

**THE UNIVERSITY TRIBUNAL  
THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO**

**IN THE MATTER OF** charges of academic dishonesty filed on February 12, 2024,

**AND IN THE MATTER OF** the University of Toronto *Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters, 2019*,

**AND IN THE MATTER OF** the *University of Toronto Act, 1971*, S.O. 1971, c. 56 as am. S.O. 1978, c. 88

B E T W E E N:

**UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO**

- and -

Q █████ Z █████

**REASONS FOR DECISION**

**Hearing Date:** August 20, 2025, via Zoom

**Members of the Panel:**

Alexi Wood, Chair

Professor Michael Saini, Faculty Panel Member

Albert Cheng, Student Panel Member

**Appearances:**

Tina Lie, Discipline Counsel, Paliare Roland Rosenberg Rothstein LLP

Adam Iggers, Discipline Counsel, Paliare Roland Rosenberg Rothstein LLP

**Hearing Secretary:**

Karen Bellinger, Associate Director, Office of Appeals, Discipline and Faculty Grievances

**Not in Attendance:**

Q █████ Z █████

**A. OVERVIEW**

1. The Student is alleged to have committed two acts of academic misconduct within nine months. First, in July 2022, she is alleged to have used an unauthorized aid or “tutoring” service in completing an assignment. The course instructor met with the Student in September 2022 to discuss her concerns about this assignment, which means the Student was on notice of possible academic misconduct by September 2022. Then in May 2023, the Student is alleged to have provided a falsified medical note to support a request for academic support.

2. While the Student attended a Dean’s Designate meeting and briefly corresponded with Discipline Counsel, she did not attend the hearing. The Panel found that reasonable notice was given and proceeded in the Student’s absence. As will be outlined below, the Panel found the Student guilty of three counts of academic misconduct and imposed a sanction, which included a zero in the two classes at issue and a suspension from the University for three years.

**B. THE CHARGES**

3. By letter dated February 12, 2024, the University outlined the charges against the Student as follows:

- a. On or about July 18, 2022, the Student knowingly obtained unauthorized assistance in connection with Assignment 1 in STA238H1S (the “**Stats Course**”), contrary to section B.I.1(b) of the Code.
- b. In the alternative to Charge 1, on or about July 18, 2022, the Student knowingly represented as her own an idea or expression of an idea or work of another in Assignment 1 in the Stats Course, contrary to section B.I.1(d) of the Code.

- c. In the alternative to Charges 2 and 3, on or about July 18, 2022, the Student knowingly engaged in a form of cheating, academic dishonesty or misconduct, fraud or misrepresentation not otherwise described in the Code in order to obtain academic credit or other academic advantage of any kind in connection with Assignment 1 in the Stats Course, contrary to section B.I.3(b) of the Code.
- d. On or about May 10, 2023, the Student knowingly forged or in any other way altered or falsified a document or evidence required by the University of Toronto, or uttered, circulated or made use of such forged, altered or falsified document, namely, a Verification of Student Illness or Injury form, dated April 18, 2023, that the Student submitted in support of her petition for academic accommodation in connection with the final exam in ECO200Y1Y (the “**Economics Course**”), contrary to section B.I.1(a) of the Code.
- e. In the alternative to Charge 4, the Student knowingly engaged in a form of cheating, academic dishonesty or misconduct, fraud or misrepresentation not otherwise described in the Code in order to obtain academic credit or other academic advantage of any kind in connection with a Verification of Student Illness or Injury form, dated April 18, 2023, that the Student submitted in support of her petition for academic accommodation in connection with the final exam in the Economics Course, contrary to section B.I.3(b) of the Code

(Collectively, the “Charges”)

- 4. The Particulars of the Charges are as follows:

- a. At all material times the Student was a student enrolled at the University of Toronto Faculty of Arts and Science.

***STA238***

- b. In Summer 2022, the Student enrolled in STA238H1S (Probability, Statistics and Data Analysis II).
- c. Students in the Course were evaluated on the basis of, among other things, two assignments. Students were required to complete the assignments independently.
- d. On or about July 18, 2022, the Student submitted Assignment 1 in the Course.
- e. The Student knew that students were required to complete Assignment 1 independently and that she could not consult with anyone, including any “tutoring” services such as SavvyUni, when completing Assignment 1. The Student knowingly obtained unauthorized assistance on Assignment 1 from others, including from SavvyUni, a “tutoring” service or other students.
- f. The Student submitted Assignment 1:
  - i. to obtain academic credit;
  - ii. knowing that it contained ideas, expressions of ideas or work which were not her own, but were the ideas, expressions of ideas or work of others, including SavvyUni, a “tutoring” service, or other students; and
  - iii. knowing that she did not properly reference the ideas, expressions of ideas or work that you drew from others, including SavvyUni, a “tutoring” service, or other students.

- g. The Student knowingly submitted Assignment 1 in the Course with the intention that the University of Toronto rely on it as containing her own ideas or work in considering the appropriate academic credit to be assigned to her work.

### **ECO200**

- h. In Fall 2022 and Winter 2023, the Student enrolled in ECO200Y1Y (Microeconomic Theory) (the “Economics Course”).
- i. Students in the Economics Course were evaluated on the basis of, among other things, a final exam worth 30% of their final grades.
- j. The final exam in the Economics Course was held on April 18, 2023 from 9:00 am to 12:00 pm. The Student attended the exam. The Student initially sat in the wrong location and was given the wrong exam. The Student was given the correct exam at approximately 9:30 am. However, at approximately 11:20 am, the Student decided to abandon the exam because she felt she did not have enough time to write it.
- k. On April 20, 2023, the Student submitted a petition to rewrite the final exam in the Economics Course. The Student explained in the petition that the distribution of the exam was very confusing and that she had wasted valuable time working on the wrong exam paper. The Student stated that losing that time made it difficult for her to finish the exam. As a result, the Student asked to be able to retake the exam.
- l. On May 1, 2023, the petition was denied on the basis that the Student had received the correct exam at 9:30 am, but did not abandon it until almost two hours later, and therefore had chosen to write the exam.
- m. On May 10, 2023, the Student submitted another petition to rewrite the final exam in the Economics Course. This time, the Student wrote that the reason was “personal illness”. The Student explained in a statement that she was unable to complete the exam due to a high fever and significant mental stress caused by being given the wrong test paper. The Student stated that at 7:00 am on the exam date,

she started experiencing a headache and nausea. She attended the exam anyway. After receiving the correct exam, the Student said she felt like fainting and her hands shook.

- n. In support of the Student’s petition, on or about May 10, 2023, she submitted a Verification of Student Illness or Injury form dated April 18, 2023, purportedly completed by Mark Brousenko of Sanomed Medical Clinic (the “VOI Form”). The form stated “fever” under Additional Comments.
- o. The Student did not attend Sanomed Medical Clinic on April 18, 2023. The VOI Form was not completed by Mark Brousenko of Sanomed Medical Clinic on April 18, 2023. The VOI Form was forged, altered or falsified. The Student submitted the VOI Form knowing that it was forged, altered or falsified.
- p. The Student knowingly submitted the VOI Form:
  - i. understanding that the University of Toronto required evidence to be presented in order to obtain the academic accommodation or relief she sought;
  - ii. with the intention that the University of Toronto rely on it in considering whether or not to provide her with the academic accommodation or relief she requested; and
  - iii. in an attempt to obtain an academic advantage.

5. Discipline Counsel advised at the outset of the Hearing that Charges 1, 2 and 4 were the primary charges. Discipline Counsel advised that if Charges 1 or 2 were made out, then Charge 3 would be withdrawn. Similarly, Discipline Counsel advised that, if the Panel made a finding on Charge 4, then Charge 5 would be withdrawn.

### **C. FINDINGS AND ORDER**

6. At the conclusion of the hearing, this Panel found the Student guilty of:

- a. one count of knowingly using or possessing an unauthorized aid or aids or obtaining unauthorized assistance in any academic examination or term test or in connection with any other form of academic work, contrary to section B.I.1(b) of the *Code*;
  - b. one count of knowingly representing as one's own any idea or expression of an idea or work of another in any academic examination or term test or in connection with any other form of academic work, contrary to section B.I.1(d) of the *Code*; and
  - c. one count of knowingly forging or in any other way altering or falsifying a document or evidence required by the University of Toronto, or uttering, circulating or making use of such forged, altered or falsified document, contrary to section B.I.1(a) of the *Code*.
7. The Panel imposed the following sanctions on the Student:
- a. a final grade of zero in STA238H1S in Summer 2022;
  - b. a final grade of zero in ECO200Y1Y in Fall 2022 and Winter 2023;
  - c. a suspension from the University for a period of three years from the date of this Order;  
and
  - d. a notation of the sanction on the Student's academic record and transcript for a period of four years from the date of this Order.
8. The Panel also ordered that the case be reported to the Provost for publication of a notice of the decision of the University Tribunal and the sanctions imposed, with the name of the Student withheld.

**D. FACTS & CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS**

9. The chronology of events is relevant to both notice and findings of offence.
10. At all relevant times, the Student was a student enrolled at the University, St. George Campus. She was last enrolled in courses in the Winter of 2024.
11. The Student did not attend the Hearing. The Provost's evidence was submitted by way of affidavits as well as evidence given under oath from Diane Pacheco, an Academic Integrity and Petitions Specialist with the Student Academic Integrity office.

**STA238H1S**

12. Sonia Markes provided evidence for the Provost. In the summer of 2022, Ms. Markes was the instructor for STA238H1S (Probability, Statistics, and Data Analysis) (the "**Stats Course**"). The Student was enrolled in the Stats Course in the Summer of 2022.
13. The Stats Course syllabus reminded students of the importance of academic integrity. The syllabus instructed students that they were expected to complete and submit their own work. If students used code from any other source, they were instructed to provide the source.
14. Students in the Stats Course were required to complete Assignment #1 on or around July 18, 2022. Assignment #1 required students to write code using "R" coding.
15. Around the due date for Assignment #1, Ms. Markes and others in the Department of Statistical Sciences received whistleblower emails reporting that various online tutoring services were providing answers to Assignment #1 in the Stats Course.

16. Ms. Markes alerted the teaching assistants for the Stats Course about the possibility of academic misconduct and provided them the screen shots of the online answers.

17. Ms. Markes reviewed the Student's answers in Assignment #1. In her opinion, there were "striking similarities between the Student's Assignment #1" and the online answers. Ms. Markes concluded that it "would have been unlikely for the Student to have independently produced answers that corresponded so closely with" the online answers.

18. In her affidavit, Ms. Markes provided side by side tables comparing the Student's answers with the online answers. The two are virtually identical. These similarities included that the Student used the same variables and syntax as the online answers, and included a particular syntax that was not taught in the Stats Course. Ms. Markes concluded that the answers the Student submitted for Assignment #1 were the answers provided by the online tutoring service.

19. Ms. Markes met with the Student on September 19, 2022 to discuss her concerns. Ms. Markes then reported the matter to the Student Academic Integrity Office. Therefore, the Student was on notice as of September 2022 that there was a concern of academic misconduct.

### **ECO200Y1Y**

20. The Student enrolled in ECO200Y1Y (Microeconomic Theory) (the "**Economics Course**") in Winter 2023. Students in the Economics Course were required to write a final exam worth 30% of their final mark. The final exam was administered on April 18, 2023. The Student attended the final exam.

### **Initial Petition**

21. However, on April 20<sup>th</sup>, the Student submitted a petition to rewrite the final exam. In her petition, she claimed that she mistakenly picked up the wrong exam and worked on it for an hour before she realized it was the wrong exam. She claimed she found the exam room set up and distribution confusing because there were two sections from the same course taking the exam in the same room. That initial petition was denied.

### Petition Appeal

22. The Student appealed the denial of the petition on May 10, 2023. In that appeal, the Student provided a new reason for the petition, stating that she had been unable to complete the exam “due to a high fever and significant mental stress caused by doing the wrong test paper.”

23. The Student attached a University “Verification of Student Illness or Injury” form (the VOI). This is a University form that students take to medical providers when seeking medical exemptions. The forms have preprinted boxes that medical providers fill out. Medical providers sign the form, provide their licensing number, and the name and location of the clinic.

24. The VOI the Student submitted is dated April 18, 2023 (the date of the final exam). At the top, under the section to be completed by the student, is the Student’s name (typed), her student number (handwritten), her signature, and a handwritten date of April 18, 2023 (written 18/04/2023). The note documents that the Student’s condition is “severe,” which, according to the form is defined as “completely unable to function at any academic level e.g. unable to attend classes, or fulfill any academic obligations.” Under “Additional Comments,” there was a handwritten note stating “fever.” The document appears to be completed by Dr. Mark Broussenko; it lists him as the practitioner (typed name), contains his printed registration number and a signature. The clinic is listed as “Sanomed Medical Clinic” on Bay Street.

25. Diane Pacheco, an Academic Integrity and Petitions Specialist with the Student Academic Integrity office, reviewed the Student's appeal petition. Ms. Pacheco, without the Student's authority, reached out to Sanomed asking them to verify the Student attended at their clinic on April 18, 2023.

26. Shockingly, the clinic responded and provided personal health information to the University. The clinic told the University that the Student did not attend the clinic on April 18, but rather on May 11 and that there was no mention of fever.

27. The University determined that the appeal petition was "Not Considered," which is the outcome when there is falsified or forged documentation. The Student was notified of this decision on June 27, 2023, and the matter was forwarded to the Student Academic Integrity Team at the Dean's Office.

### **Dean's Designate**

28. Zachary Levinsky is an Assistant Professor in the Centre for Criminology and Sociological Studies. He's also a Dean's Designate for Academic Integrity at the Office of the Dean.

29. In July 2023, the Student Academic Integrity team at the Faculty of Arts and Science received reports that the Student engaged in academic misconduct in the Stats Course and the Economics Course.

30. Dr. Levinsky met with the Student on August 11, 2023. At the outset of the meeting, Dr. Levinsky confirmed that the Student had read the Code and he cautioned the Student as required under the Code.

31. The Student denied she copied answers in the Stats Course Assignment #1. The Student could not explain the similarities between her answers and the online answers.

32. Regarding the Economics Course final exam, the Student repeated that she found the exam distribution confusing, sat in the wrong section, and started working on the wrong paper. The TA realized she was in the wrong section and gave the Student the correct exam. However, the Student developed a worsening headache and left the exam. The Student said she then sought medical attention.

33. The Student said when she submitted the initial petition, she lost the medical note. After the petition was denied, the Student claimed she returned to the clinic on May 8, 2023 and got a note that documented her condition on April 18, 2023.

34. The Student claimed that the VOI form submitted with the petition appeal was a scan of the document she received from the clinic on May 8.

35. The matter was forwarded to the Vice Provost's office on August 15, 2023. The Student was notified by email to her mail.utoronto.ca email address.

### **Vice-Provost's Office**

36. On September 25, 2023, the Student emailed the Dean's Office to provide additional information regarding the petition appeal and VOI. She attached documents that she claimed came from the clinic, and that documented that she was seen on May 8, 2023 to review the absence from April 18. The Student emailed from her mail.utoronto.ca email address.

37. Regarding the Stats Course, the Student stated in the email that while her memory was “fuzzy,” she admitted to engaging in “discussions with a classmate” where they “inadvertently compared” their answers. The Student stated that her “submission contained elements that were not entirely” her own work, “constituting an act of plagiarism.”

38. However, the Student continued to deny the allegations regarding the Economics Course. She submitted a different VOI. This one contained the Student’s printed name, but not her student number, signature or date (which were all included in the first version of the VOI submitted). This version of the VOI still listed her condition as “severe,” but there is no handwritten “fever.” The document is still signed by Dr. Broussenko but is dated May 8, 2023, not April 18 like the first one.

39. The Student also attached a copy of medical records from Sanomed, which document that she attended on May 8, 2023 and was seen by Dr. Broussenko. Those notes report that the Student reported that had a headache on April 18, which had since resolved. The notes state “missed exam / needs note in support of that.” The notes continue “note written / self care encouraged.”

40. Importantly, at the end of the note it states: “Addendum: this note was printed on July 28, 2023 to support student’s visit to clinic on the aforementioned date / Was seen here on May 8, 2023 to review absence in [sic] April 18, 2023.”

41. The Student also included her clinic billing information, which documents service dates of May 8, 2023 and July 28, 2023. There is no listed visit in April 2023. This Panel finds that the Student did not attend Sanomed in April 2023.

42. On September 26, 2023, the Dean's Office emailed the Student at her mail.utoronto.ca email address informing her that her case had been forwarded to the Vice-Provost's office.

### **Charges, Disclosure, and emails from Discipline Counsel**

43. On February 12, 2024, the Office of the Vice-Provost, Faculty and Academic Life served the charges on the Student by email to her mail.utoronto.ca email address. That same day, the ADFG Office sent the Student a letter about the charges, which included information about Downtown Legal Services and the Law Society of Ontario's Law Referral Service.

44. On February 14, 2024, Tina Lie, Discipline Counsel, emailed the Student to advise the Student to continue to check her mail.utoronto.ca email address because there would be important information in the future about the discipline hearing. Disclosure was provided by email on May 9, 2024.

### **Fall 2024 to Spring 2025 Correspondence**

45. Ms. Lie emailed the Student in October 2024 to set a hearing date. Ms. Lie's office attempted to contact the Student by phone on January 23, 2025. Ms. Lie's office called the number listed in ROSI. The call was not answered and went to voicemail. Ms. Lie's assistant left a message, but did not receive a call back.

46. Ms. Lie again emailed the Student on February 3, 2025 and again on April 28, 2025 to schedule a hearing date. These emails were sent to the Student's mail.utoronto.ca email address.

47. On April 29, 2025 the Student responded to Ms. Lie requesting that the hearing be scheduled for June 3, 2025. The Student responded from her mail.utoronto.ca email address.

48. Ms. Lie responded that same day advising she would attempt to schedule the hearing on June 3. She requested that the Student meet with her to discuss the case. The Student responded and Ms. Lie and the Student met by Zoom for May 1, 2025 at 11 am EST.

49. During that meeting, the Student advised she did not have disclosure. Ms. Lie agreed to resend the disclosure. The Student also requested that the hearing be adjourned from June 3, 2025 because of her mental health. Ms. Lie asked for medical documentation, and the Student said she would provide it. Finally, the Student admitted the charges relating to the Stats Course.

50. According to Andrew Wagg, Manager, Incident Response at Information Security, Information Technology Services, May 1, 2025 is the last time anyone accessed the Student's mail.utoronto.ca email address.

51. Ms. Lie resent the disclosure by email on May 3, 2025 to the Student's mail.utoronto.ca email address. Ms. Lie reminded the Student to provide medical documentation to adjourn the hearing date. Ms. Lie sent a follow up email on May 14, 2025. On June 18, 2025, Ms. Lie followed up again, stating that she had not proceeded with the hearing on June 3, but that the hearing was scheduled for August 20, 2025. Ms. Lie did not receive a response.

52. On July 2, 2025, the ADFG Office emailed the Student at her mail.utoronto.ca email address and attached a copy of the Notice of Hearing for the hearing scheduled for August 20, 2025.

53. Further communication with the Student included:

- a. August 6, 2025: The ADFG Office emailed the Student at her mail.utoronto.ca email address, attaching a Revised Notice of Hearing, which included a change to the faculty member;
- b. August 7, 2025: Ms. Lie emailed the Student at her mail.utoronto.ca email address, enclosing the Revised Notice of Hearing;
- c. August 11, 2025: Adam Iggers, Discipline Counsel, emailed the Student at her mail.utoronto.ca email address to provide her with copies of the affidavits on which the University intended to rely at the Hearing;
- d. August 12, 2025: Ms. Lie's office attempted to call the Student at the number listed in ROSI. The call was answered but the person answering the phone said no one by the Student's name was associated with the phone number, and that they did not know the Student or anyone with her last name. The person said they had used that phone number for at approximately 7 months;
- e. August 13, 2025: Ms. Lie's office couriered a package to the address listed in ROSI. The package included the Revised Notice of Hearing, the Charges, and the disclosure. The package was signed for at the concierge desk. The concierge desk confirmed that the Student is listed as the resident at that address. That package was not returned; and
- f. August 13, 2025: Ms. Lie's office sent the same package by email to the Student at her mail.utoronto.ca email address.

**E. NOTICE**

54. Section 6 of the *Statutory Powers Procedure Act* (SPPA) requires reasonable notice of the hearing be provided to the parties. Rule 13 of the Rules provides for the methods of service of documents, including charges and notices of hearing. This includes personal service, sending a copy of the document by courier to the student's mailing address contained in the "ROSI", or sending a copy of the document by email to the email address contained in ROSI.

55. Section 7 of the SPPA and Rule 21 of the Rules allow this tribunal to proceed in the absence of a student where notice has been given. When proceeding in the absence of a student, the University must demonstrate it took reasonable steps to notify the student of the charges and of the hearing. The University does not need to prove actual notice.<sup>1</sup>

56. This Panel finds that the University complied with the Rules and has demonstrated that it took reasonable steps to notify the Student of the charges and of the hearing. The Student was clearly aware of the proceedings. She responded to emails sent to her mail.utoronto.ca email address and met with Ms. Lie on May 1, 2025 after the Charges had been laid. The Student was clearly aware of the academic misconduct proceedings against her, received email correspondence about that, and also knew how to contact Discipline Counsel.

57. The Panel determined it would proceed to hear the case on its merits in the Student's absence.

## **F. FINDINGS ON OFFENCE**

---

<sup>1</sup> *University of Toronto and O.E.R.* (Case No. 981, March 4, 2019) at para 37.

58. The onus is on the University to establish on the balance of probabilities, using clear and convincing evidence, that the Student committed the academic offence charged.<sup>2</sup>

59. The University argued that the clear and convincing evidence demonstrated that on a balance of probabilities, the Student more likely than not obtained unauthorized assistance in Assignment #1 in the Stats Course. The syntax used by the Student was not taught in the course, her answers were identical in many places to the online answers and included the same words and phrases.

60. Discipline Counsel argued that the email that the Student sent to Dr. Levinsky on September 25, 2023 was admissible and could be used against the Student as evidence of an admission. However, Discipline Counsel also argued that the email was not necessary to for the Provost to make out the elements of the offence. The Provost did not rely on the statement the Student made to Ms. Lie during their May 1<sup>st</sup> meeting.

61. The Panel agrees that the email is not needed for the Provost to make out the elements of the charge, and as a result it is not necessary to determine if the September 25, 2023 email is admissible.

62. Based on the evidence before it, this Panel finds that the Student obtained unauthorized assistance from the online tutoring service. The Student then used this assistance and knowingly represented it as her own. The Student is therefore guilty of the charges in Charges 1 and 2.

63. Regarding the Economics Course, the Panel finds that on a balance of probabilities, the Student submitted a falsified VOI. Relying on the documents attached to the email the Student

---

<sup>2</sup> *University of Toronto and T.J.* (Case No. 1102, November 5, 2021), para 5.

sent to Dr. Levinsky on September 25, 2024, the Panel finds that the Student did not attend Sanomed in April 2023 (immediately following the exam). Rather, the Student first attended at the Sanomed clinic on May 8, 2023. The Student falsified the initial VOI to make it appear as though she had attended on April 18. In reaching this conclusion, the Panel is not relying on the email exchange between Ms. Pacheco and Sanomed in May 2023, given the circumstances surrounding how the University acquired this information including a breach in doctor-patient confidentiality.

**G. PENALTY**

64. In reaching its decision on penalty, the Panel is guided by the factors established in the case of *University of Toronto and Mr. C.*<sup>3</sup> which are:

- a. the character of the person charged;
- b. the likelihood of a repetition of the offence;
- c. the nature of the offence committed;
- d. any extenuating circumstances surrounding the commission of the offence;
- e. the detriment to the University occasioned by the offence; and
- f. the need to deter others from committing a similar offence.

Decision on Penalty

65. The Provost submits that there are no mitigating factors or information about the Student's character. The Provost submits that even though the Student engaged at various points and

---

<sup>3</sup> Case No. 1976/77-3, November 5, 1976

appeared to admit the charges related to the Stats Course, she took no action to engage in meaningful discussion or accept responsibility. This Panel agrees.

66. The Provost suggests that the Panel can infer that that Student is likely to reoffend given that she was on notice regarding the Stats Course when she submitted the forged document in the Economics Course. In the TP case,<sup>4</sup> there were three instances of academic misconduct, two of which occurred after there was already notice of the first. The Panel in that case noted that because the student “committed the second and third offences after having notice of the first, there is a higher likelihood that there would be a repetition of the offence.”<sup>5</sup>

67. We agree with that analysis and accept that there is a likelihood the Student would reoffend.

68. The Panel had no evidence on any extenuating circumstances.

69. The Student engaged in two separate forms of misconduct: plagiarism and falsification of records. As for the nature of the offence, Discipline Counsel submitted, and this Panel agrees, that forging a document is deliberate, premeditated and egregious. As for the plagiarism offence, that is a serious offence, which as this Panel has repeatedly noted, risks damaging the reputation of the University. Both offences must attract serious consequences to ensure deterrence.

70. The Provost provided precedent cases from this Tribunal with similar misconduct. In the WKS case,<sup>6</sup> the student had no prior record of academic misconduct, did not attend the hearing, and was charged with multiple counts of plagiarism and falsification of documents. In that case, there were more incidents of misconduct than are at issue here (three incidents of falsification of

---

<sup>4</sup> *University of Toronto and T.P.* (Case No. 1513, August 27, 2024)

<sup>5</sup> Para 52.

<sup>6</sup> *University of Toronto and W.K.S.* (Case No. 1131, June 24, 2021)

documents and two instances of plagiarism). In that case, the Tribunal ordered a four-year suspension, a five-year notation, and a zero in the relevant courses.

71. In the TP case,<sup>7</sup> referenced above, the Panel imposed a penalty of three-year suspension, a four-year notation, and a zero in the relevant courses.

72. This Panel agrees that the penalty sought by the Provost is appropriate. This Panel therefore orders that that Student receive the following penalty:

- a. a final grade of zero in STA238H1S in Summer 2022;
- b. a final grade of zero in ECO200Y1Y in Fall 2022 and Winter 2023;
- c. a suspension from the University for a period of three years from the date of this Order;  
and
- d. a notation of the sanction on the Student's academic record and transcript for a period of four years from the date of this Order.

73. The Panel also ordered that the case be reported to the Provost for publication of a notice of the decision of the University Tribunal and the sanctions imposed, with the name of the Student withheld.

Dated at Toronto, this 17<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2025.

Original signed by:

Alexi Wood, Chair  
On behalf of the Panel

---

<sup>7</sup> *University of Toronto and T.P.* (Case No. 1513, August 27, 2024)