabilities** within **both the government institution (GI) and its supplier (S)**.

[This page aims only to explain grounds of professional reliability, not self-promotion.](#)

## PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND

[4] Mutlu (Milton) Sancaktutar is a Senior Technologist with nearly **25 years' combined experience** in analysing, designing, modernising, safeguarding, and leading complex digital products, services and organisations **across the UK and internationally, predominantly within Government institutions and multinational enterprise environments**. He has contributed to more than **30 large-scale integration, transformation, and greenfield programmes**, frequently operating in high-risk contexts where customer-centric business mindset, interdisciplinary bridging, architectural clarity, engineering excellence, technical depth, and governance discipline were mission-critical.

[5] Milton's academic background spans **Computer Engineering and Information Science (BSc), Business Administration (MBA), and Sociology (MA, with research and applied study focus on the Sociology of e-Government Innovations)**, all pursued with a purposeful, integrated plan and vision. This multidisciplinary triad enabled him to drive **strategic goals and value to customers/citizens/workforces as an outcome of complex, multilateral interactions of micro and macro actors – in organisational and societal contexts of digital organisations**. He **closely collaborated with user / engineering communities, C-suite leaders, delivery directors, IT architects, engineers, quality specialists, compliance teams, product managers, business analysts, service operations teams, and multi-supplier ecosystems** in engagements spanning **14 countries, last 10+ years based in the UK**.

[6] As independently verifiable, Milton has a reputation for **professional integrity, fact-based analysis, and the courage to constructively challenge blind spots, flawed assumptions and expired justifications** where service reliability, governance effectiveness, process efficiencies, or information assurance may be at risk. Feedback from colleagues highlights abilities to **integrate broad range of disciplines and functions** across stakeholders, **commitment to team success, inspirational ways to motivate his teams, positive, constructive working under pressure, and capacity to bring surprisingly simple solutions to perceivably complex issues**.

[7] Milton is often recognised for a unique consultative profile capable of operating effectively across Tier-1 (strategic advisory), Tier-2 (architectural and delivery governance) and Tier-3 (hands-on engineering and technical problem-solving) domains. This enables his strategic work to remain firmly grounded in operational and technical realities, and his technical work to consistently align with broader strategic, delivery and policy frameworks.

## PUBLIC-INTEREST STATEMENT

### 1. Before Beginning

[8] Welcome to the recording of my public-interest statement. Thank you very much, for your interest, time and effort.

[9] I have prepared this statement and digital content while navigating complex formal procedures under extreme constraints and vulnerable circumstances. While there may be flaws in any aspects, these efforts and materials represent the absolute limit of my remaining capacity amidst competing priorities so far.

[10] I offer this not as a polished work, and I am not sure how much my initiatives will actually help. I could just do what remained in my capacity to try making a meaningful difference for what I thought of naming as Mayflower Case.

[11] Your understanding of these difficult conditions is deeply appreciated. I highly welcome and appreciate any feedback to improve my content, delivery, or strategy, and any other forms of support.

[12] You can reach out to me via [mayflowercase@gmail.com](mailto:mayflowercase@gmail.com) or through <https://mayflowercase.uk>.

[13] Before we begin, I need to ask for a bit of grace: I'm currently managing a lifelong ADHD condition that's been particularly tough due to broader circumstances and a pending medication review. Due to challenges of ADHD, I'm worried I might have a slip of the tongue – especially

regarding names of any organizations or individuals, or anything that makes more harm than good to public interest. I absolutely intend to keep such things private for obvious reasons.

[14] Could we please agree now, that, if I accidentally mention something sensitive, we will deem and keep that strictly off the record? Such a gaffe would be a genuine mistake caused by my current symptoms, and I'd deeply appreciate your understanding.

[15] Would that be OK for everyone?

## **2. Preliminary Disclosure & Legal Disclaimer**

[16] Before I proceed with my statement, I wish to formally place the following points on the record to ensure the clarity, intent, and legal standing of this statement:

[17] Any disclosures made within the context of Mayflower Case, are made in good faith, driven by professional, ethical, legal and civic duties as a law-abiding British citizen and a Senior Technologist with decades of relevant experience and expertise.

[18] My primary objective has been to uphold public interest, in particular relation to internal and external operations of a strategic government institution.

[19] I do NOT intent or aim to cause harm to any organizations or individuals involved, in any ways.

[20] The points I raise today regarding potential accountabilities do not reflect disrespect, undermine

value of and or imply absence of the committed efforts and high standards of work maintained by the majority of the members of the relevant organisations - particularly at working levels.

[21] I wish to explicitly state that I do not disregard the good works and services by the organizations and individuals involved in any other capacities. My focus is strictly on the specific concerns within the Mayflower Case's context. The existence of good works in one area does not negate the necessity of addressing failures in another.

[22] My comments and views regarding industry-wide concerns, practices, technology standards, or governance are provided for broader industrial context. These are based on my professional expertise and do not imply prejudice or predetermined judgment regarding the specific factual basis of the Mayflower Case or any individuals and the entities involved.

[23] While I speak with professional confidence, any confident or seemingly conclusive remarks within the institutional scope of focus are based strictly on my observations and strictly legitimate exposure to evidential records during my engagement.

[24] As a matter of public record, I am currently acting without legal representation or formal legal advice, despite exhaustive attempts with over 20 legal institutions and parties. Any legal sensitivities that might arise from this statement are unintentional and stem from my position as a technical expert fulfilling a

perceived public duty, working under extreme constraints to defend his lawful rights and positions and to uphold public interest.

[25] No part of my statements, nor any associated digital or printed content available on any media, may be reproduced, distributed, or transmitted, in part or in full, in any form, or by any means - including photocopying, recording, or other electronic or mechanical methods - without my express prior written permission.

[26] I hereby state that all my legal rights and positions are fully reserved. This statement is made without prejudice to any future legal proceedings or claims.

### 3. Introduction and Opening

[27] Hello. My name is Mutlu Sancaktutar. Milton is my preferred first name.

[28] Amongst my identities I wholly and proudly own, I am here today addressing you as a law-abiding and community-spirited British citizen.

[29] In my professional life, I am senior technologist with approximately 25 years of multidisciplinary experience in IT industry - the last 10 years in the United Kingdom, and predominantly in government institutions..

[30] In this record, I will tell you about a series of events, matters and potential proceedings, which I thought we could perhaps call "**Mayflower Case**".

[31] I will tell you about Mayflower Case, explaining how it relates to me and to you as British public. I will ask your support for Mayflower Case just as much as you feel it is in your own interest and just as much as you could do.

[32] Full version of this statement will soon be published on <http://mayflowercase.uk> .

[33] I will now announce a shorter version.

#### **4. Request for Treatment with Gravity**

[34] To everyone hearing my voice: I have a deeply personal and earnest request around this statement and any further content to follow. I and my broader family are currently facing extremely vulnerable circumstances. The publicity I will get exposed to is definitely not my preference, and it will already bring a significant further burden on myself and my loved ones.

[35] I request you to please treat this statement and my unwilling publicity that I did NOT seek with the gravity deserved. Please help us avoid further harm to be caused on us. We have suffered more than enough.

[36] Expressly speaking, I do not give my consent for any type of thoughtless messaging that may dilute the matters and deflect focus from my specific purpose - even if done with good intentions.

## **5. Summary of What it is and What Happened**

[37] Last year, 2025, I provided over nine months of consistently recognised, continuously high-performance services in a strategic government institution operating an estate of Critical National Infrastructure, providing crucial services for tens of millions of individuals and corporate bodies.

[38] Such services included, literally, days and nights of committed deliveries.

[39] As was already recognised by leadership, I think I genuinely made a huge impact within a key area of a broader strategic programme - a programme which was unfortunately running behind schedule and below qualities, from my perspective.

[40] To reduce delivery slippages and improve overall qualities, reportedly, many times I even had to work at the weekends, and many days I literally sweated at my desk under delivery pressure.

[41] I delivered such exceptional service while battling in my personal life with a series of financial and health vulnerabilities that I had responsibly and transparently reported and documented with my management multiple times.

[42] Meanwhile, in absolute good-faith, as part of my professional and contractual duties, I respectfully reported some serious, fact-based, data-driven concerns in public interest, regarding areas including but not limited to **cybersecurity, data integrity, operational resilience, value-for-money efficiencies, and accuracy and completeness of upward reporting of a strategic programme status** - status of a programme that was qualified by C-suite multiple times as the "*most strategic delivery of 2025*".

[43] On Friday the 7<sup>th</sup> of November 2025, seeing what looked to me like evident patterns of poor leadership engagement with my public-interest disclosures, I ended up having to blow the whistle, expressly referring to the protected nature of my reportings.

[44] Doing so, I risked my otherwise great reputation at a job that I loved to serve. I did so, because dignity of my profession and loyalty to my ethical, contractual and lawful duties to public required so.

[45] Monday the 10<sup>th</sup> of November, next work day right after my whistleblowing email, the supplier company through which I was contracting abruptly terminated my contract with no prior notice, talk, inquiry or investigation.

[46] My system accesses were cut off at a shocking surprise, while I was on an active technical call with my colleagues. This happened on what was otherwise another very productive and impactful day from me, as was already recognised even on that day by my colleagues.

[47] Termination letter to me declared that I would receive no payment at all for any services since 01 October 2025. No payment at all for days and nights of such hard work and influential value delivery...

[48] I had voluntarily worked under delivery pressure, even at the weekend of 8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> of November. On 10<sup>th</sup> of November, I was dismissed with no payment at all for services since 1<sup>st</sup> of October that had been consistently praised and never disputed before.

[49] Two days after my dismissal, in a formal correspondence the supplier company, my unpaid service fees were framed as a so-called "goodwill gesture" in exchange for my written assurance of no-contact with the government body I had been serving.

[50] I rejected this "deal", choosing dignity over submission under financial pressure, and filed the correspondence for further legal implications.

[51] After my dismissal, despite my repeated kind requests, I have never been given a chance to at least give my colleagues a brief farewell, to avoid any misunderstanding about myself (my reputation, my conduct, or my background). Otherwise, what kind of a person gets removed by being cut off in the middle of an active call in the team? What kind of a person gets fired without even a chance to say or receive a goodbye? What kind of a person would deserve this kind of treatment?

[52] All these happened in a context where I had already reported and documented my personal circumstances multiple times, expressly asking for help and support, but still keeping exceptionally productive and influential in our deliveries, as was consistently recognised.

[53] Let alone receiving such support, I think I got literally exploited to the hilt first, and then crumpled and disposed like a trash.

[54] I believe, this is an extreme example of profound disrespect to my basic human dignity, to the dignity of the profession I served, and to the public itself whose moneys were being consumed while all these were happening,

and while the institutions were financing their operations to defend themselves against my position.

[55] After my dismissal, I expressly reported that I was under an acute financial crisis due to this non-payment and abrupt dismissal. Despite near 10 rounds of repeated notices, position updates and requests, I have never been paid anything ever since then, and neither the supplier company, nor the government institution itself has ever given me any relief or substantial or substantive updates or assurance about the internal reviews.

[56] I think what followed after my dismissal has grown up into an even bigger leadership and governance failure.

[57] Ever since my abrupt dismissal, I have suffered a devastating degree of foreseeable, well-reported, and ever-escalating harm and detriment to my health and finances terribly impacting not only myself but also my family and loved ones.

[58] The extreme power asymmetry I face has disabled my meaningful participation in the process to defend my personal rights and dignity, and to uphold the nation-wide public interest at stake.

[59] Having exhausted all other avenues without any meaningful help for timely securing of procedural reliabilities, evidential preservations, or reliefs for equality-of-arms, I am now launching a crowdfunding initiative on GoFundMe.

[60] At this moment, this limited and controlled publicity is being launched as my last resort.

## **6. About Government-Issued Laptop**

[61] During my engagement, I was using a government-issued laptop. Both organisations pressured me to return it - without crucial and fundamental forensic assurances to me.

[62] I made it clear, consistently and in writing, that I have been very keen to return it immediately to the government institution requesting only written forensic assurances for data stored on it.

[63] The device contained strictly legitimate evidential records that are highly significant for my points and could be critical in judicial proceedings, which already looked highly likely and inevitable to follow.

[64] I repeatedly made it clear that having to preserve a government asset with a high evidential significance was keeping me in a very stressful dilemma and causing further emotional pressure on me.

[65] Meanwhile, the government institution kept me under sustained pressure to return the IT Kit, but consistently declining to give me any qualified forensic assurance.

[66] I raised this perhaps more than 10 times, and the government institutions consistently refrained from giving me qualified forensic assurances.

[67] After more than 8 written requests to the government body, yet with no forensic assurance received, under pressure, I ultimately decided to return the device without forensic assurances.

## **7. Erosion of Trust with Internal Reviews**

[68] Okay, what happened after my dismissal? After my dismissal, I immediately escalated the issues to C-suite of both organizations, and the next day I was told the issue was referred to appropriate teams of both organizations.

[69] Right after that escalation, what I was focused on from the very onset were the procedural safeguards and the evidential preservations.

[70] I made this very clear and expressed in my first escalation letters to the C-suite of both organizations: I asked them respectfully to take immediate procedural safeguards at this stage, structural safeguards, and evidential preservations like non-interference measures, certain data backups, and so forth.

[71] I continued to formally communicate my requests for such procedural safeguards. I sent a full detailed notice to both organizations listing a number of typical, fundamental procedural safeguards and evidential integrity measures.

[72] Despite over 10 times of formal correspondence, not a single one of those assurances had been given in qualified terms, not a single one of them.

[73] What did I do? I told these organizations, like, "I understand you wouldn't want the situation to escalate to higher authorities. I don't want to escalate the situation to higher authorities, either. Please give me procedural assurances to avoid procedural escalations."

[74] I listed a number of specific points, specific checkpoints about a due process. And I requested express assurances, like, "Have you implemented this and that and those measures? By when?".

[75] And while I was waiting for responses for such procedural inquiries, things happened in a way, in a documented way, where I ended up having serious doubts about how these procedures were going on. I can't disclose more, but if these organizations themselves come up and say, "well, this chap is talking about us, but actually there was no need to escalate this matter, or there was no need to go for a public funding campaign whatsoever", in that case, I can disclose.

[76] If the organisations come up and attempt to suggest my escalations and later on this publicity were not necessary, I can then disclose more specifically what made me think that all other avenues are consumed. But I can't disclose the specifics there. What I can tell now to the public is, I couldn't get any meaningful procedural safeties or assurances. And I escalated.

[77] Normally, these organizations, as far as I know, are not legally obliged to share those confirmations like checkpointing about procedures. There may not be a legal

mandate for them, but that is another matter which is questionable. I think the law and the legislations should be really, really made a lot better, a lot better to mandate, to force by law expressly specific procedural assurances, confirmations and deeper transparencies to be given to parties of investigations. That would prevent a lot of unnecessary escalations if those steps of transparencies are taken.

[78] I told these organizations, if you have implemented these safeguards, tell me yes, write me a written confirmation, then I will not escalate.

[79] So I sent them kind of a checklist, and they could just give me, for each checkpoint, when they actually implemented this and that particular element of procedural safeguards and evidential preservation safeguards. They have never returned any such confirmations.

[80] I thought, if they were to have actually implemented those procedural safeguards and measures, then they could just confirm them to prevent any unnecessary escalations outside the organizations.

[81] I repeated these procedural assurances many times, and eventually I ended up having to escalate to higher

authorities - but, not in substance/merits of matters in my claims, only procedural safeguards, in procedural reliabilities..

[82] I reported specific details to invoke external probes into the ongoing investigation, not in substance/merits, but in terms of the procedural reliability of the process. At least they could ask, like, "what is your procedural like? Have you done this and that?"

[83] Yes, there has been an ongoing investigation, but before it is too late, those external third parties could intervene to make sure that the internal procedure is reliable-enough. Maybe not, I don't know. I just did my part informing higher authorities in case they could have their powers in their statutory remits. But none of those escalations helped at all.

[84] I also tried to invoke a particular escalation channel where an institution in our overall architecture of checks and balances, one of the key institutions who play a key part in such checks and balances, which is positioned, as far as I knew, to help secure my data preservation. I filed a complaint with them aiming to ensure data preservation of my data, personal data, in these organizations and explained the full context. And at the

end of the application, I saw on the screen, 29 weeks of wait time before a case allocation. So, I filed a complaint for an urgent matter to preserve my personal data, which I think is very impactful in terms of evidential significance. But, the application ended up with a confirmation of 29 weeks of wait time. This means seven months to wait for a case allocation, and then once the case is allocated, a caseworker will start working on it in a further while, and then they will take it to the organization. But, it's already too late. There are systems that are keeping data for a while. There are data retention policies. Not all data are fully stored in those systems. And, some key data records on certain systems relevant to my case may have already been deleted or modified where such systems do not keep full audit logs.

[85] So the only thing I could do was to go to high court for interim injunctions, some procedural injunctions. But, that avenue is effectively not available to me, because that requires a lot of legal expertise, proper legal expertise. That means money, a lot of money. So it means in our institutional framework, there is no avenue that actually can secure this situation.

[86] So effectively, the law is formed in a way that, not by intent, but by outcome, favours the institutions, large institutions, over the whistleblowers.

[87] What happens is whistleblower complaints, but eventually they lose in most of the cases.

[88] Why so? If someone would not have a really, really reliable, a factual observation, would they dare blowing the whistle and potentially losing their jobs and facing all these detriments? Hundreds of people are facing this and people are still pursuing the whistleblowing channel. They see the risks and they still pursue this channel to raise their concerns. Why are they doing that? If they had not had any factual observations, something really with strong merit from their perspective, would they blow the whistle?

[89] At the end of the day, only a small minority of whistleblowing claims ultimately succeed, because structurally, the law, in effect, approaches to a dead letter in practical institutional realities. (A dead letter law is one that exists on paper but is not actually enforced any more, for typical reasons like social and practical abandonment, administrative decommissioning, loss of political/social meaning and the absence of

effective or accessible mechanisms of enforcement in practice.)

[90] When law enforcement is not accessible, it means law is not accessible. It means law is operating like a dead letter for its purpose.

[91] There are laws out there that protect individuals against institutions, but those laws are not enforceable because enforcement by statutory bodies is not accessible. I am not blaming them, I am just telling you what the situation is. Every institution may have an explanation of why they are not so accessible, as accessible as we would need. But, at the end of the day, this is the situation.

[92] And if you try to get the law enforced as a litigant in person in your individual capacity without any legal expertise, you start a game where the results are already known. Against you, there are big legal teams and infinite amount of public resources to get any kind of resource needed to defend the institutional positions, but in your end, you are already consumed. So who wins the game?

[93] Well, before the court, before the judges, we are equal. I believe there are judges in London. I really

believe there are judges in London, and they are fair, but judges rule based on law and based on data you take to them. If I can't access that data, if I can't secure the original records of those evidences against which judges would make decisions and rulings.. If I can't take those evidences to the court, the judge will just rule based on what is available in the court.

[94] I have more than 300 pages of written records about this in a very structured format. I have specific pointers to many evidential records in those systems. I have a whole list of findings based on factual observations, with specific references to who the witnesses were, where the data was recorded in which system, and so forth.

[95] But if I can't secure the preservation of data records, if the witnesses are not actually isolated from undue influence, who is the winner? Who is the likely winner of this game? Most likely, institutions.

[96] After seeing what happened to me, I cannot expect my colleagues to step up and witness against their institutions. Seeing their managers in their powers, seeing the people just directly subject to my whistleblowing situation itself in their current roles, in their current capacities, or in other capacities of

control or influence, who could take the risk to witness against their own employers? Well, some people can do, but it has reduced chances. Everyone has their own life, their dependents, their families. We cannot expect people to, kind of, risk their entire career or financials and living standards or current stable conditions. We cannot expect people to risk their stability, their family's stability, because it is not only values on one side. There are also people that they need to take care of, and it is a huge dilemma. It is a huge dilemma to impose to people, like, you have to witness against your employer taking a high risk of trouble, or, you have to protect your and your family's interests at cost of your integrity.

- Well, what happened to the person who last time witnessed against their employer? What happened to the person who actually made these points?

- Well, he's just been removed! We don't know what happened to him.

[97] Eventually, it is easy to speak on the side of the authority, but really hard to speak against the authority. People tend to speak more openly and generously when they believe something on the side of authority. When it is

against authority, they only briefly or kind of subtly can mention it, just to save their conscience but not save the truth. To save the truth being that open takes a whole lot of risk, and we can't expect people to put themselves under such risks. It is not a fair expectation from people. The system should protect me so that the witnesses can feel that the law protects everyone, including whistleblowers and including witnesses.

[98] In such a situation, what happens as a known scientific phenomenon is when people cannot speak as they believe, they start to believe as they speak. Knowing something but not being able to say it all or precisely, accurately, completely or directly causes a cognitive dissonance in human psychology. To maintain that cognitive dissonance is difficult. It causes discomfort to people experiencing it. Therefore, people, as a known matter of cognitive process, get inclined to accept and adopt the authority's rhetoric, position and points. This is how authority converts people in the larger social systems as well as in micro-organizational sociology, in the social context of organizations. So this is how power actually forces people tacitly, and sometimes quite directly to be converted to their position. Otherwise, if you decline to

be converted, you cannot stay there. You can keep in peace in your mind, but then you will not be able to keep in peace in your workplace. You need to either select a disagreement in your mind, in your conscience, or you need to select a disagreement in the organization, in the workplace - with a continued tension between your principled position and with the prevailing power structures. So, what happens most of the time is people gradually resolve the issue through certain cognitive biases, knowingly or unknowingly, somehow using a limited level of their intellect, not because they don't have the full intellect to really stay by the full truth, but they get forced to use only a limited amount of their intellect.

[99] Conversion by prevailing power structures work sometimes consciously, sometimes unconsciously, but people eventually submit. Even worse, such conversion may many times work practically in an irreversible nature: Once an individual submits to authority and adopts their position, they get exposed to another psychological motive to stay consistent over time. This means, once a person shares their witness testimony in a particular way, there emerges to be both internal and external drives to keep

consistent with it their later statements. This means, once an investigation collects witness statements in unsafe conditions and people settle down and own their rhetoric positioning around the subject matters, it remains hard for them to share their originally-most-honest views even under a new, properly safeguarded investigation. The initial, poorly-safeguarded / non-safeguarded investigation leaves a degree of permanent and irreversible bias on a later, properly-safeguarded investigation.

[100] Various and broader aspects of the sociopsychological dynamics of the above are covered by Leon Festinger's Cognitive Dissonance Theory (1957), Robert Cialdini's Influence: The Psychology of Persuasion (2021), Stanley Milgram's Behavioural Study of Obedience (1963), Solomon Asch's Conformity (1951), Morrison & Milliken's Organizational Silence (2000), Amy Edmondson's Psychological Safety (1999), Steven Lukes' Power: A Radical View (1974), Albert O. Hirschman' Exit, Voice, and Loyalty (1970), Foucault's Discipline and Punish: the Birth of the Prison (1975), Berger and Luckmann's The Social Construction of Reality (1966), amongst others.

[101] Well, after all, I don't have confidence in the safety and reliability of the settings in which witness statements were collected. And I don't have confidence on the data preservation. As such, this is effectively a law that's not meaningfully enforceable in practice.

[102] All these mean: everyone is equal, but institutions are far, far, far more equal.

[103] This relates to legislations, this relates to trainings, this relates to a lot of things, so many things. But in this case, I am NOT campaigning for a better legislation. I am unilaterally at disadvantage, serious disadvantage. So I need public support to access justice within the current legislative frameworks.

## **8. Details of Detriment and Harm**

[104] I do not want to roll into an over-narration of victimhood, but I think people should know in more direct terms: I came here today in my extreme sufferings. So much that, had things gone slightly differently or should my personal religious faith not strongly prohibited, it could have ended in the most tragic way.

[105] I owe my presence here today entirely to the grace of God, which worked through the extraordinary helps of a

couple of great friends, through medical intervention, and at times through mere luck.

[106] Please allow me to tell more: As I have already reported to many institutions before this instance directly to the public, what I am going through since 10 November 2025 has been mercilessly testing limits of human nature.

[107] Acute financial crisis in lack of any other income or savings to rely upon, while having dependents to support, and friendly loans, taxes, bills and credit cards to pay due to this financial collapse...

[108] Upon my dismissal, the utterly painful nature of having to reconstruct so many events from my memory in such a traumatic context with no access to evidential systems - I needed to write down as much as I could recall before things would fade and blur in my memory...

[109] I needed to document things for further proceedings later on. And I needed to go back to the stage and focus deeply to capture all details, as much and as precisely as I would be able to do under such circumstances, returning back to the scene of what had turned into a traumatic experience.

[110] Extreme challenges of preparing all so much mentally-draining paper work for dozens of institutions seeking mental health and legal support...

[111] The very painful nature of having to tell of the story behind every door, on every phone call..

[112] Telling scenes and trailers of an utterly heart-breaking chain of experiences, re-living the trauma again, and again, and again...

[113] Urgent need for a new job with its own challenges in those particular circumstances adding further to my stress and pressure on me...

[114] Upside down collapse of my sleeping routines...

[115] Mental health collapses over nights...

[116] Painful experiences in A&E queues, and more...

[117] Keeping inside and re-living this trauma almost every single day...

[118] My social withdrawal and identity harm I experience...

[119] Civic heart-break with my society in a situation where I am feeling utterly let down by the institutions...

[120] Last but never least... Quite personally.. My inability to see most beloved son at times that I most needed to, including Christmas and new year.. Why? Only because it was too daunting for him to see my such collapsed version, and I was unable to wear a mask of a happy, strong, functional dad..

## **9. Purpose and Goals**

[121] I am not here in an aim or desire of heroism or popularity. To me, aiming heroism or public admiration with these words would be a disgusting, undignified misery. My hard decisions and choices were dignified; so are their consequences on me, so is my own type of misery.

[122] I am not aiming to attract public attention or populism. What would I do with heroism, what good would it make to be popular, while what I needed most has been calmness, relaxation and simplicity in my life?

[123] At a personal level, the thing I now want most is justice served for myself and for the public interest.

[124] Once this matter gets sorted, I am dreaming to begin a new, calm life away from the eye-sights, fixing my financials and healing my wounds. And then, I am dreaming

to go to academia where I believe I can live and serve rest of my life most meaningfully.

## **10. Why go to public?**

[125] Today I am here asking your support, because..

[126] All these sufferings is a price I have been and will be paying in my loyalty to my professional and civic values and to my ethical, legal and contractual duties, in public interest.

[127] My loyalty to values and duties has been perfectly aligned to observe and intertwined with the public's own interests that I worked so painfully hard to uphold.

[128] As such, at this point where all other avenues have proven unhelpful, the most natural door to knock as a last resort, would be that of the public themselves.

[129] I am here today, because, given the context and background, I thought this media-recorded statement would, despite its own obvious challenges, be relatively the best way to knock the public's door.

[130] I hope you are there and you hear me.

## 11. Why should people care?

[131] I think the public should really see this matter far beyond just a single person's issue.

[132] After all this, just consider the message such maltreatment radiates in that organization or in similar organisations.

[133] After seeing all these, even if tens of millions Pounds of paper-cash literally was to be stuffed into sacks and carried off, who would take the blow to risk themselves after seeing what happens to me or to colleagues acting like me in good faith to uphold public interest?

[134] I did not see anyone stealing cash money, that's not even in question. But, I did see at times public's funds being spent like water in a river-side picnic.

[135] If we don't support people who resist institutional decline, year by year, the standards of efficiencies, accurate reporting and effective governance gradually drops. To such levels, that..

- Meeting-surfing becomes a career.
- Absentee leadership becomes a career.

- Chanting promising rhetoric disconnected from actual execution becomes a career.
- Value-washing - speaking with and owning buzzwords of values, principles or fancy/trending business jargon to shield what is behind, becomes career.
- Playing corporate drama in super inefficient daily routines becomes a career.

[136] If we don't support and protect people resisting institutional decline, these all happen.

[137] I think, if the public does not hold the hands of the destroyed professionals like me, then,

- using tax payer's money to institutionalize wasteful routines and to entrench wrongdoing becomes a career.

[138] Our economy is facing hard times, as are most other economies around the globe. It may face even harder ones. This means: The well is running dry, the sea is over.

[139] Cyberthreat levels against our strategic institutions have elevated dramatically in recent years, and years ahead are promising only much higher challenges. This means: Tomorrows are likely to be in hot water. As such, there is no room for error, there shall be no meeting room for corporate drama.

[140] This must interest you. This is about your economy, this is about your security. This is about your taxes, your institutions. This is about your interest.

[141] For the last ten years, the most productive ten years of my professional life, I delivered value to British public and in my humble capacity, I have never let the public down.

[142] And at this point, I think, it is now time for the British public to show that they do care, as well. If people do not support me in this fundraising initiative, yes, it is a big problem for me. But, letting down professionals like me may be a bigger one for the public.

[143] I have wholehearted respect for the public, for the society, but I can't worship crowds. That's not my profession. It's a two-way street, and it takes two to tango.

[144] I did my part. I'll continue to do my part. I took the blow and I will continue to take the blow. But, it's now time for the public to step in for their own interest. In the context of my being here today, this means holding my hand to help me access justice to protect my individual rights and to uphold public interest.

## 12. About the Crowdfunding Initiative

[145] This crowdfunding initiative is a last-resort effort to secure access to justice. It is not a campaign aiming to pressure institutions through publicity. It is not an attempt to bypass the courts.

[146] I am seeking public support so that a legal conclusions around this matter can be stamped where they belong: independent courts, on evidence, under the rule of law.

[147] With my crowdfunding attempt, I am aiming to finance:

- 1.all my legal and procedural costs till everything fully settles
- 2.urgent private healthcare for my ADHD condition
- 3.professional therapies to address elevated symptoms of my ADHD condition (I'm in a long waitlist with NHS, up to 28 months left now. I don't know how it will take further, so I can't rely on NHS for that. I have to get private healthcare for my ADHD medication and therapies, and I have been unable to afford that.)
- 4.professional therapies for ongoing-traumatic and post-traumatic sufferings

5.my living expenses and financial support to my dependents until I find a new job, which I will continue to look for

6.balancing my cash flows against strict payment deadlines, like tax payments, credit card payments and other personal liabilities

all in absolute transparency.

[148] I will receive all crowdfunded sums to a separate, dedicated bank account, and I will make all my relevant spendings and transfers from that account. I will public all transactions of that account on Mayflower Case's website, for absolute transparency.

[149] I will publish all my procurement selection decisions transparently on the same website, for full transparency.

[150] Once and if I get my legal costs reimbursed by the defendants, I will pay forward the full net balance of legal and procedural costs to a list of registered charities operating for nation-wide causes, and I will publish full documentation for absolute transparency.

[151] Regardless of outcomes in the court, any amounts I will use from the crowd-funded sums for my or my

dependent's living costs and financial stability / cash-flow regulation, I will later pay all of them forward to such UK-wide charities entirely.

[152] Furthermore, I will donate for such charities a significant portion of my claims rewarded by the court in excess of my unpaid service fees and of other direct financial losses/damages.

[153] As it has already been my position consistently from even the times of my service engagement with these organisations, I will NOT agree to anything like a settlement at any stage that rewards my personal rights and claims but do not bring substantial value to public interest in terms of failures recognised, lessons learned, and concretely evidenced actions and plans to address my concerns as well as their root causes. Because, upholding public interest is an inseparable part of Mayflower Case.

### **13. Governance Model**

[154] What governance model will I operate while managing and deploying these funds?

[155] I will operate a governance model designed to minimise risks arising from individual vulnerabilities, to ensure disciplined and proportionate use of resources,

and to maximise effectiveness in accessing justice, while consistently upholding the public interest.

[156] The purpose of this model is to ensure that all financial and non-financial resources are used safely, transparently, and strategically, and that decision-making is not dependent on a single individual acting in isolation.

[157] In addition to financial contributions, I anticipate that this process may result in pro bono professional support, which will be incorporated into the governance structure in a controlled and coherent manner.

### **Legal Team Structure**

[158] I intend to establish a formal legal team comprising:

- A lead solicitor and a barrister, engaged on a paid basis where required
- Supplementary pro bono legal support, integrated to increase overall capacity and resilience, without compromising accountability or legal privilege

### **Consultation and Oversight Forum**

[159] Alongside the legal team, I will establish a forum of consultation, intended to provide structured,

multidisciplinary input. This forum will include expertise, assuming pro-bono availability, in:

- Employment and internal HR policies and procedures
- Audit, assurance, and governance frameworks
- Mental health and wellbeing (to support my sustainable resilience and safe decision-making)
- Technical expertise as relevant

[160] The forum will operate strictly within legal boundaries, subject to professional advice, and will exist to support sound judgement rather than to direct legal strategy.

### **Transparency and Updates**

[161] I will provide regular updates on progress, governance arrangements, and use of funds via the project website: [www.mayflowercase.uk](http://www.mayflowercase.uk)

[162] Thank you for taking the time to listen to / read this, and for any support you are able to offer.

## **VERIFIABLE REFERENCES OF INTEGRITY**

[163] I am not expecting everyone to trust me. A fair amount of unconvinced people in higher scepticism is definitely a good thing. Such scepticism keeps asking

questions and forcing and assuring continued, highest standards of integrity.

[164] While I am aware that everything that comes from me is subject to independent verification, I still would like to share two anecdotes from my work experiences, aiming to reflect my integrity and my unshakable public interest commitment.

### **Supermarket Analogy for Prices of Values**

[165] When we talk about values – integrity, good faith, keeping your word, acting in the public interest – these are all claims. Anyone can make them. What gives them meaning is whether you are willing to pay their cost. I often explain this with a simple analogy: In a supermarket, we choose items, place them in our shopping basket, and we may even say, quite naturally, “these are my groceries.” But they are not truly ours yet. At the checkout point, reality intervenes. If we are able and willing to complete the payment, we take them with us. If not, we leave them behind no matter how genuinely we meant to have them. Values work in a similar way. We truly have them only when we pay the price for them.

[166] Over the last ten and a half years of my professional life in the UK, I have encountered several such “checkout point” moments - situations where holding to my principles had a real, tangible cost. I want to briefly describe a few of those moments factually, and leave the judgement to you.

### **Declining a Very Attractive Counter-Offer**

[167] In 2019, I was working in Milton Keynes in a role I genuinely enjoyed. The team valued my work, and I was performing well. At the same time, I had a real financial responsibility to support a few of my loved-ones in serious financial hardship, which meant I needed a higher income. I raised this openly with my employer on several occasions, but structural pay limits made an increase impossible.

[168] I therefore applied for other roles and accepted an offer elsewhere at a significantly higher rate. I gave extended notice and worked with my team to ensure a clean and responsible handover.

[169] After I resigned, my manager told me that he could speak to senior leadership saying “I have a special talent in my team”, and he could try an exceptional counter-offer

at the same rate I would get in my new role, if I am open for that.

[170] My current work place was 5 minutes away from home, where I was able to have my lunch at home whenever I wanted. The new role was in London, requiring 3 hours of total commuting. This would also mean an additional monthly cost of £1000+ for logistics and other costs. Staying at my current job 5-minutes away from home, which I already loved, would be incomparably more advantageous.

[171] I declined the counter offer, because its huge advantage was the price to pay at a check-out point for my standards of integrity.

[172] I told my manager I would just have been flying over the moon if he had done so before my interviews for a new job, I really love my team and work here, but at this stage I really could not accept any counter offer. I said I had spoken with the new client in a genuine passion and interest with the new role and the hiring team loved my personality as well as my technical skills. I said accepting a counter-offer would turn my passionate and focused attendance to those interviews into a professional role-play, and hollow out the personality they loved in me.

[173] My manager said, if I accept a counter-offer, I could help my loved ones more and better. I said I can do a good deed only within my values and personality.

[174] When I left, my manager wrote in my leaving-do card thanking me not only for my technical contributions, but also saying expressly "Your professionalism and integrity is unparalleled".

### **Serving as a Trusted Technical Referee**

[175] Long while ago, I was working at a public institution through a large consultancy supplier. One of the senior managers from the public institution approached me and explained that there was an ongoing debate regarding the pricing of a project submitted by a consultancy firm, which was a major competitor of my consultancy supplier. They needed an independent technical referee to determine whether the effort estimations for the project were exaggerated or not.

[176] He mentioned that procuring such a technical expert from the outside would take a long time, but the institution needed an independent technical assessment urgently. He said, "You don't have to accept, but could this person be you?"

[177] I replied: "As you know, evaluating the fairness of a competitor's effort estimations would naturally be subject to a serious conflict of interest concerns. I do not doubt my own fairness, but the real issue is this: Would that supplier company explicitly accept my arbitration and commit beforehand to trusting my honesty and not appealing my decision on the basis of conflict of interest?"

[178] He told me, "I already spoke with them before asking you. They stated that, within the institution, you are the only person whose impartial arbitration they would trust." Only then I came to ask you.

[179] Based on this, I accepted the duty.

[180] Comparing my effort estimations, some of my estimations were lower than the supplier's figures as I had better technical confidence on the technicalities. In other areas, my technical knowledge was less specialized, and my figures were cautious, and the supplier's estimations were lower with their better insights. Overall, my total estimation was about 20% lower than theirs.

[181] When presenting my findings, I told the public institution the following: "My figures are directly from me to you. The supplier's figures came to you from the their account management. If my own supplier were giving you these numbers, I would have submitted my figures to my manager, who would then pass them through our account management. As is quite understandable, due to administrative uncertainties, potential dependency waits, delays, and the general tendency of us technical folk to be generally optimistic, my account management would likely have added a 20% on top of my numbers before presenting them to you. And I also believe that is a fair approach. When calculated this way, the estimation from my supplier would have been only about 5% lower than the supplier's disputed figures. Therefore, the supplier is clearly exonerated regarding their engineering effort estimations for the solution architecture given to them."

[182] However, I also added: "I understand you have requested effort estimations for a given a specific scope of work and given solution approach. But looking at the scope, the scope involves transferring small amounts well-structured data from various locations across the UK into a central database just one time. I believe your requested

solution is a very expensive and complex one for such one-off data transfer. This could have been gathered via a well-structured data entry form in Microsoft Excel, or we could have defined a small workflow on the low-code platform we operate ourselves. Both would have been much more cost effective."

[183] I continued with this analogy: "In terms of the problem it solves, this project currently looks like this: We are a dairy. There are farms in different parts of the city. Just one-off, we need to collect just a few gallons of milk from a few farms and bring it to the dairy. Why lay down a bespoke railway track to these farms for this? We could just hire a van, fit a cold-chain setup inside, or even call an Uber and fill the baggage with ice-packs. Why build such expensive infrastructure? Considering the problem it solves versus the technical complexity and cost, I believe this is a very inefficient investment."

[184] The supplier company did not object to my assessments at all. I didn't follow up the rest of the process, but to the best I recall, the project was cancelled following my advice.

[185] In this instance, the price for the values of trustworthiness was paid in advance, where I had already

acted consistently and got recognised as a person of high integrity and fairness, always upholding fair public interest even when it would be against my own unfair interests. I had always promoted the notion of relentless focus to deliver the best value for the public, which was one of the key success factors of my consultancy supplier that grew much better than any other suppliers in that particular account.