

STATE OF INDIANA
IN THE MONROE CIRCUIT COURT
SIXTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

Mark White, M.D.,
Plaintiff, pro se,

v.

The Trustees of Indiana University,
Defendant.

Cause No. 53C06-2508-CT-002221

****PLAINTIFF’S MOTION TO COMPEL DEPOSITION**

AND FOR LEAVE TO SUBMIT EXHIBIT G (THE STRUCTURE HYPOTHESIS)**

INTRODUCTION

Plaintiff, Mark White, M.D., respectfully moves this Court, pursuant to Indiana Trial Rules 26(B) and 37(A), to compel Defendant Indiana University to designate and produce for deposition an expert witness or witnesses competent to testify concerning the genetic code, the codon table, and the “Sequence Hypothesis” as those concepts are taught or represented by Indiana University.

Indiana Trial Rule 26(B) defines the broad scope of discoverable information, including expert identity and opinion, and Trial Rule 37(A) provides the mechanism to compel such discovery when a party fails to comply.

Plaintiff further requests leave of Court to submit Exhibit G: Deposition of Indiana University’s Designated Expert Witness, which defines the specific factual issues to be addressed in that deposition.

A telephone conference is presently scheduled in this matter. However, no meaningful progress can occur at that conference until the parties have completed initial factual discovery. The deposition requested herein will materially narrow and clarify the issues for the Court and for all future proceedings.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

1. This action concerns the accuracy and truthfulness of scientific representations made and taught by Indiana University regarding the genetic code and its graphical representation known as the codon table.
 2. Plaintiff asserts that the “flat codon table” taught as the genetic code is a false and misleading representation of the underlying scientific data.
 3. Plaintiff has produced *Exhibit G: The Structure Hypothesis*, demonstrating that the codon table can be fully and symmetrically represented only in spherical form. The exhibit establishes a clear, testable factual framework that defines the core scientific issue in this case.
 4. Defendant has provided no factual disclosure or expert identification explaining the basis for its continued instruction of the flat codon table or the validity of the Sequence Hypothesis.
 5. The discovery sought—a deposition of a designated expert witness—represents the most efficient and direct method to identify what Indiana University teaches as factual scientific truth and to determine the evidentiary foundation, if any, supporting that position.
-

ARGUMENT

I. The Requested Deposition Falls Within the Scope of Discovery Under Trial Rule 26(B)

Indiana Trial Rule 26(B)(1) permits discovery “regarding any matter, not privileged, which is relevant to the subject matter involved in the pending action,” including the identity and opinions of experts who may testify at trial.

This case turns entirely on a single factual question: *What does Indiana University teach as the true structure of the genetic code, and is that teaching scientifically accurate?*

Only expert testimony from Indiana University faculty or other designated representatives can establish the factual basis for Defendant’s position. The deposition sought therefore falls squarely within the permissible scope of discovery under Rule 26(B).

II. The Defense Has Withheld Discoverable Information, Justifying an Order to Compel Under Rule 37(A)

Trial Rule 37(A)(2) authorizes a party to move for an order compelling discovery when another party “fails to make disclosure or permit discovery.”

Defendant has not identified any expert witness or produced any factual evidence regarding its instruction of the genetic code. Without such disclosure, Plaintiff cannot prepare for the scheduled conference or for trial.

Compelling the deposition now will not prejudice the Defendant; it merely requires Indiana University to identify an appropriate expert—someone it already employs and pays to teach this very subject—and to make that individual available for deposition.

III. Early Deposition Will Promote Judicial Economy and Clarify the Issues for Conference

The purpose of the scheduled telephone conference is to organize discovery and define the issues for trial. Yet until Defendant produces a qualified witness to testify to its factual position, there are no facts upon which the Court can base further scheduling or rulings.

Ordering this deposition before the conference, or within twenty-one (21) days of this Order, whichever is sooner, will allow both parties to proceed with clarity and efficiency.

REQUEST FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that this Court:

1. Pursuant to Trial Rules 26(B) and 37(A), order Defendant The Trustees of Indiana University to designate and produce for deposition one or more expert witnesses competent to testify concerning the genetic code, the codon table, and the Sequence Hypothesis as taught or represented by Indiana University;
 2. Direct that such deposition occur prior to the currently scheduled telephone conference, or within twenty-one (21) days of this Order, whichever is sooner;
 3. Grant Plaintiff leave to submit Exhibit G: *The Structure Hypothesis* as the factual framework for that deposition; and
 4. Grant all further relief the Court deems just and proper.
-

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Mark White, M.D.

Plaintiff, Pro Se

PROPOSED ORDER

**ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO COMPEL DEPOSITION
AND FOR LEAVE TO SUBMIT EXHIBIT G**

The Court, having reviewed Plaintiff's Motion and being duly advised, now finds the Motion well-taken.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Defendant, The Trustees of Indiana University, shall designate and produce for deposition one or more expert witnesses competent to testify concerning the genetic code, the codon table, and the Sequence Hypothesis as taught or represented by Indiana University.

Said deposition shall occur prior to the currently scheduled telephone conference, or within twenty-one (21) days of this Order, whichever is sooner.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff is granted leave to submit Exhibit G: *The Structure Hypothesis* as the factual framework for that deposition.

So ordered this 14th day of October, 2025.

Hon. Kara E. Krothe
Judge, Monroe Circuit Court 6

Distribution:
All parties of record via ECF

EXHIBIT G

Deposition of Indiana University's Designated Expert Witness

Subject: Structure of the Genetic Code – “The Structure Hypothesis”

Submitted by:

Mark White, M.D., Plaintiff, pro se
Monroe County Circuit Court 6
Cause No. 53C06-2508-CT-002221

Purpose of Exhibit

This exhibit defines the factual and conceptual scope of questioning for the deposition of Indiana University's designated expert witness concerning the representation and teaching of the genetic code.

It is not testimony, opinion, or argument; it is a framework used to identify points of factual inquiry.

Factual Framework

1. Core Issue

Whether the *flat codon table* used in instruction at Indiana University accurately represents the structure of the genetic code.

2. Document Provided

Attached hereto is the paper titled “The Structure Hypothesis,” authored by Mark White, M.D. The document outlines two testable graphical representations of the genetic code:

- a planar (flat) codon table, and
- a spherical (round) codon table based on icosahedral symmetry.

3. Points for Examination

The following factual questions are identified for deposition:

- Does the flat codon table taught by Indiana University constitute a complete and accurate representation of the genetic code?
- Is the round (spherical) codon table a valid representation of the same data?
- What scientific reasoning supports the continued use of the flat model?

- Has Indiana University ever tested, compared, or evaluated alternative structural mappings?
- What functional properties (lookup, location, symmetry, compression, variable representation) does Indiana University attribute to the genetic code?
- Does Indiana University distinguish between a hypothesis, a *model*, a table, or a *map*, and the *underlying code* when teaching this material?

4. **Purpose of Inquiry**

To determine whether the structural representation of the genetic code currently taught at Indiana University is factual, accurate, and complete within the meaning of scientific instruction.

STRUCTURE HYPOTHESIS (DEPOSITION FRAMEWORK)

Purpose:

To provide a factual and definitional framework for the deposition of Indiana University's designated expert witness concerning the representation and teaching of the genetic code.

I. Background

1. In 1958, Francis Crick proposed the Sequence Hypothesis, asserting that the linear sequence of nucleotides in DNA determines the three-dimensional structure of proteins.
 2. Indiana University and most institutions teach the flat codon table—a two-dimensional chart correlating 64 codons with 20 amino acids—as the operative representation of the genetic code.
 3. The Plaintiff asserts an alternative Structure Hypothesis, which states that the observable data of the genetic code demonstrates that structure determines sequence, not the reverse.
 4. The flat codon table is presented as evidence supporting the sequence hypothesis.
 5. Logically, a round codon table would contradict or falsify the sequence hypothesis, yet the hypothesis has not been reconsidered or rejected.
-

II. Definitions and Factual Assertions for Examination

1. Flat Codon Table.

A planar graph that arranges triplet nucleotide sequences in rows and columns. It functions solely as a *lookup table* and conveys no spatial relationships among codons.

2. Round Codon Table.

An all-dimensional graph mapped onto the surface of a sphere—specifically an icosahedron—where:

- nucleotide nodes occupy the 12 vertices (or equivalent symmetrical positions);
- amino-acid nodes occupy the 20 triangular faces as cyclic permutations of those vertices.

3. Compression of Data.

Both tables compress the 192 nucleotides that correspond to codons and amino acids. The spherical model achieves *full compression*—retaining all symmetry and relational information—whereas the planar model achieves only partial compression.

4. Symmetry and Objectivity.

The flat table's structure is arbitrary and lacks objective spatial coordinates.

The round table is defined by perfect geometric symmetry, which is an objective and reproducible property of the data.

5. Variables and Permutations.

The flat table contains a single, fixed sequence of codons.

The round table reveals 20 cyclic permutations—each corresponding to a code variable—permitting analytical and computational operations on the code itself.

6. Functional Comparison.

Function	Flat	Round
Lookup	✓	✓
Location (spatial reference)	✗	✓
Symmetry	✗	✓
Compression (complete)	✗	✓
Variable representation	✗	✓

Map Analogy.

As a flat map of Earth distorts a spherical planet, a flat codon table distorts a spherical code. The spherical (round) representation preserves all true spatial relations of the underlying structure. Just as we cannot teach that the earth is flat, we cannot teach that the code is flat for the exact same reasons.

Conclusion to Be Examined.

Because the round codon table performs all the functions of the flat table and additional verified functions based on symmetry and compression, the flat codon table is an incomplete or false representation of the genetic code.

III. Topics for Witness Examination

1. Whether Indiana University teaches the flat codon table as the definitive representation of the genetic code.
2. Whether the University recognizes the existence or validity of spherical or symmetrical codon models.
3. Whether the University has ever evaluated the completeness, symmetry, or compression properties of the flat codon table.
4. What empirical or mathematical basis supports the continued use of the flat table.
5. Whether teaching the flat table as *the* genetic code could misrepresent the underlying structure to students or the public.

Submitted by:

Mark White, M.D., Plaintiff pro se

10-14-2025

CERTIFICATION OF GOOD-FAITH EFFORT TO CONFER

Pursuant to Indiana Trial Rule 37(A)(1), the Plaintiff hereby certifies that he has in good faith attempted to confer with counsel for the Defendant to obtain the requested discovery without court action. Despite those efforts, the Defendant has not provided any disclosure or identified any expert witness, making this Motion necessary.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Mark White, M.D.

Plaintiff, Pro Se

EXHIBIT H

Email evidence of good faith attempts to cooperate

Submitted by:

Mark White, M.D., Plaintiff, pro se
Monroe County Circuit Court 6
Cause No. 53C06-2508-CT-002221

Email 1:

From: mark@codefun.com
To: "Griffin, Zachary Robert"; "Kendall Bowers"
Subject: An Open Door, Anytime
Date: Thursday, October 9, 2025 1:25:00 PM

Dear Kendall and Zach,

I wanted to reach out directly.

You've both seen the filings, and you know this isn't a personal fight. It's a simple question about truth and correction — one that could still be handled quietly and cleanly if we talk.

I've been trying to have that conversation with Indiana University for twenty-two years, and I'd still prefer to do it that way. None of this needs to be adversarial or theatrical. I think all of us would rather see a quick, fair solution than drag the court further into it.

If either of you are willing, I'd be glad to speak with you anytime, informally and off the record.

We're all adults trying to do the right thing here.

Respectfully,
Mark White
(Mark)

Email 2:

From: mark@codefun.com
To: "Kendall Bowers"; "Griffin, Zachary Robert"
Subject: Cooperative Resolution Regarding Discovery
Date: Sunday, October 12, 2025 5:49:00 PM
Attachments: [compel2.pdf](#)

Kendall and Zach,

Before filing the attached *Motion to Compel Deposition and for Leave to Submit Exhibit G (The Structure Hypothesis)*, I wanted to reach out personally and in good faith. I would much rather work with Indiana University than against it. You, I, and the Court share the same objective—to preserve and enhance the reputation of IU.

The purpose of this discovery request is not adversarial. It's an opportunity for IU to lead, not to lose. If the University designates an appropriate expert and we can discuss these questions cooperatively, we can ensure that IU's teaching is accurate, current, and defensible before the Court is asked to rule on it.

The case will go forward; the only question is *how* it proceeds—constructively or adversarially. If we approach it together, transparently and professionally, the record will reflect well on everyone involved. But before we reach that point, we should each ask a simple question:

Why spend our time in court if we can solve the problem ourselves?

Surely no one at IU wants to defend a position that turns out to be incomplete or outdated. I believe the real issue is that IU has not yet had the opportunity to see the full problem clearly. If we clarify it together now, we can prevent that misunderstanding from continuing and protect IU's reputation in the process.

I'm not asking IU to surrender anything. I'm offering a way for the University to come out ahead. If IU designates an expert and we work through the structure of the genetic code cooperatively, the outcome can demonstrate that IU is a leader in clarifying a difficult topic rather than a defendant in a dispute. That's a win for the University, for the students, and for science.

I hope we can take that step cooperatively before the conference.

Please reply to confirm you received this and the attachment.

Respectfully,
Mark White, M.D.
Plaintiff pro se
(Mark) P.S. How 'bout dem Hoosiers! Go Colts!

Email 3:

From: mark@codefun.com
To: "Kendall Bowers"; "Griffin, Zachary Robert"
Subject: Summary of Good-Faith Efforts and Next Step
Date: Tuesday, October 14, 2025 8:48:00 AM
Attachments: [compel3.pdf](#)

Kendall and Zach,

From the beginning of this case my intention has been to resolve a factual question cooperatively. The claim itself was filed in good faith because it presents a specific, testable issue: whether the version of the genetic code currently taught by Indiana University accurately represents the scientific data.

For more than two decades I have tried to raise this issue through normal academic channels. Those efforts were met with silence, which is why the matter is now before the Court. The question is simple: the representation of the code can be shown, by its own internal logic, to contradict itself. Discovery is the proper venue to examine that contradiction and to determine what IU is actually teaching and why.

I continue to believe that cooperation serves everyone better than litigation. If IU wishes to identify an expert and discuss a cooperative way to proceed—including a voluntary deposition if needed—I'm ready to do that. If the University prefers not to engage, I'll move forward by filing the motion this afternoon so the Court can compel the same process. Either way, the goal is simply to get the facts on record as efficiently and respectfully as possible.

I have attached the updated filing. Please reply to confirm you received this and the attachment.

Respectfully,
Mark White, M.D.
Plaintiff pro se

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on October 14th, 2025, a copy of the foregoing was filed electronically through the Indiana E-Filing System (IEFS). Service of this filing will be made on all registered parties by operation of the Court's electronic filing system. Parties may access this filing through the Court's system.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Mark White, MD

Plaintiff, Pro Se