

To: 5.1.2e [5.1.2e @umail.leidenuniv.nl]
From: LAW - Examencommissie
Sent: Thur 5.1.2e 2:50:52 PM
Subject: 5.1.2e decision Board of Examiners
Received: Thur 5.1.2e 2:50:00 PM

Dear 5.1.2e

On 5.1.2e you submitted your thesis for the master's programme 5.1.2e Your thesis supervisor found irregularities in your thesis that gave rise to a suspicion of fraud (use of artificial intelligence). In accordance with the provisions contained in Article 6.2 of the [Rules and Regulations](#) (R&R), the supervisor reported his findings to the Board of Examiners. The supervisor notified you of the suspicion and of the fact that he reported this to the Board of Examiners.

The Board of Examiners has studied your thesis and the information given by the examiner and on 5.1.2e gave you an opportunity to state your views on the matter and its possible consequences. On 5.1.2e you responded to this request via email. You write: "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
5.1.2e

6. 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. 5.1.2e This citation is incorrect and the intended reference was: 5.1.2e
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:

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 5.1.2e, or the Title of the relevant literature was more or less maintained but attributed to a non-existent author 5.1.2e

5.1.2e Also fabrications of a mix between the Name and the Surname of the author - 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 adaptaton 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 247410 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 for 5.1.2e because of 5.1.2e During this time I had 5.1.2e 5.1.2e

I only submitted the full draft to 5.1.2e on 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 5.1.2e feedback on 5.1.2e a month after, in which 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 5.1.2e instead of 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."

The Board of Examiners considers as follows.

Pursuant to Article 6.1 R&R, insofar as relevant here, fraud is understood to mean "any action or omission that renders proper judgment of someone's knowledge, insight, skills, (professional) attitude or reflection entirely or partially impossible. This includes in any event the possession of unauthorised communication equipment, software such as unauthorised AI software", "making use of fictitious research data, graphs, literature and literature references". Pursuant to the same article, plagiarism is a form of fraud and includes in any event "[u]sing or copying someone else's texts, data or ideas without complete and accurate source referencing".

It follows from this definition that for there to be fraud, the intention of the student is irrelevant.

There can be no doubt that you are guilty of fraud as defined in Article 6.1, because especially from the third chapter onward, the text, as already noted by your supervisor, is indeed characteristic of AI: very vague, abstract reflections that sometimes haphazardly throw things together, and a great deal of repetition of the same. Also it is striking that you refer to 5.1.2e literature, but never to a page number, which also suggests the use of AI.

Moreover, and as already noted by your supervisor also, a significant number of references in your work show that you have made use of AI, which you yourself now also admit in your e-mail to the Board of Examiners:

- Footnote 24 refers to an 5.1.2e book that was published in 5.1.2e between 5.1.2e not in 5.1.2e;
- Footnotes 29-31 refer to a book that does not exist;
- In footnote 32, repeated elsewhere multiple times, the date and the ECLI-number do not match the case name and case number;
- Footnote 35 refers to a book that does not exist, there is a book with a similar title, but that book was written by another author and was published in 5.1.2e not in 5.1.2e;
- Footnote 45 also refers to a book that does not exist. According to your supervisor, 5.1.2e is a relevant author, but 5.1.2e has only written a book with the title "5.1.2e";
- Footnote 81 refers to a case that does not exist; ECLI-number, date, and case number are all from different cases; this case name cannot be found ([only in part](#)); the accompanying text makes various claims about things supposedly discussed in this judgement;
- Footnote 69 also refers to a case that does not exist; ECLI-number, date, name, and 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;
- On page 21, the text reads: "5.1.2e 5.1.2e 5.1.2e However, according to the supervisor's information, these are incorrect facts. "5.1.2e 5.1.2e

- On page 21-22, the tekst reads: "5.1.2e 5.1.2e However, according to the information of the supervisor, 5.1.2e does not exist in 5.1.2e only in some other 5.1.2e

- On page 27, the tekst reads: "5.1.2e 5.1.2e

5.1.2e

5.1.2e
5.1.2e
supervisor, this was 5.1.2e not 5.1.2e, which in its judgement on that decision 5.1.2e
did not refer to 5.1.2e (but to a different one: 5.1.2e 5.1.2e was not even adopted at the
time of the disputed 5.1.2e”

With regard to the question of whether a sanction should be imposed and, if so, which sanction is appropriate, the Board of Examiners notes that fraud is regarded by the university as a serious offence, which in principle must be dealt with strictly. In the words of the Examination Appeals Board: “The starting point of the Board, as well as of the university, is that fraud in any form or scale is not tolerated within an academic environment.” “The academic ‘company’ exists by virtue of trust in the integrity of the scholar. A (prospective) scholar must therefore refrain from fraud at all times (...)”.

The Board of Examiners endorses this point of view, also in the light of the task assigned to it by law to guarantee the quality of the exams and examinations.

The Board of Examiners is of the opinion that you are guilty of extensive fraud, by submitting a master thesis containing a number of references to sources that do not exist or that do not correspond to the arguments attributed to it. What you say in your email of 5.1.2e to the Board of Examiners cannot excuse or justify this. There can also be no doubt that you were well aware of what you were doing, but that this did not stop you from submitting the thesis. You have thus demonstrated a lack of academic integrity. Therefore, the Board is of the opinion that an official warning or declaring the result of your thesis invalid would not do justice to the facts and that there is no reason to give you an opportunity to repair the defects.

Therefore, the Board, by virtue of Article 7.12b paragraph 2 of the Higher Education and Scientific Research Act (*Wet op het hoger onderwijs en wetenschappelijk onderzoek, WHW*) and Article 6.6.3 sub b. and c. *R&R*

- declares the result of your thesis invalid; and
- excludes you from the opportunity to repair and resubmit your thesis.

This means that your thesis will not be graded and that you have to write a new thesis, on another subject.

Your supervisor and the thesis coordinator have been informed of this decision.

A note of this decision will be added to your electronic file (i.e. uSis), which will not be shared with other persons.

On behalf of the Board of Examiners of Leiden Law School,

5.1.2e

An [appeal](#) against this decision lies with the Examination Appeals Board, c/o Rapenburg 70, PO Box 9500, 2300 RA Leiden or via email: cbe@bb.leidenuniv.nl. An appeal must be lodged within six weeks after the decision having been emailed to you.