

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT, FOURTH
JUDICIAL CIRCUIT, IN AND FOR
DUVAL COUNTY, FLORIDA

CASE NO: 16-2021-AP-000008

DIVISION: AP-A

SONIA ANDREOU, MD,
Petitioners,

v.

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA SCHOOL
OF MEDICINE, JACKONVILLE,
Respondent.

Petition for Writ of Certiorari from a decision by University of Florida College of Medicine

March 6, 2024

PER CURIAM

The University of Florida terminated Andreou's residency due to academic dishonesty. Specifically, the University determined Andreou copied another student's answers on the American Board of Surgery In-Training Examination ("ABSITE"). The University initiated its investigation after receiving a letter from the American Board of Surgery. The Board identified an anomaly with Andreou's result; she and the other student had sixty-four wrong answers match, and eighty-two percent of their examination responses were identical. The odds of this occurring randomly were extremely low.¹ Based on the seating chart, the University concluded that Andreou looked at the screen of another student who had been in front of her. After the University terminated her residency, Andreou exhausted her available administrative remedies.

¹ By the Board's calculations, the odds of the matches occurring by chance was 1/10,000,000,000,000,000,000.

On certiorari review, this Court must apply the following three-part standard of review: (1) whether procedural due process was accorded; (2) whether the essential requirements of law have been observed; and (3) whether the administrative findings and judgment are supported by competent substantial evidence. *Haines City Cmty. Dev. v. Heggs*, 658 So. 2d 523, 530 (Fla. 1995) (citing *City of Deerfield Beach v. Vaillant*, 419 So. 2d 624, 625-26 (Fla. 1982)).

Andreou alleges the University terminated her residency because she has a significant social media presence; she is an amateur bodybuilder and posts pictures of herself online. However, it is not this Court's role to reweigh the evidence. Based upon the record, there was competent, substantial evidence of Andreou's academic dishonesty. She had notice of the disciplinary action and an opportunity to be heard. The University followed its own guidelines during the investigation and complied with the relevant law. Accordingly, the Petition is **DENIED**.

Beverly, Day, Dees, JJ., concur.

Neil L. Henrichsen, counsel for Petitioner
Shayne A. Thomas, counsel for Respondent