



University of Toronto TORONTO ONTARIO M5S 1A1

---

## University Tribunal

October 21st, 1993

BY REGISTERED MAIL

PERSONAL AND CONFIDENTIAL

Ms A.

Markham, Ontario

Dear Ms A.

At its hearing on October 20th, 1993, the University Tribunal considered the following charges against you:

1. THAT in or about April, 1993, you did forge, alter or falsify an academic record contrary to section B.I.3.(a) of the University of Toronto Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters, 1991;
2. THAT in or about April, 1993, you did utter, circulate or make use of a forged, altered or falsified record contrary to section B.I(3)a of the University of Toronto Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters, 1991.

In particular, you submitted the second term paper in POL 209Y late. In order to excuse the lateness of the paper you submitted a note handwritten on a medical prescription form. Printed on the top of the form was the name and address of Dr. Manmohan Sharma, with handwriting which read: "[Ms. A.] , 23-3-93, Patient unable to attend school due to severe illness." Although the note was purportedly signed by Dr. Sharma, the handwriting and signature on the note were not Dr. Sharma's and the document was a forged, altered or falsified document.

I am writing to formally advise you of the decision of the Tribunal with respect to these charges. The jury acquitted you of charge #1 and found you guilty of charge #2. The jury agreed unanimously to impose the following sanctions:

- suspension from the University for a period of two years, beginning September 1994
- a grade of "O" in POL 209Y;
- Notation of the sanctions and the reasons for them to be recorded on your transcript for a period of four years beginning in September 1994;

- that the decision be reported to the Provost for publication in the University newspapers, with the name of the student withheld.

In reaching its decision, the jury stated that "We felt that there was nothing about Ms A.'s character that bore on the case. We did not feel that we were in a position to assess that. In terms of extenuating circumstances, we could not know what those were. In terms of detriment to the University, we felt that there was a fair bit: there was the reputation of the University to protect generally from offences of this nature. There was the fact that members of the community were dragged in. They spent a fair bit of time and trouble. Similarly, the University itself went through this proceeding without knowing whether, from the point of view of the defendant, the plea was guilty or not guilty. In terms of the seriousness of the offence, it is obviously a serious offence for somebody to try to cheat on an assignment required for a course, however, there was the sense that there were no previous offences and there is no way to know about the likelihood of repeating it. Again, there were no mitigating circumstances. On balance, we did not want to be any more aggressive than what the University's counsel had recommended. On the other hand, we did not want to be any more lenient than what the University recommended either, because we had very little way of making a decision in that area."

Information concerning rights of appeal may be found in Section C.III of the Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters. The deadline for filing an appeal by you or by the University is November 12th, 1993.

Yours truly,



Lynn Snowden  
Secretary  
University Tribunal

c.c.: R. David  
L.R. Rothstein  
P. Silcox  
D. Cook  
A. Sedra