1. Re: Accommodation (specifically Paris 1).

Redacted. J asking to stay with me despite hesitation my side, repeated suggestion of alternative. 02.04.2021.

1.1 Re: Accommodation (specifically Paris 2).

Redacted. Separate room and bed.

1.2 Re: Accommodation (specifically Paris 2).

Redacted. Suggestion and instruction how to book her own apartment for Paris 2, offer to pay.

06.06.2021.

2. Request submitted to the university with the "appeal". Re: Claimed lack of request

1. This filing is a formal request for leave to submit supplemental exhibits/declarations on appeal for special reasons, confined narrowly to objective observations already at issue in the verdict and necessary to correct material misstatements.
2. The exhibits are extracted from records in the Appellant's possession; originals are preserved and stored independently.
3. The reasons this request asks for their admission are summarized as follows:
   - **Late and evolving prosecution exhibits.** The prosecution's key translated exhibits were submitted and revised at a late stage (including after witness examination), and were available to the defense only after the evidentiary phase / closing submissions. As shown in the appeal, reliability and attribution issues remain in those materials.
   - **Need for source-linked verification.** Given the seriousness of the findings, it is necessary that the record include source-linked materials that permit verification of quotation, attribution, and context.
   - **Narrow and targeted scope.** The proposed exhibits and statements are limited in scope and address specific findings and factual assertions relied upon in the verdict and in the prosecution's case; they concern external facts already in issue; they are not submitted to re-open the entire evidentiary record. No exhibit or statement touches upon issues internal to the Complainant's mind and require her rebuttal.
   - **Materiality in light of changes in the case narrative.** The prosecution/university presentation evolved over time, including through revised translations and changing emphases. The proposed exhibits are therefore necessary to place the relevant contradictory or clarifying facts on the appellate record.
   - **Practical difficulty in obtaining declarations earlier.** Because of the sensitivity and conduct of the proceedings and confidentiality concerns, it was difficult to obtain witness cooperation earlier.

3. Excerpt taken as evidence of romantic language/manipulation, 6 February 2025. Re: Allegations of romantic pretense, Sections 15(k) and 88.

> "Yes. For me it was extremely exhausting; it was work, but I also did not want to make her feel that it was work. I said it because she said it made her feel better, and then I said: 'Ah, okay, good. Yes, yes, it makes me feel good too.' […] Ultimately, it was not true that her presence made me feel better. What could have made me happy was if what I said had a positive effect."

After an interruption, further:

> "So it is not true that I felt that way, but I certainly believed at the time—I had hope at the time—that it would work for her."

4. Requests for hugs, "verbal hugs" etc. by J over 2019-2022.

Redacted

4.1. Samples of comics and messages made by J that contributed to my concern about her expectations of our relationship.

Redacted. Comic created by J depicting her embracing/hugging me, J 02.08.2021

Redacted. J asking for connection

J , 13.06.2022

Redacted. J calling me soulmate

J, 04.03.2021

5. Attempts to involve outside parties; Re: Setting boundaries.

Redacted. Attempts from 2022 to involve University psychological help for J and secondary supervision.


Redacted. February 2021 attempts to involve secondary advisor, refusal by J.

Redacted. Attempts from 2021 to involve University psychological services.

6. Her request to stay with me and my suggestion of alternative accommodation. Re: Agency in accommodation.

Redacted. Requests from J to stay with me; my suggestion to book her own accomodation funded by my grants.

7. Email between university officials (including Yakirevitch and Berenson) regarding ERC grant. Re: Involvement of research funds in dispute.




Translation: He brings with him a prestigious research grant worth a great deal of money from the European Union — an ERC grant — so that, should he choose to move to a European institution, he would also bring with him a handsome dowry, and any institution there would be happy to take him in.

8. Pressure from Yakirevitch, Kupferman to restrict communication with coauthors and scientific communication; threats of one-sided disclosure. Re: Inappropriate pressure during dispute.

You are also requested not to share the paper you have written with any person or body, including the other researchers working on this project.

We intend to communicate this to the academic institutions or persons organizing this conference.

9. Email by panel sharing witness data to third parties (Yael Peterzil and Hagai Lavner). Re: Witness pressure.



Email sharing data about witnesses with third persons, dismissing the notion that they had been involved as frivolous.

10. Attachment of said email of Talia Sasson calling leak to third parties "frivolous". Re: Reliability of claims by Sasson.

1. On June 22, 2026, June 23, 2026, June 24, 2026, and June 25, 2026, the Appellant emailed this Tribunal, expressing strong opposition to the presence of Ms. Petrozil or any other individual who is not a party to the hearing in the appeal proceeding. Among other things, he argued that this exposure might compromise the confidentiality of the testimonies heard in the first-instance trial tribunal.
2. And indeed, as if a magic want were waved, two motions were filed, one by Petrotou, and the second by Dasha Poliakova, who claimed to be shocked by the fact (according to her) that her demand for the confidentiality of documents she submitted had been breached.
3. Both motions assume that the confidentiality barrier governing the conduct of the proceeding had been breached.
4. I can only express regret that these Applicants totally failed to examine the Tribunal's decisions; their claims lack any factual basis, and my decision dated June 24, 2026, only illustrates that these are frivolous claims.
5. My decision dated June 24, 2026, takes the Appellant's interests into maximal consideration, ruling that none of the Complainant's friends—despite her painful passing—shall be present during the appeal proceeding at this stage. This ought to put an end to the saga of applications to the Tribunal on this matter.
6. If information regarding the existence of the proceeding leaked to others—and we do not know this for a fact—this occurred through no involvement of the Tribunal. Nevertheless, the Applicants ought to take into account that the

11. J describes the similarities she felt between us and asks me if I find them weird, too, while describing them as reassuring (June 2019).

Redacted.

June 2019

12. Altered messages in university account, red heart after “instead” in my 14:40 message is not present in original. Re: Reliability of university record.

Redacted

13. Attempts to restrict the default to “math-only”-support.

Redacted, messages between 2021 and 2023

14. J complaining about anxiety, how it affected her, the lack of help from Hebrew University employees, and asking me to support her (2021).

Redacted

14.1. J about her confidence in HUJI psychological aid, 2021

Redacted