

To: LAW - Examencommissie[examencommissie@law.leidenuniv.nl]
From: 5.1.2e
Sent: Tue 5.1.2e 12:05:07 PM
Subject: Fwd: 5.1.2e: suspicion of fraud - invitation to state your views
Received: Tue 5.1.2e 12:05:27 PM

Dear 5.1.2e and Members of the Board of Examiners,

I would like to apologise. I submitted my views last Sunday before the deadline you had given me, but I have just realised that I mistakenly sent them to my Umail address instead of yours. This happened because I have an automatic forward from Umail to my personal email, and I didn't notice the error at the time.

Please find my views below.

Apologies once again for the oversight.

Best regards,

5.1.2e

----- Forwarded message -----

From: 5.1.2e <5.1.2e@gmail.com>
Date: Sun, 5.1.2e at 23:23
Subject: Re: 5.1.2e suspicion of fraud - invitation to state your views
To: 5.1.2e <5.1.2e@umail.leidenuniv.nl>

Dear 5.1.2e and Members of the Board of Examiners,

Thank you for your message and for allowing me to provide my response regarding the concerns raised about my submitted thesis.

Firstly, I want to express my sincere apologies. I acknowledge that several references in my submitted thesis were incorrect, and I fully accept responsibility for not conducting the appropriate verification and source checking that is expected at the masters level. I understand that this is not in line with the academic integrity standards of Leiden University.

Below, I would like to clarify each of the points raised:

1. 5.1.2e - This was one of the textbooks I used 5.1.2e. However, I now realize that the cited publication year is inaccurate.

2. 5.1.2e - This reference was incorrect. The intended source was: 5.1.2e
5.1.2e

3. 5.1.2e - This was also incorrect. The correct reference is: 5.1.2e
5.1.2e

4. 5.1.2e Also wrong, the correct reference was: 5.1.2e

5. 5.1.2e The original reference was supposed to be: 5.1.2e

247412 5.1.2e

0096

6. [redacted] 5.1.2e [redacted] 5.1.2e In fact, the case is fabricated. I relied on a secondary online blog post and failed to verify the existence of this case. I understand this was a serious oversight.

7. [redacted] 5.1.2e This citation is incorrect and the intended reference was: [redacted] 5.1.2e [redacted] 5.1.2e

I have been reflecting on how these errors occurred for almost a week now, and despite being surprised initially, I believe a potential explanation to this could be:

[redacted] 5.1.2e

- I also acknowledge I used AI tools in other two ways: to help format all the citations and footnotes in line with the required style and to assist in translation and language.

However, during this process, some sources appear to be altered, misreferenced or even fabricated. Maybe due to unclear or imprecise orders to the AI on my side (asking the AI tool to "correct" a citation, for example). I can see that in some cases, the citation was altered only in part [redacted] 5.1.2e, or the Title of the relevant literature was more or less maintained but attributed to a non-existent author [redacted] 5.1.2e [redacted] 5.1.2e. Also fabrications of a mix between the Name and the Surname of the author - [redacted] 5.1.2e. For others I do not have an explanation of why did the AI change correct citations for wrong and unexistent ones. Now, I deeply regret relying on this tools without properly verifying every citation after the translation and adaptation to the style.

In addition, I relied on some online blogs and secondary sources when IU could not directly access legal literature or find the relevant [redacted] 5.1.2e. And, again, I failed to critically verify the legitimacy of some of those sources.

To give context, I have been working on this thesis on and off [redacted] 5.1.2e because of [redacted] 5.1.2e. During this time I had [redacted] 5.1.2e [redacted] 5.1.2e [redacted] 5.1.2e. I only submitted the full draft to [redacted] 5.1.2e on [redacted] 5.1.2e under the mistaken impression that the process required a single draft to be delivered to the supervisor before the deadline for the final version. I received [redacted] 5.1.2e feedback on [redacted] 5.1.2e a month after, in which [redacted] 5.1.2e mentioned concerns about academic integrity. By that time, unfortunately, I had already submitted the final version to Brightspace (because I wrongly thought that the deadline was [redacted] 5.1.2e instead of [redacted] 5.1.2e). I take full responsibility for not engaging my supervisor earlier and for submitting without review. Had I received feedback sooner, I would never have submitted the thesis in that form and would have postponed submission to another semester.

I accept the Board's right to impose consequences for my errors. But i would also like to ask for the opportunity to revise and resubmit my thesis under supervision and following Leiden's academic integrity. After investing so much time and effort into the master's degree, and having made significant personal and professional sacrifices to complete it, I am fully committed to rectifying this situation and graduating in the future in accordance with the standards of Leiden University.

Thank you again for considering my explanation. I remain available for any further clarification.

Sincerely,

[redacted] 5.1.2e

[redacted] 5.1.2e <[redacted] 5.1.2e @umail.leidenuniv.nl> [redacted] 5.1.2e 17:08:

Dear 5.1.2e

Your thesis supervisor has found irregularities in your thesis that you submitted a few weeks ago, irregularities that have given rise to a suspicion of fraud (use of artificial intelligence). The reasons for this suspicion are:

- Footnote 24

5.1.2e

This is an 5.1.2e book that was published in 5.1.2e between 5.1.2e, not in 5.1.2e

- Footnotes 29-31

5.1.2e

This book does not appear to exist. It is a relevant author, but 5.1.2e has no such publication.

- Footnote 32 (repeated elsewhere multiple times)

5.1.2e

5.1.2e

Date and ECLI number do not match case name and case number.

- Footnote 35

5.1.2e

This book does not appear to exist. There is a book with a [similar title from a different author](#), published in 5.1.2e.

- Footnote 45

5.1.2e

This book does not appear to exist. It is a relevant author, but 5.1.2e only has written a book 5.1.2e

- Footnote 81

5.1.2e

5.1.2e

This case does not exist. ECLI code, date, case number are all from different cases. This case name cannot be found ([only in part](#)). The accompanying text make various claims about things supposedly discussed in this judgement.

- Footnote 69

5.1.2e

5.1.2e

This case does not exist. ECLI code, date, name, case number are all from different cases. The case name cannot be found ([only in part](#)). The accompanying text make various claims about things supposedly discussed in this judgement.

• p. 21 5.1.2e

5.1.2e

Incorrect facts. 5.1.2e

5.1.2e

• Pp. (22-) 5.1.2e

5.1.2e 5.1.2e

• P. 27 5.1.2e

5.1.2e

5.1.2e

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