

From: [REDACTED] 5.1.2e <[REDACTED] 5.1.2e @law.leidenuniv.nl>
Sent: Tuesday, [REDACTED] 5.1.2e 8:52 AM
To: [REDACTED] 5.1.2e <[REDACTED] 5.1.2e @law.leidenuniv.nl>
Cc: [REDACTED] 5.1.2e <[REDACTED] 5.1.2e @law.leidenuniv.nl>
Subject: Fraud in thesis: [REDACTED] 5.1.2e

In the thesis of [REDACTED] 5.1.2e Adv. LLM student [REDACTED] 5.1.2e (attached), the supervisor [REDACTED] 5.1.2e and the second reader [REDACTED] 5.1.2e found a number of problematic references. Discussing this with the student, it emerged that most of the problems relate to careless or unprofessional dealing with actual and relevant sources. We can deal with these issues ourselves, taking them into account in the grading.

However, in addition to this, there is also the use of non-existing academic material in the footnotes, which we consider a case of fraud. This, we wish to report to the Exam Commission.

Here is what it is about – first our message to the student on the matter (1), then the student's answer to us (2) and finally our response (3):

(1) [REDACTED] 5.1.2e to the student (e-mail of [REDACTED] 5.1.2e):

"I am afraid that we have difficulties in understanding some of your referencing, i.e. your footnotes. Here are five examples, which we ask you to explain to us: [...]"

Footnotes 23 and 28 [REDACTED] 5.1.2e: these articles do not seem to exist; at least the relevant pages in the journal that you indicate contain no such contributions (there are entirely different articles instead). How do you explain this? Have we overlooked something? Note that this is a particularly serious issue since the indication of non-existent academic material by a student in written work is a form of fraud and will have to be reported to the Exam Commission.

Please send your answers to these questions to us by this upcoming Monday, [REDACTED] 5.1.2e before midnight."

(2) Student [REDACTED] to the professors (e-mail of [REDACTED]):

“Regarding Footnotes 28, 35, and 38: I mistakenly cited the [REDACTED] article as if it appeared in [REDACTED] but that was an error. What I intended to reference was [REDACTED] published by [REDACTED] [REDACTED] which discusses [REDACTED] arguments and cites [REDACTED] original work (from [REDACTED]). I apologize for the confusion — I should have cited the [REDACTED] paper directly, as that was the actual source I engaged with.

This is the correct article... [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

(3) [REDACTED] to the student ([REDACTED]):

“We note your explanations, dear [REDACTED] which [REDACTED] and myself have discussed.

We find, based on your explanations, that some of the mistakes “simply” reflect a lack of sufficient care in dealing with sources. That is, of course, a problem but then one we can deal with ourselves by taking it into account in the grading.

However, the issue of the article by [REDACTED] is a wholly different story: you argue that you found this author through the work of [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] indeed refers to [REDACTED] but then to an article from [REDACTED] a wholly different title. So, this author does exist and [REDACTED] has indeed written on matters that, in terms of the topic, can be relevant for your work. However, the fact remains that [REDACTED] wrote nothing with the title and in the journal that you indicated in your footnote. It is our impression that you may have relied on AI here without then checking what it presented to you. The unfortunate, and highly problematic result of this is that your footnotes refer to non-existent academic material. That, we will have to report to the Exam Commission.”

Following the Adv LLM rules, we request the Exam Commission to look into this matter and to decide on a sanction.

Best regards,

5.1.2e

5.1.2e

Leiden University,

5.1.2e

5.1.2e

NL - 2300 RA Leiden

(office address: Steenschuur 25, 2311 ES Leiden)

Tel. +31-7

5.1.2e

Fax +31-7

5.1.2e

e-mail

5.1.2e

5.1.2e@law.leidenuniv.nl and

5.1.2e

5.1.2e