

**Dunn, Peter E.**

---

**From:** puherman@ritva.physics.ucla.edu on behalf of puherman [puherman@ritva.physics.ucla.edu]  
**Sent:** Monday, April 23, 2007 12:30 AM  
**To:** Dunn, Peter E.  
**Cc:** puherman@ritva.physics.ucla.edu  
**Subject:** (No subject header)

April 22, 2007

Dear Dr. Dunn:

This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter dated April 11 and received by me in a fedex envelope on April 17. It may have arrived at UCLA on April 16.

Needless to say this is a short fuse.

Here is my response:

In March 2006 Purdue issued a statement saying that with regard to Taleyarkhan's research Purdue will "conduct a thorough review of the work and any concerns expressed about it." So why am I- the PI on this project- first receiving a request for information one year after your published statement.

- 1) What is the purpose of the current request?
- 2) Is the purpose to generate information that would enable Purdue to decide whether or not to form a faculty committee of inquiry or investigation? If so then who decides whether or not to form such a committee?
- 3) If a committee of inquiry / investigation has already been formed then I shall be happy to meet with that committee to discuss this important matter and to work with them to determine, and provide, what information they need in order to reach a decision in this matter.
- 4) I recommend that you also include Eugenie Reich on your list of witnesses.
- 5) With regard to your list of items comprising research misconduct I wish to ask if: the generation of false data via methods that the community of scientists regards as reckless, constitutes research misconduct.

Sincerely yours  
Seth Putterman  
310-8252269

- 1731