

To: 5.1.2e [redacted] 5.1.2e [redacted] @law.leidenuniv.nl
Cc: 5.1.2e [redacted] 5.1.2e [redacted] @law.leidenuniv.nl
From: LAW - Examencommissie
Sent: Tue 5.1.2e [redacted] 7:05:51 AM
Subject: RE: Suspected case of AI/Plagiarism
Received: Tue 5.1.2e [redacted] 7:05:00 AM

Dear 5.1.2e [redacted]

Thank you for your email. Could you please inform the student that you reported this to the Board of Examiners and that the Board will investigate the case further to decide whether or not a sanction is appropriate, and if so, what the sanction will be, and that in the course of this investigation the Board will of course contact 5.1.2e [redacted] and give 5.1.2e [redacted] an opportunity to respond to our findings?

Also, please do not release 5.1.2e [redacted] grade before the Board has decided.

We will, of course, keep you informed.

Best regards, on behalf of the Board of Examiners,
5.1.2e [redacted]



Universiteit Leiden | Faculteit der Rechtsgeschiedenis
Steenschuur 25 | 2311 ES Leiden | examencommissie@law.leidenuniv.nl

From: 5.1.2e [redacted] <5.1.2e [redacted]@law.leidenuniv.nl>
Sent: Monday, 5.1.2e [redacted] 1:19 PM
To: LAW - Examencommissie <examencommissie@law.leidenuniv.nl>
Cc: 5.1.2e [redacted] <5.1.2e [redacted]@law.leidenuniv.nl>; 5.1.2e [redacted] <5.1.2e [redacted]@law.leidenuniv.nl>
Subject: Suspected case of AI/Plagiarism

Dear Exam Committee,

I would like to bring to your attention a case of suspected use of Artificial Intelligence/plagiarism in a Reg LLM master's thesis.

This concerns the submission by 5.1.2e [redacted]. During 5.1.2e [redacted] drafting period, it was difficult to get the student to understand the feedback I gave 5.1.2e [redacted]. When 5.1.2e [redacted] submitted 5.1.2e [redacted] final draft, I had a meeting with 5.1.2e [redacted] and the thesis coordinator, 5.1.2e [redacted], during the review of this piece, I found some inconsistencies in the footnotes and sources, among others, by textually citing quotes from sources that did not exist in the cited piece. In this sense, we reminded 5.1.2e [redacted] that 5.1.2e [redacted] could not use AI to write the thesis and also reminded the student of the need to be careful with the sources and citations used in the final submission.

After receiving 5.1.2e [redacted] official submission, I have found several inconsistencies and issues in the thesis. For instance, the student cites a book that does not exist. Similarly, there are a couple of papers that are cited, but the publishing journal and/or title do not correspond with the actual article that is published. These findings came after a cursory check of the footnotes and sources. So it could be the case that there are more instances. I am attaching the thesis in its Word format with my comments on the sides as well as control change highlights on the spotted issues.

As a result of our meeting to discuss the grading with 5.1.2e [redacted] we decided that it was better to send you the case for revision.

Kind regards,

5.1.2e

5.1.2e

Leiden University



Universiteit
Leiden

Universiteit Leiden | Faculteit der Rechtsgeleerdheid -

5.1.2e

5.1.2e

The Netherlands | +31 (0)70

5.1.2e

| www.universiteitleiden.nl