

To: 5.1.2e 5.1.2e @law.leidenuniv.nl]
Cc: 5.1.2e 5.1.2e @law.leidenuniv.nl]; 5.1.2e @LAW.leidenuniv.nl]
From: LAW - Examencommissie
Sent: Thur 5.1.2e 10:39:54 AM
Subject: RE: Potential Plagiarism LLM thesis (5.1.2e student ID: 5.1.2e
Received: Thur 5.1.2e 10:39:00 AM

Dear 5.1.2e

The Board of Examiners received a request from 5.1.2e to reconsider its decision to declare the result for 5.1.2e master thesis invalid. Given the information that 5.1.2e has now provided, the Board has decided to grant 5.1.2e request to be afforded an opportunity to repair (or rectify) the thesis. However, the grade that 5.1.2e will subsequently receive will be capped at a grade 6. It is for you as examiner/supervisor to decide what the reparation should entail.

We have informed the student of our decision and told 5.1.2e that 5.1.2e should contact you as soon as possible.

Yours kindly, on behalf of the Board of Examiners,

5.1.2e

From: LAW - Examencommissie

Sent: maandag 5.1.2e 16:18

To: 5.1.2e

Cc: 5.1.2e

Subject: RE: Potential Plagiarism LLM thesis (5.1.2e student ID: 5.1.2e)

Dear 5.1.2e

The Board has declared the result of the thesis invalid. This means that the student will have to write a new thesis.

We just sent the decision to the student.

Best wishes,

5.1.2e

From: 5.1.2e <5.1.2e @law.leidenuniv.nl>

Sent: Monday, 5.1.2e 2:24 PM

To: LAW - Examencommissie <examencommissie@law.leidenuniv.nl>

Cc: 5.1.2e <5.1.2e @law.leidenuniv.nl>; 5.1.2e <5.1.2e @LAW.leidenuniv.nl>

Subject: Potential Plagiarism LLM thesis 5.1.2e , student ID: 5.1.2e

Dear the Board of Examiners,

I am writing here to refer you to irregularities which I encountered in marking the thesis of one of my supervisees, 5.1.2e

5.1.2e student ID: 5.1.2e

5.1.2e

According to the Turnitin report (please see attached), it appears that the student's thesis has 32% similarities with one particular source: 5.1.2e

5.1.2e (see page 50 of the report)

In particular, I refer you to sections 4.1 to 4.3 of the thesis (see pages 28 to 39 of the report), which are highly similar both in terms of the text, the formatting, and the footnotes. While the student cited 5.1.2e book at the bibliography section (at page 46), the original source was not cited in many of the footnotes relating to the irregularities (meaning that the footnotes were also potentially plagiarized). There were also a couple of paragraphs in section 1.1 and section 2.2, which were highly similar to the original source without proper citation. I discussed the matter with the assigned second reader of the thesis, 5.1.2e (who is also in cc). We both agree that the similarities were extensive, and thus, we decided to refer this matter directly to your attention.

I contacted the students in due course. I also cc 5.1.2e who is 5.1.2e thesis for

5.1.2e

Thank you again for your time and attention to this matter.

Yours faithfully,

5.1.2e

5.1.2e Leiden University