Victim not satisfied with handling of arson case
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for the vandalism after Osherson brought the complaint to him. Sherwood, Osherson, a Campus Police officer and the faculty advisor of the student being disciplined were present at the hearing, Sherwood said. Wong chose not to be a witness at the hearing, Sherwood continued. Wong claimed that he was never asked to appear at the hearing.

The affair was handled informally by the Office of the Dean for Student Affairs because Osherson did not ask to take the case to the Committee on Disciplinary Actions. Sherwood said.

Wong said that he was under the impression that the hearing had determined that the guilty student would immediately apologize to him in person. When the student had not apologized to him nine days later, Wong became upset and complained again to Osherson.

Sherwood said no time limit was specified for the apology.

Students, MIT both failed to communicate
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ing. At that meeting Gray said he would not discuss any compromising. At that meeting Gray said he would not discuss any compromising. At that meeting Gray said he would not discuss any compromising. At that meeting Gray said he would not discuss any compromising.

There was no violation of the disciplinary actions by the student," he said. The student did eventually apologize to Wong, who said he was not satisfied because he felt the vandal was "forced" into an apology and because he doubted the student's sincerity.

Wong said he had wanted his door to be completely restored, but several of the carvings turned out to be irreparable. During his personal apology, the vandal suggested making restitution of $100 for the damage, Wong said. Wong accepted the offer, but stressed that the figure was not his idea.

The vandal, who lives in the same hall as Wong, is moving off the floor voluntarily, Wong said. Wong added that he was disturbed that the Dean's Office had not contacted other gay residents of the floor about the case.