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**Trial Division – *s. B.i.1(f)* and *s. B.i.1(a)* of the *Code* – concoction and forged documents – Student concocted references to sources in a research report – Student falsified the document outlining his sanction to reflect a lesser penalty – Student attached the falsified document to his appeal documents – hearing not attended – reasonable notice of hearing provided – finding on evidence – finding on guilt – 5-year suspension; recommendation of expulsion; case reported to Provost for publication**

Student charged under *s. B.i.1(f)* and *s. B.i.1(a)* of the *Code*. The charges related to allegations that the Student concocted references to one or more sources in a research report, and that when offered a proposed sanction for the concoction, the Student knowingly altered or falsified the sanction letter to reduce the suggested penalty in his appeal of the sanction. The Student was not present at the hearing. The Panel heard evidence that the Student had accessed his ROSI account. The Panel found that reasonable notice of the hearing had been provided in accordance with the *Code*, and the hearing continued in the absence of the Student.

Student found guilty with respect to both charges. The Panel accepted evidence that the sources referenced in the Student’s report did not exist, and evidence that the University sanction document had been altered by the Student. The Panel emphasized the severity of the allegations, noting its astonishment that in the process of exercising his right to appeal his concoction sanction the Student would falsify the very document under consideration by the Vice Provost. The Panel concluded that its sanction for the Student should reflect the abhorrence of the Tribunal for this kind of misconduct, and should seek to deter other students from contemplating any sort of alternation of University documents. The Panel imposed a 5-year suspension; a recommendation of expulsion; and that the case be reported to the Provost for publication.