

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO BULLETIN OF 26 OCTOBER 1976

Issue I

REISSUED 12 NOVEMBER 1987

Remimeo
All HCOs
All Tech Divs
All Qual Divs
All Courses

(Reissued to include this HCOB as
part of the Auditor Admin Series.)

(Also issued as HCO PL 26 Oct 76
Issue I, same title.)

C/S Series 97
Auditor Admin Series 25

AUDITING REPORTS, FALSIFYING OF

Probably the most covert and vicious crime in auditing
is falsifying an auditing report.

At first glance, to someone who is trying to PR himself
as an auditor or to escape consequences of session goofs,
this might not seem to be the huge crime that it is.

When an auditing report is falsified, means of repair-
ing the pc are denied, out-tech and a need for restudy or
redrilling of materials is covered up, out-tech is spread
about and the repute of the org and Scientology are at risk.

There are many ways of falsifying an auditing report.
Chief amongst them is omission of vital data in the report.
Another is faking the things run or the pc's actions or
reactions.

To the person doing this, it may seem that he has covered
up his incompetence, but in actual fact it is eventually
detected.

A twice-declared person recently messed up the cases of
several VIPs by simply omitting some of their disagreements
with what was being done.

Three SPs, now declared, some years ago had a mutual
understanding that they would not put down each other's
withholds. These three also falsified auditing reports
to the effect that they had run certain things on pcs "and
there was nothing on them," when in fact they either had
not run them or there was reaction which they did not put
into the report. They messed up about a dozen people be-
fore they were caught and it took many, many hours of care-
ful C/Sing and auditing to salvage those cases (and it
also took about two years). They made several hundred
serious enemies for themselves and today I doubt any
Scientologist would even speak to them and their names are
remembered with scathing contempt.

It is not only easy to detect a falsified auditing
report, it is also inevitable that it will be detected.

The person whose auditing reports have been falsified is easy to spot in folders and records. The auditor marks "VGIs, F/N" and the Examiner notes bypassed charge and bad indicators. An auditor seeking to prevent this being detected has been known to take the Examiner Report from the folder, but that there is no Examiner Report would be the first thing a C/S would notice. Examiner Reports have been forged and exchanged with the actual one but this too is very visible.

Lack of a proper success story points directly to out-tech, and if it is not visible in the folder, then that folder contains falsified auditing reports.

The pc in the midst of his auditing, refuses to re-sign for more. An inspection of folder either finds the out-tech in the auditing reports or it doesn't. If the Folder Error Summary finds no out-tech, the next thing that is looked for is falsified auditing reports and this is extended to looking at the other cases this auditor has handled to see if there is any similarity of reaction.

A D of P interview with the pc will reveal falsified auditing reports. It will contain data that does not appear in the auditing reports. The first thing suspect is the auditing reports.

Basically, correct tech applied by a competent auditor who has been trained and interned, works and works every time. When it "doesn't work," a C/S begins to look for the real scene. There are many ways he can ascertain the actual scene. Amongst these are outside-the-door session taping, monitors, interviews, lack of success stories, failures to declare, failures to re-sign, Examiner Reports at variance with the session reports, personal checkup into the case and many others.

The only thing which temporarily misleads a C/S is a falsified auditing report. But in all our experience with these, the detection of such reports is inevitable even if it occurs a long time afterwards.

The person who would falsify an auditing report is usually found to be a suppressive with abundant R/Ses and evil intentions who never should have been trained in the first place.

Therefore, the penalty for knowingly falsifying an auditing report in order to make oneself seem more competent than one is or to hide departures from the C/S or to omit vital data necessary to C/Sing, resulting in upsets to a case and time spent in investigation by seniors, is actionable by a Committee of Evidence and, if the matter is proven beyond reasonable doubt, a cancellation of all certificates and awards, a declare and an expulsion order are mandatory.

Should the person perpetrating the falsification of auditing reports run away (blow) before action can be taken, the result is the same and is enforceable even if the person is not present.

A green auditor may look upon the offense as slight. If he is too untrained to realize that proper application of tech works every time and that improper application is a gross overt act, he may not realize the seriousness of his action. This, however, cannot be pleaded as a defense. It is not a light thing to end the hopes and close the door on a pc just because one is trying to cover up his blunders. The blundering auditor can be repaired by cramming and retraining. But only if it is known how he has blundered. That in itself is nowhere near as serious as hiding the fact.

HCOB 26.10.76 I
Reiss. 12.11.87

- 3 -

Honesty is the road to truth.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:CSI:nt:sap