I'll introduce briefly a case of "pseudo-ellipsis" which appears within a non-restrictive relative clause, as shown in (1).

(1) It looked like the results had been tampered with, which I'm sure he would never do ___.

The gap following 'do' at first blush appears to be an instance of verb phrase ellipsis, but upon further examination turns out to be a filler-gap dependency licensed by relativization. (Under a movement analysis, the gap is formed when 'which' moves to the spec of CP in the relative clause.)

I point out that cases like (1) are instances of filler/gap mismatch: the filler in this case is a passive VP, while the gap is interpreted as active. Filler-gap dependencies traditionally involve both a syntactic (wh-movement) and semantic (coindexation between the wh-element and its relativized head) dependency. I'll invite discussion of whether acceptable mismatch of the sort in (1) can be accommodated by the traditional account, perhaps by appealing to the semantic half of the dependency.

Next I ask whether that same account can be extended to explain cases of unacceptable mismatch, as in (2), which seems to behave more like a syntactic dependency, enforcing structural identity between the filler and the gap (cf. (3)).

(2) ? The results were challenged by the committee, which the judges did as well.
(3) The committee challenged the results, which the judges did as well.