Refutation of Tarski-Grothendieck set theory

From: en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tarski–Grothendieck_set_theory

Axiom: $\forall x\exists y\,[x\in y \wedge \forall z\in y\,(P(z)\subseteq y \wedge P(z)\in y) \wedge \forall z\in P(y)\,((\neg z\approx y) \to z\in y)]$ (1.1)

We assume the Meth8/VŁ4 apparatus and method.

LET p q r s: x, y, z, P.
necessity, for all; % possibility, for one or some;
> Imply, greater than; < Not Imply, less than, ∈; = Equivalent to, ≈

(#p&%q) & ((p<q)&((#r<q)&((~((s&r)>q)&((s&r)>q))&((#r<(s&q))&((~r=q)>(r<q)))))) ;
FFFF FFFF FFFF FFFF (1.2)

Remark: The consequent in Eq. 1.2 has the same table result as Eq. 1.2. Therefore the quantifier as the antecedent has no affect on the result.

Eq. 1.2 as rendered is *not* tautologous. This means the axiom of Tarski-Grothendieck set theory in Eq. 1.1 is refuted.