

To: LAW - Examencommissie[examencommissie@law.leidenuniv.nl]
From: 5.1.2e
Sent: Sun 5.1.2e 7:49:43 PM
Subject: 5.1.2e suspicion of fraud - invitation to state your views
Received: Sun 5.1.2e 7:50:52 PM
[Statement by 5.1.2e.pdf](#)
[Supporting Documents.zip](#)

Dear Professor,

I hope this message finds you well.

I am attaching my written response and accompanying documents that respond to the allegation.

I have provided detailed responses. Additionally, I have included relevant evidence to support my statement.

I appreciate the opportunity to address this matter. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you require any further information. I'm happy to participate in the meeting and explain the incident.

Thank you for reading this letter during your busy schedule, and I look forward to hearing from you!

Kind regards,

5.1.2e

From: LAW - Examencommissie <examencommissie@law.leidenuniv.nl>
Sent: Tuesday, 5.1.2e 3:50 PM
To: 5.1.2e <5.1.2e@umail.leidenuniv.nl>
Subject: 5.1.2e suspicion of fraud - invitation to state your views

Dear 5.1.2e

Your thesis supervisor has found irregularities in the draft text of your thesis that you submitted last week, irregularities that have given rise to a suspicion of fraud. The reasons for this suspicion are:

1. your written and spoken English are so far apart that it is almost unreasonable to believe that you wrote the draft yourself;
2. even if it is assumed that you wrote the text yourself, when asked about your writing process (about one week after you submitted your first piece) your answer was "I do not know", and when asked the same question in another way, you maintained that you could not tell your supervisor how you wrote your thesis draft;
3. on more than one occasion, in more than one draft, there are sources that are made up (or in AI-terms "hallucinated"). In older drafts, there was one occasion there was a source that was written by a real person, but the citation contained the wrong journal. There were statistics from a real website, but the website did not contain those statistics (the numbers were off by quite literally tens of millions). In a new draft you submitted, insofar as your supervisor has had the time to establish this you refer to one source by a real professor in a real book, but the chapter referred to does not exist, and the page number is completely incorrect (the professor did write a chapter for this book, but on an entirely different topic and about 450 pages further in the book).

In accordance with the provisions contained in Article 6.2 of the [Rules and Regulations](#) (R&R), the supervisor reported 5.1.2e findings to the Board of Examiners. The supervisor notified you of the suspicion and of the fact that 5.1.2e reported this to the Board of Examiners.

The Board of Examiners will initiate an investigation into what happened and, once it has been completed, will take a decision about whether to impose a sanction. Before it does so, you are hereby invited to state your views on the matter and on its possible consequences. The Board would like to hear your views (via e-mail) on this on Monday, 5.1.2e 12:00 hrs. at the latest.

Yours kindly, on behalf of the Board of Examiners,

5.1.2e



Universiteit
Leiden

Universiteit Leiden | 5.1.2e | Steenschuur 25 | 2311 ES
Leiden | examencommissie@law.leidenuniv.nl